



MS 326

2009-10

SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)

SCHOOL: 06M326

ADDRESS: 401 WEST 164TH STREET NEW YORK, N.Y. 10032

TELEPHONE: 917-521-1875

FAX: 917-521-1750

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

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

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: 06M326 **SCHOOL NAME:** Writers, Leaders of Tomorrow

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 401 W. 164th Street

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 917-521-1875 **FAX:** 917-521-1750

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Sharon Weissbrot **EMAIL ADDRESS:** sweissbrot@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON: _____

PRINCIPAL: Sharon Weissbrot

UFT CHAPTER LEADER: Robin Samuels

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT: Iris Perez

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE:
(Required for high schools) _____

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL SUPPORT ORGANIZATION (SSO) INFORMATION

DISTRICT: 06 **SSO NAME:** Leadership Support Organization

SSO NETWORK LEADER: Lawrence Block

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
Ms. Sharon Weissbrot	*Principal or Designee	
Ms. Robin Samuels	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Ms. Iris Perez	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
Ms. Flor Vence	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
Ms. Sylvia Gonzalez	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
None	Student Representative <i>(optional for elementary and middle schools; a minimum of two members required for high schools)</i>	
None	CBO Representative, if applicable	
Ms. Yomaly Peralta	Member/UFT	
Ms. Goins	Member/Parent	
Ms. Mutiva	Member/UFT	
Ms. N. Vasquez	Member/Parent	
Ms. Canela	Member/Parent	
	Member/	
	Member/	

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

- Core (mandatory) SLT members.

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

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

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

MS 326 is located in District Six, in Washington Heights section of Manhattan and services about 370 students in grades six, seven and eight. MS 326 occupies part of a facility that was formerly occupied by IS 164 which was phased out in June 2006 due to poor academic performance over a number of years. MS 326 has been in existence since September 2004 and experienced the removal of the entire leadership team in August 2006 due to a lack of leadership skills and poor student performance. The present Principal assumed the leadership of the school at the end of August 2006 and has turned MS 326 into a school that is successful in providing a quality education to the children in the community. The Department of Education gave MS 326 an A grade on the 2007-8 Progress Report Card and stated that the school was in the 95th percentile of all middle schools in New York City. Ms 326 received an A grade on the 2008-9 Progress Report card and stated that the school was in the 98th percentile rank of all middle schools in New York.

MS 326 is a unique school in many different ways. This includes our dedicated staff, our diverse student population and the quality of the instructional programs offered to the students. We work very hard to make our school an inviting place to teach and to learn. Our students report to school early to study math and stay late to work on their projects. MS 326 offers the core curriculum and the visual and performing arts which builds engagement, enthusiasm, motivation and success in our students. Staff is deployed effectively through efficient scheduling to make full use of their particular talents. Budgeting decisions are managed very efficiently to support instruction for the students and professional development for the staff in all subject areas.

The school has an inclusive culture in which every child matters regardless of their performance levels or behavior. Special education students are supported in ways that enable them to close the achievement gap through an inclusion program as well as self-contained classes. As stated in the 2008-9 Progress Report, 49% of the special education population closed the achievement gap by a year and a half in both literacy and mathematics. MS 326 has effectual systems to support students most in need and this has resulted in the lowest one third of the students closing the achievement gap in literacy and math. Students' attitudes to learning and their behavior are very positive. MS 326 asks a great deal from the students but cares for each one of them deeply. The tone is set at the start of the day as a member of the staff greets the students at a single entrance and the Principal ensures that the students enter the building in an approved manner in terms of dress and behavior. We have six counselors working in the building providing services to at-risk students who are in danger of failing to make adequate yearly progress.

The principal sets high standards for selecting new staff. They must have knowledge about their content areas but also be able to establish atmosphere conducive to learning. Teachers are observed both formally and informally in order to improve the delivery of instruction. Student attendance is monitored closely and any absences are actively pursued. Much of the teaching is based on an atmosphere of trust that encourages students to talk about their work, make suggestions and become actively engaged in their learning.

The school has an extremely systematic way of collecting and analyzing data. Teachers engage in ongoing assessment of students' performance by using a range of strategies such as conferring notes, classroom tests, observations, pre and post assessments, targeted assessments, predictive tests, and a wealth of information available in the student's data binder. This year, we continued to administer interim measurements in literacy, math and introduced the concept to the social studies and science teachers. The school uses available data, providing staff with objective information and an understanding of how students are performing, individually and in various groups. The school uses the data to identify those students who have made significant gains in performance levels as well as those students who have made little or no progress or lost ground in closing the achievement gap. The impact of these systems on students' achievement is very clear as the interpretation of their performance data has a direct affect on the alignment of the curriculum and classroom planning and instruction to help close the achievement gap.

Most teachers participate in professional learning teams according to their content areas. Teachers use these committees as a vehicle to collaborate in curriculum planning, looking at student work and creating instructional cohesiveness across content areas. Student outcomes are compared by grade and across the school in order to determine whether the progress that students are making is sufficient. These analyses enable the school leaders to be precise when identifying development needs amongst the teachers and within the curriculum.

The principal and cabinet gather and analyze in depth data throughout the school year. We use this analysis to compare how well the school is doing compared to other schools in the area and across the City. The conclusions drawn from it are communicated to teachers so they have a clear understanding of each student's performance, individual performance goals, and also how well their school and grade are doing in comparison with other schools in the peer group, the community as well as the city.

Our students have entered various graphic design competitions at the high school level and have come back with trophies. According to business executives in the field of graphic design, our student produced yearbooks exceeded the quality of work produced by students at the Parson's School of Design. MS 326 targets support in small groups for the lower performing students during the extended day program, Saturday Academy and during regularly programmed instructional period. Our students extend the walls of the school by taking classes at the Bronx Zoo, the Museum of Natural History, the Botanical Gardens and the Museum of Jewish Heritage.

MS 326 works together with two CBO's: Columbia Presbyterian Hospital and the ACDP (Association of Progressive Dominicans). Columbia Presbyterian Hospital operates a medical clinic on the third floor that meets the needs of the students as well as a dental clinic on the first floor which is presently being expanded to service more students. Research has shown that students' medical needs are often met through various programs but dental services are often overlooked or postponed due to the high cost of the services. Poor dentition leads to poor health problems, poor self-esteem and affects a child's ability to communicate effectively. As part of a new three year 21st Century grant, Children's Aid Society will become part of our family and provide support for our parental involvement program. The Association of Progressive Dominicans will continue to operate an after school recreational program as well as an instructional program.

The school communicates clearly with parents and involves them from the start in their child's learning at the middle school level. MS 326 communicates with parents and caregivers through monthly progress reports, report cards, phone conversations, outreach efforts by school staff, parent association meetings and informal meetings. The school provides workshops of interest to parents through its connection with Columbia Presbyterian Hospital and other community based organizations. Parents reported that they feel welcomed at the school and appreciate the ready access they have to staff. The parent coordinator is available to help parents and parents have high praise for the work of the school and the dedication of the staff as reported on the Environmental Surveys.

MS 326 received a math, science and technology grant from General Electric Foundation which will drive instructional innovation for the next four years as we help our students close the achievement gap. This grant will focus on the five key elements of the blueprint for middle school success in helping our students achieve their potential and prepare for college and the work force in the 21st century. The grant will pay for consultants in math, science and technology. As of August 2006, MS 326 had limited technology and this was an area that the SED identified as in need of improvement. Through effective budgeting each year, technology has increased in the school. At the end of 2008-9, the entire computer lab was replaced with new computers. The existing computers were distributed to classrooms to create hubs of computers. Funds from the GE grant were used to buy two smartboards and 27 laptops for the fourth floor. MS 326 also received a bilingual grant which was utilized to set up a Read 180 lab and provided funds to buy a smartboard for the bilingual classes. The technology consultant funded through the GE grant will be providing professional development in the integration of technology in the classroom.

SECTION III – Cont'd

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

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

CEP Section III: School Profile

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT							
School Name:	M.S. 326 - Writers Today & Leaders Tomorrow						
District:	6	DBN:	06M326	School BEDS Code:	310600010326		
DEMOGRAPHICS							
Grades Served:	Pre-K	3	7	√	11		
	K	4	8	√	12		
	1	5	9		Ungraded	√	
	2	6	√	10			
Enrollment				Attendance - % of days students attended:			
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08*	2008-09
Pre-K	0	0	0		89.6	89.7	89.5
Kindergarten	0	0	0				
Grade 1	0	0	0	Student Stability - % of Enrollment:			
Grade 2	0	0	0	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 3	0	0	0		92.6	89.3	89.7
Grade 4	0	0	0	Poverty Rate - % of Enrollment:			
Grade 5	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 6	175	114	80		87.7	95.7	83.5
Grade 7	182	183	123	Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:			
Grade 8	185	164	174	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 9	0	0	0		4	7	36
Grade 10	0	0	0	Recent Immigrants - Total Number:			
Grade 11	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 12	0	0	0		25	30	12
Ungraded	3	3	2	Special Education Enrollment:			
Total	545	464	379	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Special Education Enrollment:				Suspensions (OSYD Reporting) - Total Number:			
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
# in Self-Contained Classes	16	12	20	Principal Suspensions	86	35	12
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	11	23	35	Superintendent Suspensions	23	11	20
Number all others	29	25	22	Special High School Programs - Total Number:			
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
				CTE Program Participants	0	0	0
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:				Early College HS Program Participants	0	0	0
(BESIS Survey)				Number of Staff - Includes all full-time staff:			
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
# in Transitional Bilingual Classes	71	0	39	Number of Teachers	33	40	39
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0				
# receiving ESL services only	88	177	102				

CEP Section III: School Profile

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT							
# ELLs with IEPs	2	0	13	Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	6	9	9
These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.				Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	N/A	0	0
Overage Students (# entering students overage for grade)				Teacher Qualifications:			
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
(As of October 31)				% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100.0	100.0	94.9
	14	17	12	% more than 2 years teaching in this school	21.2	22.5	59.0
				% more than 5 years teaching anywhere	54.5	50.0	46.2
Ethnicity and Gender - % of Enrollment:				% Masters Degree or higher	91.0	80.0	69.0
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	% core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	100.0	100.0	97.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.0	0.0	0.0				
Black or African American	19.8	18.8	19.3				
Hispanic or Latino	79.4	80.4	80.7				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	0.2	0.2	0.0				
White	0.6	0.6	0.0				
Male	56.3	57.8	60.4				
Female	43.7	42.2	39.6				
2009-10 TITLE I STATUS							
√	Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP)						
	Title I Targeted Assistance						
	Non-Title I						
Years the School Received Title I Part A Funding:				2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
				√	√	√	√
NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY							
SURR School (Yes/No)	√	If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:				Math	
Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2008-09) Based on 2007-08 Performance:							
√	In Good Standing (IGS)						
	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1						
	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 2						
	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) – Year 1						
	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) – Year 2/Planning for Restructuring (PFR)						
	NCLB Restructuring – Year ____						
	School Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP) – Year ____						

CEP Section III: School Profile

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT

Individual Subject/Area Ratings:							
Elementary/Middle Level				Secondary Level			
ELA:	SINI 1			ELA:			
Math:	IGS			Math:			
Science:	IGS			Graduation Rate:			

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

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

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results – 2008-09		Quality Review Results – 2008-09	
Overall Letter Grade:	A	Overall Evaluation:	NR
Overall Score:	102.8	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	
School Environment:	11.6	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	
<i>(Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)</i>		Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	
School Performance:	23.6	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	
<i>(Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)</i>		Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	
Student Progress:	55.6		
<i>(Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)</i>			
Additional Credit:	12		

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

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

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

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

An analysis of the 2008-2009 progress report revealed that MS 326 is on the course to continued improvement. The 2005-2006 progress report rated our school at 22.7 points which was equivalent to an "F" and was reflective of the overall conditions at the school prior to my arrival as Principal at the end of August 2006. The 2007-8 progress report revealed that we surpassed the target score of 63.3 and achieved a score of 84.5 which was an "A" and placed MS 326 in the 95th percentile rank of all middle schools. The results of the 2008-9 progress report revealed that MS 326 achieved a score of 102.8 and outperformed 98% of the middle schools in New York City.

The response data for 2008-9 environmental surveys revealed that 99% of the parents responded to the surveys which was an increase of 12% over the response rate in 2007-8 and 62% increase over the response rate for 2006-7 and higher than the city average response rate of 45%. This was due to an increase in parent involvement at the school, increased parent satisfaction with the school, and the efforts of the parent coordinator to promote parental participation in the completion of the surveys. The parents rated the school 9.3 out of a possible 10 in academic expectations (117.2% of the city horizon), 9.2 out of a possible 10 in communication (128.6% of the city horizon), 8.2 out of possible 10 in engagement (110% of the city horizon) and 8.9 in safety and respect (90% of the city horizon).

The response rate for the student section of the environmental section of the 2008-9 Progress report was 97% as compared to the city average response rate of 80%. The students rated the school 8.4 of a possible 10 in academic expectations (115% of the city horizon); 7.3 out of a possible 10 in communication (118% in the city horizon); 8 out of possible 10 in engagement (113% of the city horizon) and 7.4 out of a possible 10 in safety and respect (93.3% of the city horizon).

MS 326 is on the course towards continued improvement as evidenced by the fact that the data from the 2008-9 progress reports revealed a school that has made consistent strides in both literacy and math during the past three years. During 2008-9, the percentage of students making at least one year of progress in literacy was 77.8% as compared to 75.6% in 2007-8.

In comparing the school to the peer horizon in terms of students making one year of progress in literacy, MS 326 was at 102.9 % of the range of the peer group in 2008-9. However, when looking at the school relative to the city horizon, the percentage of the MS 326 students making one year of progress in literacy was 121.1% of the city range of scores. This reveals that our students made more progress in literacy during 2008-9 than the average student in middle school across the city. The

percentage of students in the school's lowest third making one year of progress was 93.6% which is an increase over 85.7% in 2007-8. An analysis of the math scores revealed that the percentage of students making at least one year of progress was 73.6% which was a decrease from 76.4% over the 2007-8 results. In comparing the school to the peer horizon in terms of students making one year of progress in literacy, MS 326 was at 83.3% of the range of the peer group. However, when looking at the school relative to the city horizon, the percentage of the MS 326 students making one year of progress in literacy was 81.4% of the city range of scores which is a slight decrease from the 2007-8 levels. The percentage of students in the lowest one third making one year of progress in math was 88.1% which is a seven percent increase over the 2007-8 level of 81.9%.

A review of the ELA and Math performance data for all tested students revealed continuous improvement and indicated that we are closing the achievement gap for the Black students, ELL's and for those students who are in the lowest one third as well as the other NCLB subgroups. According to the 2008-9 NY State Accountability Report, the school made AYP in both math and ELA for Black students, for all students, students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged, and limited English Proficient students in ELA. The school also made AYP for all students in science. According to the 2008-9 NY State Accountability Report, MS 326 is "in good standing" in making adequate yearly progress.

An analysis of the number of level 1's in ELA based on the total school population during of period 2007-9 revealed a decrease from 17% (N= 90) in 2007 to .03% (N=1) in 2009. At the same time, there was an increase of approximately 23% in the number of students functioning at level 3/4 in ELA.

TOTAL SCHOOL FOR THE ELA TEST								
Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	1	.03	204	59.5	138	40.2	0	0
2008	35	8	298	68	103	23.7	2	.5
2007	90	17	337	65	88	17.0	1	0.6

A review of the ELA performance data for all tested students in the sixth grade revealed continuous improvement and indicated that we are closing the achievement gap for the Black students, ELL's and for those students who are in the lowest one third as well as the other NCLB subgroups. An analysis of the number of level 1's in grade 6 during of period 2007-9 revealed a decrease from 11% (N= 17) in 2007 to 0% (N=0) in 2009. At the same time, there was an increase of approximately 30% in the number of sixth grade students functioning at level 3/4.

GRADE SIX ELA RESULTS								
Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	0	0	44	60	30	40	0	0
2008	6	5.7	80	76	19	18	0	0
2007	17	11.0	121	78.1	16	10.3	1	0.6

An analysis of the sub-group of special education students revealed that there was an obvious improvement in the student performance levels at the sixth grade level during the period 2007-2009. There was a decrease of the number of level 1 sixth grade special education students from 57% in 2006 to 0% in 2009. By 2009, twenty percent of the sixth grade special education students were functioning on grade level. Eighty percent of the sixth grade special education population was meeting minimum standards in ELA as compared to only 35% in 2006.

GRADE 6 ELA SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS								
Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	0	0	20	80	5	20	0	0
2008	0	0	21	100	0	0	0	0
2007	7	33.3	13	61.9	1	4.8	0	0
2006	8	57.1	5	35.7	1	7.1	0	0

An analysis of the ELL data for grade six revealed that there was improvement in the performance levels of the students. It is also important to note that many of these students have been in an English Language Speaking School for less than three years but took a grade level exam in English Language Arts. This factor affects the number of students achieving a level 3 from year to year. An analysis of the scores in 2009 revealed a significant jump in the number of level 2 students and a decrease in the number of level 1 students.

GRADE 6 ELA English Language Learners

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	0	0	30	91	3	9	0	0
2008	18	38.3	17	36.2	12	25.5	0	0
2007	35	60.3	18	31	5	8.6	0	0
2006	18	45	22	55	0	0	0	0

The overall results indicated a positive change in the performance of the grade 6 students from 2007 to 2009. An examination of the 2008-2009 instructional program and professional development opportunities for sixth grade teachers supported a need to raise the academic rigor of the literacy program to help close the achievement gap. While there was a significant increase in the performance levels of the sixth graders on the ELA test, the grade continued to lag behind the seventh and eighth grade performance levels.

Seventh grade ELA Results:

An analysis of all tested seventh grade students revealed that there was a decrease in the number of level 1's from 46 students in 2007 to zero students in 2009. Furthermore, 2009 witnessed a turnaround in the number of level 3/4 students. In 2009, there were 56 students who achieved level 3 as compared to 23 students in 2007 which is an increase of 38 percent.

GRADE 7 ELA All students

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	0	0	56	50	56	50	0	0
2008	12	7	112	65	48	28	0	0
2007	46	25.4	112	61.9	23	12.7	0	0

During 2007-9, the special education subgroup results revealed an increase from 5.9% to 27% in the number of students performing at level 3 and a decrease from 47.1% to 0 % in level 1's. Similarly, an analysis of the ELL data during the same period presented in the chart below saw a decrease in level 1's and an increase in level 3's. However, while the ELL population has closed the achievement gap, they continue to lag behind the general education group as a whole and the special education group as a sub-group in the seventh grade

Grade 7 ELA Special Education

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	0	0	19	73.0	7	27.0	0	0
2008	4	17.4	13	56.5	6	26.1	0	0
2007	8	47.1	8	47	1	5.9	0	0

GRADE 7 ELA ELL's

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	0	0	36	75.0	12	25.0	0	0
2008	10	17.5	44	77.2	3	5.3	0	0
2007	36	64.3	20	35.7	0	0	0	0.6

Eighth Grade ELA Results:

In analyzing the eighth grade student performance levels from 2007 to 2009, there was a decrease in the number of level 1 students from 2007 (15%) to 2009 (less than 1%). There was an increase in the number of total population eighth graders performing at level 3/4 from 2007 to 2009. Similar to the data in seventh grade, the special education students decreased their level 1's and increased their level 2's during the three year period which means that all special education students are meeting standards for the first time. The ELL population saw a 38% decrease in level 1's with one student, who is a long term absence, achieving a level 1. The rest of the eighth grade students met minimum standards at level 2.

GRADE 8 ELA All Students

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	1	1	106	67	52	33	0	0
2008	17	11	104	66	36	23	2	1
2007	27	15	104	57.8	49	27.2	0	0

GRADE 8 ELA Special Education

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	0	0	23	92	2	8.0		
2008	3	21.4	9	64.3	2	14.3	0	0
2007	10	43.5	12	52.2	1	4.3	0	0

GRADE 8 ELA ELL's

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	1	2	54	96	1	2.0	0	0

2008	15	26.8	36	64.3	5	8.9	0	0
2007	19	40.4	24	51.1	4	8.5	0	0

Greatest Accomplishments in Literacy:

Our accomplishments in literacy can be best exemplified by the following chart which reveals the data for the entire school for the past three years.

- The data shows a consistent pattern of a decreased number of students performing at level 1 and an increase of level 3/4 across all grades and all subgroups.
- The data also revealed in the charts below a pattern of decreased number of students performing at level 1 and an increase in the number of level 3/4 students in the total school results.
- The 2009 SED Performance Index is 138 for ELA which is an increase over the PI levels of 88 in 2006, 101 in 2007 and 116 in 2008.
- Literacy teachers during spring 2009 collaborated on revising the existing literacy curriculum to reflect increased rigor across the grades in both the reading and writing workshops segments of the balanced literacy curriculum.
- Literacy teachers differentiated instruction for all learners which was reflected in the standardized test results.
- Increased collaboration among the literacy teachers with the support from the consultants and coach which resulted in the sharing of strategies.

TOTAL SCHOOL ELA								
Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	0	0	210	60	140	40	0	0
2008	35	8	298	68	103	23.7	2	0.5
2007	90	17	337	65	88	17.0	1	0.6
2006	77	25.4	183	60.4	43	14.2	0	0

TOTAL SCHOOL SPECIAL EDUCATION								
Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	0	0	64	82.0	14	18.0	0	0
2008	14	31.1	26	57.8	5	11.1	0	0
2007	23	42.6	29	53.7	2	3.7	0	0
2006	37	53.6	29	42.0	3	4.3	0	0

TOTAL SCHOOL ELL'S								
Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	1	less than 1%	112	82.0	24	18.0	0	0
2008	30	19.4	116	74.8	9	5.8	0	0
2007	69	43.4	86	54.1	4	2.5	0	0
2006	40	48.8	41	50.0	1	1.2	0	0

- When looking at the data for the total school for the past three years, it is clear that there have been an increase in the number of level 3 students for the subgroups (ELL's and special education) and a decrease in the number of level 1's.

- It is also important to look at a longitudinal analysis of the performance levels of the same students over the three year period at MS 326. In this brief slice of data, it is clear that over a three year period from 2007-2009, the same students went from 11% level 1 in sixth grade to less than 1% in eighth grade. At the same time, there was an increase in the number of students functioning at level 3 (11%) in sixth grade as compared to eighth grade (33%).

LONGITUDINAL ANALYSIS

ELA - 6 TH GRADE TO 8 TH GRADE TOTAL SCHOOL								
Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009 8 th	1	.07	105	66.4	52	33	0	0
2008 7 th	12	7	112	65	48	28	0	0
2007 6 th	17	11.0	121	78.1	16	10.3	1	0.6

Significant Aids to continuous Improvement

A review of the data indicates that the following are significant aids to continuous improvement:

- The Principal, Assistant Principals work consistently to provide professional development and coaching to build capacity at all levels in the school.
- The Principal has been successful in building a highly motivated team of staff.
- The principal and other senior staff have a very good understanding of the quality of teaching and its impact on learning throughout the school.
- Teachers plan together and work collaboratively with their colleagues to develop grade protocols in order to better service the students.
- Continuation of the instructional strategies that have contributed to the overall improved student achievement during the school year 2008-9 including the implementation of daily 90 minute literacy block and a clinic session on Friday to address individual student needs.
- The implementation of the teacher created new literacy curriculum with emphasis on increased academic rigor for all students.
- Implementation of the Read 180 program, teacher directed, computer assisted learning, library based and group supported reading program for ELL's.
- Provision of a desktop computer for enhanced learning for each sixth grade student through a grant from the Computers for Youth.
- Continued provision of academic intervention services for all students who are not performing on grade level.
- Ongoing professional development by consultants and the literacy coach to help teachers differentiate instruction to all students.
- Teachers will continue to maintain data binders in math where they will identify the next steps for students based on ITA's, predictive tests, performance series and teacher generated assessment tools.

Based on an analysis of the ELA data, MS 326 has made considerable progress in closing the achievement gap for all subgroups. However, 60% of the total population is not performing at level 3. Therefore, there is a continued need to address the needs of students in ELA. It is also important to note that the ELL's made significant progress in closing the achievement gap but continues to lag the performance levels of their monolingual counterparts. The performance levels of the ELL's continue to be an area of need for this school. We do not anticipate any factor prohibiting our continued improvement.

Constraints towards continued progress:

- Limited budget to buy additional instructional materials and improve technology. Budget affected by cuts.
- Poor image of school in the community which affects enrollment.
- The continued creation of charter schools which attract the higher functioning students and MS 326 becomes a last choice for students.
- Sending out of letter by DOE stating that the school is failing when it has received an A grade. This is undermining the efforts of the teachers and the efforts of the students. Level 3 students left for other schools under NCLB.
- Our student population consisted of a large number of special education students and a reduction in the total register of general education students in the school for 2008-9. The percentage of special education students approached 21% in comparison to the District 6 average of about 15% during 2008-9.
- The total ELL population approached 40% during 2008-9 which has an impact on student performance.
- A small number of underperforming teachers who continue to exist in the building. Teacher Data reports support this fact and these teachers were provided professional development.

Math:

An analysis of the grade 6 math results for all students revealed a positive trend in total student performance between 2007 and 2009 as there has been an 27% increase in the number of students functioning at level 3 and steady decrease in the number of students functioning at level 1 during the period from 2007-2009. It is also important to note that the number of sixth graders performing at levels 3 and 4 were much lower than the other grades and that there were more sixth graders performing at level 1 than in the other two grades.

GRADE 6 Math All students

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	8	10	38	45	36	43	2	2
2008	26	23	43	38.3	40	35.7	3	2.6
2007	54	34	78	49	26	16	2	1.3

There is also a similar pattern when looking at the subgroups. An analysis of the sixth grade special education sub-group between 2007-9 revealed an increase of 25% in level 3's/4's and a decrease of 45.5% in level 1's. Examination of the sixth grade ELL data revealed that there was a 23% increase in the number of Level 3 students and a 47% decrease in the level 1's.

GRADE 6 Math Special Education

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009		20		52		24		4

2008	16	24.6	35	53.9	14	21.5	0	0
2007	38	65.5	18	31.0	2	3.4	0	0

GRADE 6 Math ELL's

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	5	13	21	56	12	31.0	0	0
2008	18	38.3	17	36.2	12	25.5	0	0
2007	35	60.3	18	31	5	8.6	0	0

Seventh Grade Math Scores:

An analysis of the seventh grade results during the period of 2007-2009 reflected a very positive trend in the performance of all tested students on the math tests. In 2009, only 3% (N=4) students performed at level 1 in comparison to 23 % students (N=41) in 2007. An analysis of data revealed a positive change in the number of students performing on or above grade level. In 2009, 82% of the students (N=97) performed at or above grade level as compared to 18% (N=32) in 2007.

GRADE 7 Math All Students

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	4	3.0	18	15	88	73	9	9.0
2008	8	4.4	79	43.8	88	49	5	2.8
2007	41	23	106	59	30	17	2	1.1

During 2007-9, the special education subgroup results revealed an increase from 5.9% to 57% in level 3's and a decrease from 47.1% to 11 % in level 1's. Similarly, an analysis of the ELL data during the same period saw a decrease in level 1's from a high of 23% (N=41) in 2007 to 6% (N=3) in 2009. The ELL student data demonstrated an increase in level 3' and 4's from 18.1% to 69% in 2009.

GRADE 7 Math Special Education

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	4	11	9	32	15	57	0	0
2008	4	16	15	60	6	24	0	0
2007	8	47.1	8	47.1	1	5.9	0	0

GRADE 7 Math ELL's

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	3	6	12	25	31	65	2	4.0
2008	8	4.4	79	43.8	88	49	5	2.8
2007	41	23	106	59	30	17	2	1.1

Eighth Grade Math:

The eighth grade results over the three year period 2007-2009 is also indicative of a very positive trend in the performance of all eighth grade students. In 2007, 42% (N=75) of the students performed at level 1 (N=75) as compared with 4.0% (N=7) functioning level 1 in 2009. An analysis of data revealed a positive change in the number of students performing at or above grade level. In 2007, only 14% (N=25) of the student body was able to achieve a level 3 as compared to 67% (N=120) in 2009.

GRADE 8 All Tested

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	7	4.0	52	29	116	65	4	2.0
2008	16	9.8	66	40.5	76	46.6	6	3.7
2007	75	42	78	44	25	14	0	0

The special education students decreased their level 1's from 81% in 2007 to 8% in 2009 while the level 3 and 4's increased from 0% in 2007 to 24% in 2008.

GRADE 8 Math Special Education

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	2	8	17	68.0	6	24.0	0	0
2008	4	25	9	56.3	3	18.8	0	0
2007	17	81	4	19.0	0	0	0	0

Similar to the results for the special education subgroup, the ELL's saw a dramatic decrease in level 1's and an increase in level 3's. A comparison of the 2007-2009 ELL data revealed a decrease in level 1's from 60.9% in 2007 to 6% in 2009. An analysis of the data further revealed that there were only 10.9% Level 3's in 2007 as compared huge increase to 64% Level 3 and Level 4 in 2009.

GRADE 8 Math ELL's

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	4	6.0	19	30.0	40	63	1	1.0
2008	8	13.3	16	26.7	33	55	3	5.0
2007	28	60.9	13	28.3	5	10.9	0	0

Greatest Accomplishments in Math

- Newly hired math teachers established classrooms conducive to learning and were mentored as well as provided support by the math coach.
- The data shows a consistent pattern of a decreased number of students performing at level 1 and an increase of level 3/4 across all grades and all subgroups.
- The 2009 SED Performance Index is 167 which is an increase over the PI level of 84 in 2007.
- Inquiry Team targeted high level 2's and moved the majority to level 3 two years in a row.
- Math teachers differentiated instruction for all learners which was reflected in the standardized test results.
- Increased collaboration among the math teachers

- Our accomplishments in math can be best exemplified by the following charts which reveal the data for the entire school for the past three years. The data revealed in the charts below a pattern of decreased number of students performing at level 1 and an increase in the number of level 3/4 students in the total school results.

TOTAL SCHOOL								
Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	19	5	107	28.0	242	63.0	15	4
2008	50	11	192	41.8	204	44.4	14	3
2007	171	33	262	51.0	81	15.6	4	.08
2006	117	34.1	172	50.1	54	15.7	0	0
2005	95	45.5	93	44.5	19	9.1	2	1.0

TOTAL SCHOOL SPECIAL EDUCATION MATH								
Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	10	13.0	29	51.0	38	36.0	0	0
2008	16	24.6	35	53.9	14	21.5	0	0
2007	38	65.5	18	31.0	2	3.4	0	0
2006	23	53.5	18	41.9	2	4.7	0	0

TOTAL SCHOOL ELL'S MATH								
Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	12	8.0	53	35.0	87	57.0	0	0
2008	30	17.5	69	41.9	68	39.8	4	2.3
2007	77	47.5	65	40.1	19	11.7	1	0.6
2006	53	48.6	53	48.6	3	7.8	0	0

- When looking at the data for the total school for the past three years, it is clear that there have been an increase in the number of level 3 students for the subgroups (ELL's and special education) and a decrease in the number of level 1's across all grades.
- It is also important to look at a longitudinal analysis of the performance levels of the same students over the three year period at MS 326. In this brief slice of data, it is clear that over a three year period from 2007-2009, the same students went from 34% level 1 in sixth grade to 4.0% in eighth grade. At the same time, there was an increase in the number of students functioning at level 3 and level 4 (67%) in eighth grade as compared to sixth grade (17.3%).

LONGITUDINAL ANALYSIS

6 TH TO 8 TH GRADE TOTAL SCHOOL 2007-2009				
Year	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4

	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009 8th	7	4.0	52	29	116	65	4	2.0
2008 7th	9	04.9	82	44.6	88	47.8	5	2.7
2007 6th	54	34.0	78	49	26	16	2	1.3

One of the reasons for the increase in the number of students performing at or above grade level was the result of the efforts of the inquiry team. The seventh grade math teachers collaborated and identified a group of students who had scored a level 2 or a low level 3 on the 2008 math test and subjected them to additional instruction in which the teachers engaged in a task analysis and changed the delivery of instruction.

- The students increased their RESI scores on the 2009 math test anywhere from .06 to 1.50. Based on the 2009 math exam, one student jumped up from a high level 1 to level 2, 17 students moved from a level 2 to a level 3 and 1 student jumped from a level 2 to a level 4 as a result of the direct instruction in the inquiry group.

Significant Aids to continuous Improvement

- Continuation of the instructional strategies that have contributed to the overall improved student achievement during the school year 2007-8.
- Establishment of a second inquiry group to address the needs of incoming seventh graders.
- The use of Contract for Excellence funds to hire a math teacher to reduce class size in the seventh grade math classes with large number of ELL's and special education students.
- Professional development to address differentiation strategies as well as to provide support in implementing the 3rd edition of Impact Math.
- Increasing the academic rigor of math instruction in the classroom.
- Teachers work collaboratively with their colleagues in unwrapping the math curriculum.
- Teachers maintain data binders in math where they will identify the next steps for students based on ITA's, predictive tests and teacher generated assessment tools.
- Regular meetings between AP's, literary and math coaches and individual teachers to review student progress and set goals for students as well as whole class goals. Math consultant works with the math teachers
- Support from the Leadership Support Organization.
- Participation in the Computers for Youth program that will provide a computer in the home of every sixth grader.
- Implementation of an in-house Teacher Mentoring Program to support the new math teachers and the literacy teachers with less than two years experience.
- Title III funds were used to provide small group instruction for the ELL's in math and literacy during Saturday Academy and in the morning prior to the start of the school day.

Constraints towards continued progress:

- Limited budget to buy additional instructional materials and improve technology. Budget affected by cuts.
- Poor image of school in the community which affects enrollment.
- Sending out of letter by DOE stating that the school is failing when it has received an A grade. This is undermining the efforts of the teachers and the efforts of the students. Level ¾ students left for other schools.
- Our student population consisted of a large number of special education students and a reduction in the total register of general education students in the school for 2008-9. The percentage of

special education students approached 21% in comparison to the District 6 average of about 15% during 2008-9.

- The total ELL population approached 40% during 2008-9 which has an impact on student performance.
- Push back by math teachers to incorporate best practices and differentiate instruction.

Based on an analysis of the math data, Ms 326 has made considerable progress in closing the achievement gap for all subgroups. However, slightly more than 50% of the total population is not performing at level 3. Therefore, there is a continued need to address the needs of students in math. It is also important to note that the ELL's made significant progress in closing the achievement gap but continues to lag the performance levels of their monolingual counterparts. The performance levels of the ELL's continue to be an area of need for this school. We do not anticipate any factor prohibiting our continued improvement. We do not anticipate any obstacles to continuous improvement in the performance levels of students on the math tests.

SCIENCE:

The N Y State report card for 2008-9 reported that MS 326 met AYP in science. A review of the science test results for the 2006-2009 revealed that there was a decrease in level 1's and an increase in level 3's. In 2008-9, we had a performance index of 141 for all students but the ELL's had a performance index of 108. Similar to the results on the ELA test, the ELL's continue to lag behind the general education population. There is a need to increase the rigor of the science curriculum, introduce interim measurements, ensure that there is reliability across the grades and increase the teacher collaboration in science through professional learning committees. Additionally, there is a need to improve the quality and quantity of laboratory exercises in preparation for the eighth grade NY State science examination.

SOCIAL STUDIES:

An analysis of the results of the 2009 NY State social studies test revealed that 63% of the students scored at level 2 while 34% scored level 1. Only 3% of the students scored level 3 and 4. These results are very similar to the results from the 2008 social studies exam. The 2008 results revealed that the Black population had 18% at level 1, 75% at level 2 and 7% at level 3. In comparison, there 36% Latino students at level 1, 62% at level 2 and only 2% at level 3. This data reflects the results of the ELA with the general education students outperforming the special education as well as the ELL's. Since the social studies test requires reading and writing in response to document based questions, the fact that the ELL's did not perform as well as the general education monolingual students is not a surprise. While the social studies eighth grade exam does not figure into NCLB accountability scores, it is still an indicator of the fact that the students have not improved their performance over a two year period. The test was administered the first week in June which may affect the student outcomes as the students are preparing for graduation and not thinking about the exam. There is a need to establish interim measurements in social studies, increase teacher collaboration, increase academic rigor and begin looking at student work in social studies in order to improve student performance levels.

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, 25% of the seventh grade students who scored a level 2 on the 2009 ELA test, will make an average growth of 4 levels as per Fountas and Pinnell gradients.

After conducting our needs assessment, the SLT determined that we needed to address the needs of the seventh grade students and help them close the achievement gap. Using the data from nyStart, the seventh grade had the largest concentration of level 2's in the school (N=44). The data in ARIS revealed that many of these Level 2 students are receiving special education services. By June 2010, 25% of the seventh grade students who scored a Level 2 will make an average growth of 4 levels as per Fountas and Pinnell gradients. (25% of 44 students is 11)

Goal #2: By June 2010, 20% of the students who scored a level 2 or below on the 2009 math test will demonstrate a growth of 10% between the pre and post unit math tests.

A review of the data revealed that 33% of the total students scored at level 2 (28%) N=107 or a level 1 (5%) N=18 on the March 2009 math test. We expect that 20% of the students (N = 125) who scored level 2 or below will demonstrate a growth of 10% between the pre- and post math unit tests. (20% of 125 students is 25)

Goal #3: By June 2010, a minimum of 30% of the students (N=40) who have been in the country two or more years will make an average growth of 4 levels as per Fountas and Pinnell text gradients. With a total student population of N=40, 30% of 40 students equals a minimum of 12 students who will meet this goal.

A review of the data revealed that there are about 40 students who have been in the country two or more years and must meet increased promotional criteria. It is expected that a minimum of 30% of the students (N=40) who have been in the country two or more years will make an average growth of 4 levels as per Fountas and Pinnell. (30% of 40 students is 12 students)

Goal # 4: By June 2010, students will have 90% attendance year to date at a minimum.

A review of the attendance data revealed that attendance was 89.6% for the 2008-2009 year. Taking into consideration attendance figures due to the swine flu, the overall attendance rate dropped .02% in 2009 as compared to 2008. Students need to be in school to learn and therefore, it is expected that there will be an increase of .04% to reach the minimum attendance rate of 90% for all students by June 1, 2010.

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

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

Subject/Area (where relevant): English Language Arts

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>By June 2010, 25% of the seventh grade students who achieved a level 2 students 2009 ELA test will make an average growth of 4 levels as per Fountas and Pinnell gradients. With a total population of N=44, 25% of 44 students equals a minimum of 11 students who will meet the goal</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>By June 2010, a minimum of 25% of the seventh grade students (N=44) who scored a level 2 on the ELA test will make an average growth of 4 levels as per Fountas and Pinnell text gradients. With a total population of N=44, 25% of 44 students equals a minimum of 11 students who will meet the goal.</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>Use of Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect and analyze on a six week basis running records per student about five times during the year (September-May). • Analyze data by student, class and grade each administration of running records <p>Curriculum and Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training on running records for literacy teachers by AP's. • Basal levels of running records will be established, staff will be trained on guided reading instruction will be incorporated in the classroom. • Accelerated feedback to ELL's, special education and lowest 1/3 students to improve performance levels. <p>Development of Staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literacy consultant working with teachers in the classrooms from September-May • Attendance at Leadership Support Organization sponsored workshops in math (coach, teachers, AP) during the fall and spring semesters • Continued support from Literacy Coach, ESL Coordinator, and Lead Literacy Teacher and

	<p>administrations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional development on running records. • Create a data informed professional development plan for each teacher. <p>Personal Leadership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal blocks time daily to interact with students and informally observe teaching and learning during ELA instruction • Principal reviews quantitative and qualitative data and meets with coach/AP's on a weekly basis to identify support needed by individual teacher and grade <p>Use of Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedules that allow for common planning time as well as time for literacy teachers to engage students in small group instruction. • After school program on weekdays and Saturday to provide additional ELA instructional support for bilingual students. (October-April) by licensed teachers. Use of Title I funds to pay for consultant who will work with ELA teacher • Use of C4E funds to pay for ESL teachers to reduce class size • Staffing of AP's, coaches, lead teachers, • Programming to enable teachers to meet during common planning time and to visit lab sites and classrooms of colleagues to observe best practice and participate in debriefings in order to provide collaborative feedback. • Allocate funds for the purchase of books for study.
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using five interim assessments (approximately every six weeks) students will make on the average an improvement of one jump upward on each of the checkpoints. <p>Evidence to Support the Goal: Establish a chart of baseline data which includes the results of running records assessments as well as the post test. This information will provide evidence of students making a one jump between the first assessment and the last assessment.</p>

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): Math

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>Goal #2: By June 2010, 20% of the students who scored a level 2 or below on the 2008 math test will demonstrate a growth of 10% between the pre and post unit math tests.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>By June 2010, a minimum of 20% out of the students (N=125) who scored a level 2 or below on the math test during 2008-2009 will make an average growth of 10% on the standard based Impact Unit Tests in comparison to baseline data (pre-test) to the post test (a minimum of 35 students will show an increase of 10% from the pre-test to the post test ...25% of 125 students equal 20 students).</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<p>Use of Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of standard based unit exams across grade levels to evaluate student needs, develop plans, improvement, set student goals and gauge student progress. We believe that the implementation of this work will build capacity and have a positive bearing on student progress as we continuously evaluate their progress and expand their achievement targets. • Collect, record, analyze and document Impact math unit test results for each student, class and grade (September-May) by math teachers, coaches and administrators. • Analysis of ongoing data from interim assessments and standardized tests to inform instruction. (October-May) by teachers, administrators and coaches. • The development and maintenance of individual assessment binders which include assessment data, and teacher feedback to identify strengths/weaknesses and the next steps.

Curriculum and Instruction:

- Implementation by teachers of the revised edition of Impact Math and continued support from the math coach (September-June)
- Focus on individualizing instruction to meet identified needs of students in math. Establishment of a new inquiry group of seventh graders and continued intervention work with eighth grade inquiry group on pre-algebraic functions. Teachers and Math AP, data specialist (math coach) will monitor progress of students
- Monitor progress of students by grade, class and individually on interim assessments i.e. ITA's, predictive, Impact Math Unit tests. (October to May).
- Accelerated feedback to ELL's, special education and lowest one third of students.

Development of Staff:

- Increased collaboration among math teachers in looking at student work
- Hiring of two math consultants from AUSSIE to work with math teachers on increasing academic rigor in the classrooms and differentiation instruction
- Implement mastery teaching approaches to address student needs as identified by unit and other assessments.
- Continued support from Math Coach and Leadership Support Knowledge Management KM in the area of math instruction.
- Attendance at Leadership Learning Support Organization sponsored workshops in math (coach, teachers, AP) during the fall and spring semesters.

Personal Leadership:

- Principal blocks time daily to interact with students and informally observe teaching and learning during math instruction
- Principal reviews quantitative and qualitative data and meets with coach/AP's on a weekly basis to identify support needed by individual teacher and grade

Use of Resources:

- After school program on weekdays and Saturday to provide additional math instructional support for bilingual students. (October-April) by teachers, administrators and coaches.
- Use of Title I funds to support the hiring of a math consultant to work with math teachers in conjunction with the math coach.
- Use of Title III funds to support after school program and Saturday Academy math instruction.
- Use of C4E funds to hire an additional math teacher to reduce class size in math classes.
- Programming to enable teachers to meet during common planning time and to visit lab sites and classrooms of colleagues to observe best practice and participate in debriefings in order to provide collaborative feedback.
- Provision for coverages to allow for interschool visits and debriefings

Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment

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

Evidence:

- Using five interim assessments (approximately every six weeks) students will make on the average an improvement of 2% on each of the checkpoints.
- Agendas and sign-in sheets from math content and PD meetings.
- Logs from AUSSIE trainers

Evidence to Support the Goal:

Establish a chart of baseline data which includes the results of the pretests and the interim assessments as well as the post test. This information will provide evidence of students making a 10% jump between the Impact math pre-tests and post tests.

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

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

Subject/Area (where relevant): English Language Learners

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2010, a minimum of 30% of the students (N=40) who have been in the country two or more years will make an average growth of 4 levels as per Fountas and Pinnell text gradients. With a total student population of N=40, 30% of 40 students equals a minimum of 12 students who will meet this goal.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>A review of the data revealed that there are about 40 students who have been in the country two or more years and must meet increased promotional criteria. It is expected that a minimum of 30% of the students (N=40) who have been in the country two or more years will make an average growth of 4 levels as per Fountas and Pinnell. (30% of 40 students is 12 students)</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<p>Use of Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect and analyze on a six week basis running records per student about five times during the year (September-May). • Analyze data by student, class and grade each administration of running records <p>Curriculum and Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training on running records for literacy teachers by AP's. • Basal levels of running records will be established, staff will be trained on guided reading instruction will be incorporated in the classroom. • Accelerated feedback to ELL's, special education and lowest 1/3 students to improve performance levels. <p>Development of Staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literacy consultant working with teachers in the classrooms from September-May

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance at Leadership Support Organization sponsored workshops in math (coach, teachers, AP) during the fall and spring semesters • Continued support from Literacy Coach, ESL Coordinator, and Lead Literacy Teacher and administrations. • Professional development on running records. • Create a data informed professional development plan for each teacher. <p>Personal Leadership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal blocks time daily to interact with students and informally observe teaching and learning during math instruction • Principal reviews quantitative and qualitative data and meets with coach/AP's on a weekly basis to identify support needed by individual teacher and grade <p>Use of Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of funds to support the hiring of a literacy consultant to work with literacy teachers. • Use of Title III funds to support after school program and Saturday Academy science instruction. • Use of C4E funds to hire an additional teacher to reduce class size in classes. • Programming to enable teachers to meet during common planning time and to visit lab sites and classrooms of colleagues to observe best practice and participate in debriefings in order to provide collaborative feedback. • Provision for coverages to allow for interschool visits and debriefings
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using five interim assessments (approximately every six weeks) students will make on the average an improvement of 2% on each of the checkpoints. • Agendas and sign-in sheets from math content and PD meetings. • Logs from AUSSIE trainer <p>Evidence to Support the Goal: Establish a chart of baseline data which includes the results of the pretests and the interim assessments as well as the post test. This information will provide evidence of students making a 10% jump between the Impact math pre-tests and post tests.</p>

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): Attendance

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>Goal # 4: By June 2010, MS 326 will have 90% student attendance year to date at a minimum. A review of the attendance data revealed that attendance YTD was 89.6% for the 2008-2009 year. In addition to taking into consideration attendance figures due to the swine flu, the overall attendance rate dropped .02% last year. Students need to be in school to learn and therefore, it is expected that there will be an increase of .04% to reach the minimum attendance rate of 90% for all students by June 1, 2010.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>Use of Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect and analyze on a monthly basis student attendance by student, class and grade (September-May). • Identify students in need of intervention and discuss at attendance committee meetings <p>Curriculum and Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At risk counseling for high risk students to help them stay in school and avoid dropping out due to poor attendance. • Hallway posters depict daily attendance per class. <p>Development of Staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PD for all staff on attendance procedures • PD on identifying high risk students. <p>Personal Leadership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal blocks time daily to interact with students and informally observe attendance on a weekly basis. • Principal reviews quantitative and qualitative data and meets with coach/AP's on a weekly basis to identify support needed by individual students and classes

<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>Use of Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programming to enable teachers to meet during common planning time and to visit lab sites and classrooms of colleagues to observe best practice and participate in debriefings in order to provide collaborative feedback on engaging students in learning and improve student attendance
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of monthly attendance data students by individual students, class and grade. • Agendas and sign-in sheets from attendance meetings. <p>Evidence to Support the Goal: Establish a chart of baseline data which includes the results of the monthly attendance data by student, class and grade.</p>

REQUIRED APPENDICES REQUIRED APPREQUED APPENDICES 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	60	60	20	10	20	0	26	0
7	100	95	30	15	60	0	42	0
8	120	90	60	60	40	0	54	0
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

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

Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services

<p>Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)</p>	<p>Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).</p>
<p>ELA:</p>	<p>Small group instruction and one to one tutoring during the school day, before and after school and Saturdays using Great Leaps, Just Words, Rewards.</p>
<p>Mathematics:</p>	<p>Small group instruction and one to one tutoring during the school day, before and after school and Saturdays using Options materials</p>
<p>Science:</p>	<p>Small group instruction after school for students using materials from Urban Advantage program as well as instruction for bilingual students. Instructional support given to students in preparing exit projects and preparation of projects for science fair.</p>
<p>Social Studies:</p>	<p>Small group instruction and one to one tutoring focusing on (1) research for exit projects; (2) support for content in class. Support given to students during lunch and after school by social studies teacher.</p>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:</p>	<p>Small group and one to one tutoring using guidance materials as well as advisory for high school.</p>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:</p>	<p>School psychologist doesn't service students at MS 326 as school has a clinic from Columbia Presbyterian Hospital staffed with psychologist and psychiatrist. Any student at risk is referred to the clinic and the child is assigned to provider who develops a treatment plan</p>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:</p>	<p>School Social worker provides services to students individually and in groups based on need during the school day. She also sees individual students before school</p>
<p>At-risk Health-related Services:</p>	<p>MS 326 in conjunction with the Columbia Presbyterian maintains a fully equipped medical clinic which is able to address the needs of the student body for emergency care as well as preventive care. Parents sign permission forms which enable the clinic medical personnel to treat the students. HIPPA laws prevent hospital from disclosing their case load.</p>

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

NCLB/SED requirement for all schools

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

Language Allocation Policy 2009-2010

The purpose of the 2009-2010 school wide Language Allocation Policy at MS 326 is to provide guidance for language use as ELL's progress through their academic and language development program in grades sixth through eighth grade. Our Language Allocation Policy is a coherent plan for language development that provides a continuum through which instruction in English will increase as ELL's develop proficiency in their second language. This Language Allocation Policy will include a description of the various programs at Middle School 326 and how it is applied to meet the needs of all ELL's in the building. It is expected that the Language Allocation Policy will enable us to meet and exceed the minimum requirements for English language development instruction as mandated by CR Part 154. Sharon Weissbrot MA CCC/SLP, the Principal of MS 326, is accountable for the implementation of this policy which will strengthen ELL instruction and enable our students to meet and exceed the language requirements for ESL instruction as mandated by New York State Part 154 regulations.

The LAP team members consist of Sharon Weissbrot (Principal), Julie Kreichman (ESL teacher), Jessica Allred (ESL teacher), Angel Ortega (Assistant Principal), Jose Brito (bilingual teacher), Zaida Ortiz (guidance counselor), Iris Perez (parent) and Iris Nunez (parent coordinator).

MS 326 is located in District 6 in upper Manhattan and services students grades six, seven and eight. This year, the school had a student population of about 370 students and the ELL population comprises about 36% (N=132) of the total population. MS 326 is a school on the rise as we continue to be a school that achieved a grade of an "A" on the 2007-8 Progress Report and an A on the 2008-9 Progress Report. We received extra credit for moving our ELL's in both math and literacy in 2009.

MS 326 offers transitional bilingual programs as well as pull out/push in ESL programs in all grades. It is anticipated that MS 326 will phase in a dual language program in September 2010 which will enable the school to offer our parents a full choice of programs. We have two certified ESL teachers, a bilingual math teacher, bilingual science teacher, and a Spanish language literacy teacher. Copies of all teachers' licenses are on file in the main office (room 221) of MS 326.

The Department of Education has implemented new eighth grade promotional policy for June 2009 which will have major impact on ELL students who previously may have articulated to high school without meeting standards in both English and math or passing all of their core academic subjects. English Language Learners will be held to promotion standards based on their number of years in NYC public schools. First year ELL's and students with interrupted formal education (SIFE's) must pass core subjects. Second and third year ELL's must score at Level 2 in math and make expected gains in ELA as well as pass core subjects. Fourth year ELL's will be held to the same standards as English proficient students which means they must score a level 2 or above on math and ELA assessments and pass all core academic subjects (ELA, math, science and social studies). We have nine special education students mandated for ESL services. Additionally, MS 326 has about eleven newcomers in the sixth grade, sixteen newcomers in the seventh grade and ten newcomers in the eighth grade as of the October 31st registers.

Language Allocation Policy is included in the Comprehensive Education Plan. MS 326 has a clear and comprehensive vision of its services for all students. The school does coordinate all personnel and resources in alignment with ELL needs, as addressed in the CEP. The school leadership is knowledgeable of all federal, state and city mandates that support the ELL population as evidenced by classroom settings and procedures. In addition, the instructional support specialists from the Leadership Support Organization support the teachers and drive best practices in classrooms with ELL's.

The School Leadership Team as well as cross grade, cross content and cross program teams use data to inform decision making and drive instruction. Ms. Nunez, the parent coordinator, invites parents of ELL's to participate in the school leadership team, the CEP process and attend the Parents' Association meetings. Posters advertising meetings are placed prominently throughout the building as well as in entrance ways. The phone master, which can be programmed to contact all parents or just the parents of the ELL's, is used to notify parents of meetings and/or important messages. Translated letters are also be sent home via backpack. Through the creation of monthly meetings of the Language Allocation Committee, the staff works collaboratively with the school community in monitoring, assessing and revising school procedures, policies and practices as they apply to the ELL population

MS 326 is committed to providing parents with programmatic options for parents of English Language Learners. There are sustained activities for informing and orienting parents about the LAP policy in the parent's native language. When a parent comes into MS 326 with a newly arrived student, he/she is greeted by the ESL Coordinator, Julie Kreichman, who gives the parent a Home Language Survey. Ms. Kreichman engages the parent and child in an oral interview while Ms. Allred, another ESL teacher interviews the parent and the child in their Native Language. A Lab-R is administered to assess linguistic performance levels in both English and Spanish. In this way, a new arrival's placement in bilingual classes and ESL classes are ascertained. The parent completes the form and as well as other registration papers. The parent is given a choice of available programs. There is a video presentation that is provided to the parents within ten days of their child's enrollment in our school. The parent coordinator is available to assist the parent in the registration process and help arrange visits to the medical clinic to update immunization status of their child. The parent will see the Parent Orientation Video/DVD and a "Guide for Parents" brochure which is printed in the parent's home language. The State requires students to be placed in the appropriate program within ten days of enrollment. Parents, who do not come to view the video, are contacted by the parent coordinator to ensure that all parents are given an opportunity to view the video and make an informed choice of ELL programs. This entire process is supervised by the Assistant Principals and the Principal.

MS 326 has undergone major changes since it opened its doors in 2004. It has gone from a SURR school to a school in good standing with the State Education Department for the 2009-2010 year. An analysis of the trends in program choices over the past few years indicates that most of our parents chose a transitional bilingual program as their choice of programming. With the implementation of a dual language program in September 2010, parents will have another type of instructional model to select for their child. By adding a third option to the instructional models, we will be able to provide appropriate programming in accordance with parent requests as many of our feeder schools have dual language programming and if we are to attract these students to our school, we must be able to offer a dual language program.

Upon registration, if the ELL student is in need of mandated special education services, the Individualized Education Plan is reviewed to ascertain the classification, the recommended program, staffing ratio, the language of instruction, whether the student is category X, and the language of the related services as well as the short term objectives. If the parent does not come into school with the IEP, the Principal will check the Special Education Information Services website to ascertain the recommended services. The parent will be introduced to the special education teacher as well as the related service providers and a copy of the A-1 letter will be placed in the child's cumulative records. If it is deemed that the special education program is not appropriate after thirty days of the student sitting in the program and depending on the change requested, either a Type II change will

be implemented or a Type 3 request for a substantial change in the IEP will be submitted to CSE. Language instruction in the special education classes is aligned with the ESL, ELA and NLA New York standards as well as the IEP mandates. Most special education students either meet standard criteria or modified criteria. However, there is a small group of students who meet New York State Alternate Assessment based on their cognitive performance levels as determined by their IEP. These students will meet Alternate Placement Indicators as determined by their functional levels. There are presently nine special education students mandated for ESL services. The ESL teacher maintains an attendance booklet on each child and submits attendance data in December and June of each year.

Within ten days of his/her registration at the school, the student will be administered a LAB-R if the child is new to the system as well as a Spanish test to ascertain functional abilities in both languages. The tests are hand scored to provide immediate data. However, the grids are submitted to the ISC Assessment Coordinator at specified times of the year as the DAA memorandum regarding the LAB-R testing. Based on the results of these tests as well as teacher input, the student may remain in his assigned class or move to a more appropriate setting which will meet his instructional needs. A parent survey and program selection form which is attached to the notification of entitlement to ELL services provides information on how the ELL program information is delivered. MS 326 uses the information from the survey form to make sure that the parents understand the information provided by the school and that the information that they are getting is useful thorough and timely. Documentation to support the fact that the school has appropriately placed all eligible students can be found in the Principal's office. This documentation includes parent option letters, continuation letters, program and class ATS lists as well as the list of new admits (code 51 and 58 only). The parent survey and program selection forms are reviewed by the ESL coordinator, Ms. Kreichman, periodically to see the trends of parental choice and to make any changes to programs as necessary. Using HIBE function in ATS, Ms. Kreichman can analyze parent requests. As a school, we are committed to providing parents in the community a full selection of programs that will meet the linguistic needs of their students. The parents are very pleased with the instructional program at MS 326 as evidenced by the results of the environmental surveys as 100% of the parents responded favorably to the conditions at MS 326. Our school presently offers bilingual self-contained as well as ESL free standing services. We are considering offering a dual language program in the future if there is sufficient population requiring such program as per the Office of Student Enrollment. In the meantime, MS 328 which exists in the same building offers a dual language program and all students requiring this program attend MS 328.

The parents' surveys and program selections forms are also reviewed by the ESL coordinator in conversation with teachers and the Assistant Principals to ascertain if the child's program is appropriate during the monthly Allocation Policy Committee meetings. A review of returned forms indicates that most parents of children who have been in the English speaking class prefer a monolingual ELL setting. This is also similar to parents of special education students who also request that their children be Type 3'd for monolingual settings. In addition, if the student is encountering academic difficulties, the appropriateness of a student's program is also a discussion topic at the Intervention Team meetings. If the Intervention Team recommends a change in programming, the change is implemented and then reviewed by the Intervention Committee to ascertain if the student is benefiting from the TIER I and/or TIER II intervention strategies.

All students who have been identified through the BESIS report will receive a pre-slugged grid to take the NYSESLAT test which is administered in April and May of each year. Students who are new to school after the BESIS process, will be identified through a print out off ATS reflecting new admits to the school. The NYSESLAT assessment tool consists of four subtests: reading, writing, speaking and listening. While the reading, listening and writing subtests are administered as a group, the speaking subtest is administered individually. The student must take all four sections of the test to get credit for the exam. Based on the child's performance on the test, he/she will be identified as a beginner, intermediate, advanced or proficient.

If the student was enrolled in the school the previous June, then the Language Allocation Policy committee has already met and ascertained his/her performance levels on the NYSESLAT as well as the ELA test. MS 326 notifies parents of the NYSESLAT scores and program eligibility before the beginning of the school year. ELL's that continue to score below a certain level of English proficiency continue to be entitled to ELL services. ELL's scoring at or above that level are no longer entitled to ELL services through state funding and enter an all monolingual classes. Parents of ELLs in bilingual classes can decide whether or not their child should continue, despite entitlement status. Ms. Krecihman, the ESL coordinator, assists parents in their decision making process.

All teachers receive class lists of their students' NYSESLAT scores in September and professional development is provided so that the teachers can make informed decisions about their students based on data analysis. The teachers' schedules and the flow of the day are posted in the main office on the counter which is accessible to everyone. Bilingual teachers have opportunities to articulate with quota teachers, ESL and ELA teachers during a common planning periods. In accordance with individual teacher programs, there is additional time during the day when teachers can meet to discuss student progress. All stakeholders including administrators, teachers, and students are able to clearly articulate when and why the students' native language and English are used in teaching and learning in the various programs. The parent coordinator and the bilingual coordinator are available to help the parents understand the intricacies of the different programs and how they relate to instruction for their children.

In addition to the new arrivals, who have been in an English Speaking school for three years or less, there are students who are termed long term ELL's. These students have not been able to move their NYSESLAT scores into the proficient stage. The teachers of these students are held accountable for raising scores and performance levels in the classrooms. When there is a need for TIER II intervention strategies, a general education teacher pulls the students out of the classroom and provides support. There is also the possibility of the SETTS teacher providing at-risk intervention services to the bilingual students. As part of our medical clinic, students can be referred for a hearing and vision test to ascertain acuity. A referral to the Pupil Personnel Committee may help shed some light on why the child is having difficulty meeting performance expectations. At times, it may be determined through an evaluation that the child needs special education services to help him/her achieve his education potential.

Ongoing assessment i.e. interim tests, unit tests in content areas, teacher made assessment tools, standardized tests, are designed to collect evidence of student learning or the need for mid-course change that are systematically implemented across grades and programs. Tests are provided in both languages to children in both formal and informal testing situations. As per DAA, all ELL's are entitled to a full range of testing accommodations: extended time for standardized tests, separate locations, bilingual glossaries and dictionaries, simultaneous use of English and bilingual version (Spanish, Chinese, Arabic) of the tests, a third reading of the reading selection on the ELA tests. The ESL, literacy and content area teachers work collaboratively to help evaluate student work and data to ascertain the language and cognitive demands of tasks aligned to the standards. In the special education classes, the teachers work collaboratively with the paraprofessionals in implementing the objectives as indicated on the student's Individualized Educational Plan.

Based on the evaluation of student performance on the 2009 standardized tests, it was determined that that the students needed support in the writing process as well as literacy above the core curriculum. In addition, a bilingual literacy outside consultant has been working with the students in 621, 721, and 821 as well as the seventh grade monolingual classes to help improve the students' reading and writing skills. The Leadership Support Organization has a bilingual instructional specialist working with the staff on a regular basis. Additionally, the lead ESL teacher has registered for workshops for literacy coaches to help close the achievement gap of the ELL's.

The patterns across the four modalities-listening, speaking reading and writing affected our instructional decisions as to selection of teachers to instruct the students, programming of students for ESL pullout as well as push-in services, the grouping of students for ESL instruction as well the amount of ESL time. An analysis of the NYSESLAT data revealed that listening skills and speaking skills performance levels surpass the

performance levels in reading and writing in both the transitional and ESL only classes. Based on this analysis, we made an instructional decision to hire consultants who will be working with the ELL's in the bilingual classes and the monolingual classes on their writing skills and raise the academic rigor of their work. Additionally, all ELL's in bilingual and monolingual classes have been administered running records to help improve the reading levels by establishing basal levels, applying instruction and then they will be retested every eight weeks this year.

The students are also administered the ACUITY interim assessments as well as the predictive and instructional targeted assessments in transitional programs as well as the free standing ESL program. In all cases, the data is posted online within five days and teachers had access to the data to identify specific needs to be addressed in the classroom. Based on these tests, we know that our children in the bilingual transitional classes have moderate delays in vocabulary and inferential reasoning. Students in free standing ESL classes exhibit similar needs but to a lesser degree than the transitional students. Most students in the bilingual and the free standing classes use simple declarative sentences when writing answers to extended responses. As a result of this analysis, this year, we will also administer an extended response to all students to begin analyzing their extended response data and use the data to drive instruction.

Native language instruction is aligned with ESL/ELA instruction. The same skills/strategies are worked on in both languages simultaneously to reinforce the learning experiences. A certified Spanish Language teacher provides instruction which is programmed into the daily schedule for the bilingual classes. Instruction in the English Language Arts is provided by certified English Language Arts teachers for both the bilingual and ESL classes.

This year, we are continuing to move from a school which was reactionary to a school which is meeting the needs of its students. There are about 150 ELL's in the building with varying linguistic abilities in English. In order to meet the needs of these students, there are three transitional bilingual classes, and a free standing ESL program to service those students who are in monolingual classes. Students are all departmentalized with seventh and eighth grade students moving from room to room. In sixth grade, all students remain in their classrooms but the teachers move from room to room to help bridge the gap between fifth and seventh grades. Students are grouped heterogeneously for all subjects except for ESL instruction which is based on functional levels. ESL teachers also push into classes to support the content area teachers who are working with monolingual ELL's and enrich language development for these students within the content area instruction. All ELL's who have been in an English speaking school for more than a year and a day must take the ELA exam in English. They are able to take other NY State exams in their native language.

All staff members in the general education and special education classes are appropriately licensed. Three teachers hold appropriate teaching certificates that reflect not only their content areas but also their bilingual expertise. In addition, the bilingual special education teacher has demonstrated her proficiency in both languages by passing the required English proficiency exams. The English Language Arts program is taught by licensed ELA teachers. Through these various programs, MS 326 has implemented for 2009-2010 a rigorous instructional program that ensures continuity of instruction and language development. The ELL students receive 90 minutes of literacy and 90 minute blocks of math instruction to help them achieve their education potential in these subjects. Content area instruction is rigorous as evidenced by the reports and projects the students are required to complete.

Language instruction for the ELL's is aligned with the ESL, ELA and NLA and content learning standards and the core curriculum from New York standards. Regardless of the content area, all instruction promotes four language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Native language is used to support high demand, high challenging areas of instruction. It is expected that the teachers will know how to scaffold instruction to promote linguistic development. There is consistency of language usage as per the program design i.e. transitional, dual or free standing ESL. Content area instruction is aligned with the NYC and NYS standards in mathematics, science and social studies. It is provided in both English and the

native language based on the student's placement as per the Language Allocation Policy. English language instruction is provided through the content areas using scaffolding strategies to ensure that both language and content acquisition objectives are achieved. Content area instruction is supported by instructional materials in both languages in sufficient numbers of appropriate quality and aligned to the standards. Content area instruction is conducted in the languages identified on the language allocation policy in the transitional and dual language programs. Content area teachers develop linguistic functions and cognitive skills through the content topics and themes. On going assessment strategies i.e. unit tests, teacher made tests, practice standardized tests, student created projects are used to determine movement towards the content area.

Observations of classroom instruction in the transitional classrooms as well as monolingual classes have revealed that the teachers engage the students in an environment that is conducive to learning. Teachers have high expectations for all students and are accountable for instruction. Lessons consistently promote the use of oral and written language as evidence by work in the student portfolios and classroom visits. Scaffolding strategies are employed which promote ESL and academic development as well as the development of higher cognitive skills i.e. modeling, bridging, contextualization, schema building, text representation, and metacognition. By having the teachers act as facilitators this year, there has been an increase in oral discourse between pairs of students which has promoted the further development of language.

Students participate in an instructional program that regular ensures continuity of rigorous instruction. The instructional program is aligned with the mandated ESL/NLA/ELA and content learning standards and the core curriculum. There is evidence in the classroom of implementation of the core curriculum in all content areas: literacy, science, social studies and math. Teaching materials include a wide range of print, visual and digital resources designed for increasing English language proficiency. Language functions and structures are taught within the context of the lesson. Classroom teachers can explain the basis for their decisions for language use in instruction. The knowledge level of the entire staff is sustained through ongoing training in ESL methodologies, as well as changes and status of the Language Allocation policy. There is a professional development program that targets the needs of teachers of second language learners i.e. second language acquisition, developing academic language through content areas. The literacy and ESL teachers work collaboratively to evaluate student work and data to ascertain the language and cognitive demands of tasks aligned to standards. In addition, the math and science teachers interact with the literacy/ESL teachers as part of a team approach to help the students achieve his/her educational potential. All teachers maintain portfolios for each student where reading and writing products are collected to be assessed periodically by the student, teachers and parents in both languages

In the transitional bilingual program, instruction is provided in the student's native language with intensive support in ESL. The goals of a transitional bilingual self-contained program are to attain English language proficiency within three years; providing grade level academic work in the student's native language so that the student maintains academic progress while developing English proficiency and providing instruction in two languages (Spanish and English). There are about 20 heterogeneously grouped sixth grade students in the sixth grade transitional class and about thirty heterogeneously grouped students in the seventh and eighth grade transitional bilingual classes. Sixth grade students are self-contained in their classroom and are not departmentalized. The seventh and eighth grade students travel to classes as a group.

Additionally, students are grouped for ESL instruction based on their performance levels on the NYSESLAT test and instruction is differentiated based on their functional levels. Excluding the students in the transitional program there are about 70 students in the free standing ESL program. By grouping students according to functional levels in the transitional bilingual classes, explicit ESL instruction is delivered to comply with the mandates. In the beginning stages of English language development, 60% of instructional time will take place in the student's native language and 40% in English. As the students develop fluency in English, instructional time in English also increases. It is expected that students will develop their English language skills through ESL and ELA with the ratio shifting to second language proficiency until the student is ready to enter into an all English program. It is expected that the beginner's ESL class will move to 50% English and 50% Spanish by the end of the year. The instructional

program is aligned with State standards. Teacher and student programs are created by the Assistant Principal and reviewed for compliance by the Principal and the ESL Coordinator. Changes are made to student programs as dictated by student needs on an ongoing basis.

It is the policy of MS 326 to provide increased English instruction by providing instruction in English for literacy/ESL, social studies, science and finally math. All bilingual students receive instruction in the native language arts. Based on an analysis of the data, most of our students are in the intermediate level with weaknesses in reading and writing. Analysis of the 2009 ELA data revealed that there has been a reduction in the number of level 1 students and an increase in the number of level 3's as we close the achievement gap of the students. However, the number of level 3 ELL students continue to lag their monolingual peers in all core subjects. Assessment data for all standardized tests (ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies) can be found in the assessment section of this CEP. The data is broken down by grade as well as sub-groups. Additionally, we use Fountas and Pinnell to track the reading skills of all ELL's and our teacher developed writing rubric to track student performance in writing.

In the bilingual transitional class, math is taught in Spanish, Science is taught in Spanish while English language arts and social studies are taught in English with the support of a push-in ESL teacher. In the ESL stand alone classes, students are taught in English with the support of the ESL teachers. Students receive ESL instruction based on need as identified on the NYSESLAT test. Native Language Arts in Spanish is provided to all students in the bilingual classes.

In addition to the transitional programs, MS 326 also has an ESL program for those students who receive all instruction in English using ESL methodologies as determined by the NYSESLAT scores. The goals of our ESL program are to support the monolingual students in their academic subject area instruction in English. Using the push-in/pull out model, the ESL certified teacher provides ESL instruction to students

Instruction is aligned to the NYCDOE core curriculum in balanced literacy as supported by the Susan Radley literacy units and math using native and second language as determined by the program design and the Language Allocation Policy. Students are grouped homogeneously for ESL instruction based on performance on the LAB-R, NYSESLAT as well as teacher input and a consideration on the amount of time in an English speaking school. The ESL teacher pushes into the classrooms and works collaboratively with the teachers. In other cases, she pulls students out of their literacy class to provide instruction to the students based on their functional levels. It is important to note that all teachers group the children in pairs to promote oral discourse as well as socialization.

While a new arrival is considered to be in an English speaking school for three years or less, there are significant difference in receptive and expressive linguistic functioning in terms of content form and use between students who have been at MS 326 for two months as opposed to two years. Students are grouped heterogeneous for content area subjects to provide opportunities for students who are less proficient in language the necessary time to interact with those who are more proficient. Teachers facilitate learning and take responsibility for student success by using different approaches. However, students are grouped functionally for ESL instruction in small groups in order to promote social as well as academic language development

We have a small number of students who have been identified as students with interrupted formal education. These students are in the bilingual classes and receive small group instruction from the ESL teachers when they are in the classroom. Programmatically, the bilingual classes are small with registers of 16-18 in sixth and seventh grade and 22 in eighth grade. This setup allows teachers to provide individualized attention to SIFE students. MS 326 provides after school support for many of these SIFE kids through a Read 180 additional support program as well as early morning help in math.

We also have a very small group of ELL students who have been in English speaking school for more than six years and are still considered English Language Learners. These students receive small group instruction and have been targeted for after school programs as well as the Saturday Academy. These students are also part of the Level 1 ELA group. The literacy teachers provide additional instructional time for these students.

We have a small group of students with special needs (N=9) who are mandated for exception for bilingual services as per their IEP. These students are pulled out for ESL instruction by a certified ESL teacher in addition to having a second teacher in the collaborative teaching setting. The Principal checks SEC on a weekly basis to ensure that all students have been picked up for services and that the teacher has called in the first attends to the IVR system.

As part of our intervention programs in ELA, we are in the process of implementing Read 180 for both the beginning as well as intermediate level students. The literacy teachers all have time built into their programs to address student needs in small groups during the day. Additionally, students have been identified to come to school for the 37.5 minute program. The ESL teachers work with the beginners while the other teachers work with the intermediate students. Furthermore, we have after school and Saturday programs to address the needs of ELL's. In math, we have classes before school and on Saturdays to address the needs of the students. Monolingual ELL's in general education and special education classes have their needs addressed by the presence of a second teacher in a reduce class. In social studies, an ESL teacher pushes into the class to help the students demonstrate understanding the content. In science, students are provided assistance in after school program for both monolingual as well as transitional classes.

Our plan for continuing transitional support for two years for ELL's reaching proficiency on the NYSESLAT includes monitoring of student progress in all core areas. In math, students are monitored on their performance on unit tests and these results are transparent in the classroom. In literacy, all students have been issued running records and these results are all transparent. Fridays are devoted for addressing the needs of students that surface via these tests and other interim assessments. Social studies and science are all developing uniform across the grade unit tests which will be transparent.

All students have access to standards based instructional materials. Instructional strategies and activities reflect scientifically based research. The balanced literacy model is used in Native Language Arts instruction and English as a Second Language. The students receive the mandated minutes of instruction of NLA, ESL and ELA. Technology continues to be improved as each year computers are bought from funds cut out from the general operating funds.

The students use textbooks, libraries and instructional materials that are aligned with the school's core curriculum and reflect the language of instruction. Impact math books are available to students in both English and Spanish. This is to ensure that they can refer back and forth between languages when necessary. The classroom library areas are clearly defined by language and include books that are leveled in English and in the native language. There are leveled books for guided reading and independent reading We continue to buy additional low level high interest materials. Overhead projectors are available in all classrooms. The teachers use red ink to indicate Spanish materials and blue ink to represent English. There are adequate instructional materials in each language. For social studies, the students use the textbook entitled "Una Nacion Mucho Pueblos". Science textbooks are available in English and Spanish from Glencoe.

The ELL students demonstrate learning through measurable product development, demonstrations and exhibits i.e foldables, DNA models, exit projects, portfolios in both math and literacy. In order to complete their exit projects, the students demonstrate technical proficiency including but not limited to research on the internet and the use of computers in the classroom. Students' work is displayed in each language to celebrate their accomplishments in both their native language and their second language acquisition. The walls in the classroom are print rich in each language as evidenced by word walls, reports, posters, foldables. It is expected that the content area teachers will plan lessons that complement instead of merely translate the content instruction in the other language. The use of authentic literature in the native language is used to support the core curriculum.

Language functions, language structures and vocabulary lessons are planned as part of every lesson. Teachers are expected to incorporate the study of conventions (bound and unbound morphemes) along with the study of content and the use of

pragmatics in discourse.

Teachers plan for the development of both social and academic language through various activities and trips. Activities are planned considering the family and language background of students and to celebrate their heritage through the Dominican Heritage performances, the Arts Festival, the January Talent/holiday/culture performances as well as the Spring Festival. Instruction is designed to mediate the learning of various proficiency classifications: newcomers, SIFE, long term ELL's, beginners, intermediate and advanced proficiency levels. Lessons are designed to meet standards while there is differentiation for student needs. Literacy development are provided for every student and the literacy instruction is consistent with the instructional goals and objectives of the program which is based on the student's linguistic performance levels as determined by the LAB-R and NYSESLAT.

Teachers scaffold academic language to support students' participation in content areas. The bilingual teachers use overhead projectors and other visuals to support students' participation in the content areas. The ESL teacher and the bilingual teachers model the use of language in ways in which students are expected to participate. They will model correct use of the language to the students during conversations and in feedback on students' work.

Professional development comes from many different sources...internal as well as external. We have a literacy and math coach that hold weekly grade level content level meetings. Additionally, the bilingual teachers meet with a lead ESL teacher to address the needs of the students. Two outside consultants work with the teachers and students as they model instruction in the classrooms. They maintain connections with the teachers via emails. Consultants from the Leadership Support Organization provide additional support in the area of the ELL's in the building. Teachers are able to participate in LSO's workshops outside the building and interact with teachers from other parts of the city. We have math, science and technology consultants from AUSSIE who works with the math teachers on differentiating instruction. The minimum 7.5 hours for all staff takes place during the PD days as well as during faculty conferences. The staff is provided with opportunities to work with one of six counselors to assist them in providing supports in helping students articulate to high school. As discussed earlier in this plan, NLA is provided to the transitional classes only programmatically by a licensed teacher.

Parent Involvement is an integral part of the school. In addition to monthly parent association meetings in which all parents are contacted by the parent coordinator to come to the meeting, we have a workshop program on health issues in conjunction with our CBO, Columbia Presbyterian Hospital. For the 2009-10 year, we will have a program of increased parent involvement in conjunction with Children's Aid Society. Parents will complete surveys to indicate their interest in programs conducted by CAS. The parent coordinator works together with all of our CBO's to improve parent involvement.

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

Form TIII – A (1)(a)

Grade Level(s) 6-8 Number of Students to be Served: 150 LEP Non-LEP

Number of Teachers 6 Other Staff (Specify) _____

School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview

Title III, Part A LEP Program

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

We have three transitional bilingual (Spanish) classes, one on each grade level. Students are identified by the use of NYSESLAT test data, list notice data and home language surveys. Parents are given orientation meetings in which they can choose an appropriate program after they see a video. Flexible grouping based on continuous assessment is at the heart of this approach. Each student will have a standards-based ESL portfolio. This will reflect his or her progress in using English throughout the year and help us make necessary adjustments to the LAP. We will also draw upon LAB and NYSESLAT assessments, running record, and item analyses in placing students and moving them to more advanced groups. In the school year 2000-2010, we expect to have at least 5% of our students moving to monolingual classes. Preliminary data from the NYSESLAT indicated that our students improved their performance levels.

Our school is presently staffed with two certified ESL, a bilingual math and a bilingual science teacher. We hold professional development sessions to help teachers augment their skills so that they will all be able to use ESL techniques within all content area lessons to meet the individual needs of our ELL children. Transitional Bilingual Classes receive ESL instruction from licensed ESL teachers and content area instruction from certified bilingual teachers. Native Language Arts follows the workshop and balanced literacy models, and we adhere to the Native Language Arts Performance Standards. All students in bilingual classes receive a minimum of four periods of Native (Spanish) Language Arts per week. WE have ESL teachers pushing into classes as well as pulling out students based on proficiency level based on NYSESLAT. The program is supervised by the Principal.

Beginning English Language Learners, many of whom are new arrivals to the United States, receive instruction in Spanish for 60% of the time and in English for 40% of the time. During the course of the year, we adjust this ratio. As students begin to reach Intermediate proficiency, their

content-area learning incorporates more English by using differentiated instruction, project based learning activities as well as language development in the content area including word strategies. They also have the opportunity to participate in after-school English classes given by their teachers. In January, the Spanish-English ratio for former Beginning English learners changes to 50:50; they begin learning science in English. They continue to take Spanish Language Arts five times a week.

In March, the Spanish-English ratio changes again: students learn both Spanish and Science in English, so the ratio becomes 40% Spanish and 60% English. As students begin to reach advanced proficiency, their content-area learning incorporates more English by using the strategies outlined above. All year round they also have the opportunity to participate in after-school classes given by their teachers.

Advanced English Language Learners have a 75 % English and 25% Spanish ratio. All of their content-area instruction is in English, and their Language Arts classes follow city and regional curricular guidelines with some added language supports.

Parents of students have the option of choosing bilingual or monolingual classes. 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. 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.

There are numerous extracurricular activities that are available for the ELL population. All students at MS 326 are able to participate in the after school graphic design program which integrates technology and design. Students are taught how to design posters and magazine covers. In addition to an after school chess club, there is a CHAMPS gym program for both boys and girls. Students are able to participate in musical (vocal) program, an art program to develop art portfolios/marketing portfolios for high school admissions. On Saturdays, there are programs for students interested in applying for specialized high school programs as well as various academic classes to address specific needs.

I. Parent/community 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 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 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 programs offered at the school will be aligned with parents' requests.

Information materials are also available in the parent's home language. Parent conferences are conducted in the Fall and the Spring to orient parents regarding program requirements, instructional standards and assessments. In addition, after six week into the marking period, a progress report indicating student performance levels will be sent home in the language of the parent.

II. Project Jump Start (Programs and activities to assist newly enrolled ELL students):

Newly enrolled students are administered the LAB-R to ascertain their functional levels in English and Spanish. Depending on their level, they will be placed in a group for ESL instruction. Beginner speakers of English will also receive 37.5 minute of instruction with a licensed ESL teacher while students that fall into other groups (intermediate or students who need to take the ELA exam) will be serviced by other teachers. All ELL's have the opportunity to attend after school programs as well as Saturday academy. Since the bilingual classes are small, the student-teacher ratio is low which allows for focused instruction Letters were sent to parents of all newly enrolled students prior to the start of the school year describing the school, expectations, uniform requirements and upcoming programs for parent orientation in Septemb

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

Teachers 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. A consultants from Susan Radley Accelerated Learning will work with all of the bilingual classes and their teachers to improve performance levels. The bilingual science teacher will attend workshops focused on AMNH as well as science content. In collaboration with the literacy coach and ESL Coordinator, bilingual teachers will participate in study groups using journal articles and books addressing the needs of the ELL. During the summer the coach and teachers will research resources for the study groups. The Leadership Support Organization has provided 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. Professional Development is also provided to all teachers who teach ELLs, which include ELA, Math, Science and Arts teachers.

Teachers will be provided seven ½ mandated hours of professional development in teaching English Language Learners.

09/08/09	two hours	Bilingual Accountability Procedures; NYSESLAT testing; Looking at Data
11/03/09	Two hours	Looking at student work and next steps
11/06/09	one hour	ESL strategies
12/04/09	one hour	Interventions to support academic language
06/10/09	one and half hours	analysis of assessments

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

School: MS 326 BEDS Code: 310600010326

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

Allocation Amount:		
Budget Category	Budgeted Amount	Explanation of expenditures in this category as it relates to the program narrative for this title.
Professional salaries (schools must account for fringe benefits) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Per session- Per diem	\$ 23,947.20	(Example: 480 hours of per session for math and literacy teacher and science program to support ELL Students: 480 hours x \$49.89 (current teacher per session rate with fringe) = \$23,947.20) After school (math and science) and Saturday Academy (literacy)
Purchased services <ul style="list-style-type: none">- High quality staff and curriculum development contracts.		
Supplies and materials <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Must be supplemental.- Additional curricula, instructional materials.- Must be clearly listed.	\$ 712.80	Read 180 materials to support instruction
Educational Software (Object Code 199)		
Travel		
Other		
TOTAL	\$24,660.00	

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

Requirement under Chancellor's Regulations – for all schools

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

Part A: Needs Assessment Findings

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.

When a parent comes to MS 326, he/she is greeted by the Parent Coordinator who has an office near the main entrance to the building. Ms. Nunez will speak to the parent, ascertain how we can better serve the parent and provide assistance. Ms. Nunez is bilingual in both Spanish and English. For new entrants, Ms. Nunez will bring the parent to Ms. Kreichman, our ESL coordinator who have the parent complete the Home Language Survey to ascertain parent's language preference. Signs exist in the building notifying parents to their right for written translations in their native language. 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.

In those cases where we do not the internal expertise to translate a document, letters are sent to the translation section of the DOE and they will translate it.

Information regarding parent language abilities are located in ATS. Parents speak either English or Spanish and all notices are sent home with both languages. Additionally, the secretary regularly runs a report in ACS which indicates missing information. She is then able to follow up if the parent language is not listed in ATS. Eighty percent of our parent population speaks Spanish and twenty percent of parents speak English only. Every document is printed in both Spanish and English.

Our parent coordinator and secretary are bilingual speakers of English and Spanish. Additionally, a large number of the staff at MS 326 are able to converse with parents in their own language about their child's academic needs.

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.

A review of the home language surveys indicated that the majority of parents speak and read Spanish only. Many staff members speaks Spanish which is the language in the school's community. Communication between school and the community is always in both languages, Spanish and English. All public meetings and parent association meetings are conducted in both languages. There is always the chance that we might have speakers of other languages i.e. Arabic, French, Haitian Creole, American Sign Language. If these cases do arise, we will contact the Office of Translation Services to help us. District 75 will be contacted if we need a speaker of American Sign Language.

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 to parents is provided in English and Spanish back to back. Specific written communications are translated by the bilingual translation team composed of the business manager and the Assistant Principal. Progress Reports, Quality Review Reports, Report Cards, and all letters sent home to parents are translated into Spanish. Copies are available in the Parent Coordinator's office. In the case that we have other language needs, the Office of Translation Services will be contacted.

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 by the following school members who are bilingual Spanish/English: Assistant Principal, teachers, parent coordinator, school aides, guidance counselors, business manager, and secretary. During parent-teacher conferences, teachers are grouped together so that monolingual English speaking teachers have someone in the room who can help in communication between the school and the parent.

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

Translators are available at all times. Parents have full access to school activities and information regarding their children's' academic performance. A large number of people on staff speak Spanish and we also have staff members who speak French. Parent have full participation in school events as all activities are conducted in Spanish and English. Parents receive all letters and forms about school activities in the language that they speak.

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:	388,298	47,365	435,663
2. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside for Parent Involvement:	3,882		3,882
3. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside to Improve Parent Involvement (ARRA Language):		473	473
4. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified:	19,414		19,414
5. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect – HQ PD (ARRA Language):		2,122	2,122
6. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Professional Development:	4,244		4,244
7. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect (Professional Development) (ARRA Language):		\$43,082.60	

8. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2008-2009 school year: 97%
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.

It was discovered that one teacher had been issued two different social security numbers due to an error on the part of the Social Security Administration over a period of years. Once that matter was cleared up at the SED level and the city level, the fact that she was missing an CST exam surfaced. The teacher took the CST for middle school science and passed the exam over the summer. At this point, our school should return to having 100% highly qualified teachers.

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.

2009-10 School-Parent Involvement Policy

- I. MS 326 in compliance with the Title I/PCEN mandates, has implemented a parent involvement policy strengthening the link between the school and the community. Our policy is designed to keep parents informed by actively involving them in planning and decision-making. Parents are encouraged to participate on school leadership teams, parents associations, and parent advisory councils, as trained volunteers and as members of the school professional development advisory council. Educational research has shown a positive correlation between parental involvement and student achievement. The overall aim of the policy is to develop a parent involvement program that will build a home-school partnership that assists parents in acquiring effective parenting skills, provide parents with the information and training needed to effectively become involved in planning and decision making, increase their understanding of the role of the home in enriching education and improving student achievement, and the development of positive attitudes toward the school community as whole.
- II. The policy encompasses all parents including parents of English Language Learners and special needs students.
- III. The policy is designed based upon a careful assessment of parents’ needs and the evaluation of the effectiveness of the Title I/PCEN Parent Involvement Program.

In developing the MS 326 Parent Involvement Policy, our PTA and parent members of the School Leadership Team were consulted on the proposed Parent Involvement Policy and asked to survey its members for additional input. To increase parent involvement, MS 326 will:

- Actively involve parents in planning, reviewing and improving the funded programs and parental involvement policy of the school.
- Support level committees that include parents such as the School Leadership Team and the Parents Teacher's Association. Provide technical support when needed.
- Maintain parent coordinators Title I funds to serve as liaisons between the school and parent communities. The parent coordinator will provide parent workshops based on the assessed needs of the parents in the school site in conjunction with Columbia Presbyterian Hospital.
- These workshops may include the parenting skills, GED, ESL and curriculum based workshops to build parents' capacity to help their children at home.
- Provide a school informational meeting on all funding programs in the school.
- Provide written translations.
- Provide an Annual Fairs for parents in order to improve home school communication

MS 326 will encourage more school-level parental involvement by:

- Holding annual Parent Curriculum Conference
- Maintaining parent participation in school leadership teams
- Encouraging parents to become trained volunteers
- Having written and verbal progress reports that are periodically given to keep parents abreast of their children's progress
- Providing monthly newsletter to increase communication between school/teacher and the home.

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-PARENT COMPACT

The Literary Arts Academy and the parents of the students participating in activities, services, and programs funded by Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) (participating children), agree that this Compact outlines how the parents, the entire school staff, and the 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 that will help children achieve the State's high standards.

This School-Parent Compact is in effect during school year 2009-2010.

Note: provisions bolded in this section are required to be in the Title I, Part A School-Parent Compact.

PART I - REQUIRED SCHOOL-PARENT COMPACT PROVISIONS

School Responsibilities

The Literacy Arts Academy MS 326 will:

- **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:**
 - **Academic Intervention programs to address literacy and math needs i.e. Wilson Reading program; Read 180, At Risk SETSS, Rewards**
 - **Unified Curriculum in all content areas across the grade**
 - **Consultants to work with teachers to improve the delivery of instruction**
 - **Common prep for planning**
- **hold parent-teacher conferences during which this Compact will be discussed as it relates to the individual child's achievement. Specifically, those conferences will be held:**

- **November 2009 and February 2010**
- **provide parents with frequent reports on their children's progress. Specifically, the school will provide reports as follows:**
 - **Six Week Progress Reports will be sent home in October 2009; January 2010; March 2010 and May 2010.**
 - **Report Cards will be distributed in November 2009; January 2010; April 2010 and June 2010.**
- **provide parents reasonable access to staff. Specifically, staff will be available for consultation with parents as follows:**
 - **Staff members are available at all times except when they are in the classroom engaged in instruction.**
- **provide parents opportunities to volunteer and participate in their child's class, and to observe classroom activities, as follows:**
 - **All parents have the opportunity to volunteer and participate in their child's class or do a walk through the building.**
 - **Parents should contact the Parent Coordinator.**

Parent Responsibilities

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

- Supporting my child's learning by making education a priority in our home by:
 - making sure my child is on time and prepared everyday for school;
 - monitoring attendance;
 - talking with my child about his/her school activities everyday;
 - scheduling daily homework time;
 - providing an environment conducive for study;
 - monitoring the amount of television my children watch;
 - making sure that homework is completed;
- anticipating, as appropriate, in decisions relating to my children's education;
- promoting positive use of my child's extracurricular time;
- participating in school activities on a regular basis;
- 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;
- providing my child with a library card;

- communicating positive values and character traits, such as respect, hard work and responsibility;
- respecting the cultural differences of others;
- helping my child accept consequences for negative behavior;
- being aware of and following the rules and regulations of the school and district;
- supporting the school's discipline policy;
- express high expectations and offer praise and encouragement for achievement;

PART II OPTIONAL ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES

We, as students, will share the responsibility to improve our academic achievement and achieve the State’s high standards. Specifically, we will:

- come to school ready to do our best and be the best;
- Advocate LASER: Learning; Accountability; Standards; Excellence and Results.
- come to school with all the necessary tools of learning- pens, pencils, books, etc.
- listen and follow directions;
- participate in class discussions and activities;
- be honest and respect the rights of others;
- follow the school's/class' rules of conduct;
- follow the school's dress code;
- ask for help when we don't understand;
- do our homework every day and ask for help when we need to;
- study for tests and assignments;
- read at least 30 minutes every day outside of school time;
- get adequate rest every night;
- use the library to get information and to find books that we enjoy reading;
- give to our parents or to the adult who is responsible for our welfare, all notices and information we receive at school every day.)

Additional Requirements:

The Literary Arts Academy will:

- involve parents in the planning, review, and improvement of the school’s parental involvement policy, in an organized, ongoing, and timely way;
- involve parents in the joint development of any schoolwide program plan, in an organized, ongoing, and timely way;
- hold an annual meeting 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;
- 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;
- 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.
- 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;
- provide to each parent an individual student report about the performance of their child on the State assessment in at least English language arts and mathematics; and
- 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 Final Regulations (67 Fed. Reg. 71710, December 2, 2002).

School Staff-Print Name	Signature	Date
Parent(s)- Print Name(s)		

	Student (if applicable)- Print Name		

(NOTE: The NCLB law does not require school personnel and parents to sign the School-Parent Compact. However, if the school and parents feel signing the School-Parent Compact will be helpful, signatures may be encouraged.)

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.

We are using the teachers' section of the environmental surveys along with the National Staff Development Council's Standards for Staff Development revised edition to help us plan effectively. Based on standardized exam results and student records, intervention classes are weaved into the school program and provided before and after school. 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 modifications in the presentation of grade level curriculum in all subjects. Literacy teachers will teach 60 students and will provide additional support to the Levels 1&2 and then the Level 3's. Math teachers will work with 90 students and provide intensive support to all students. Saturday Academy program for grades six, seven and eight will be provided to all students. Courses, based on student need and interest, include tutorials in math and literacy, Art Portfolio Preparation, and other programs depending on student needs. An after school recreational program developed with the 21st Century Program will address student emotional and physical needs. Our schoolwide reforms are associated with increased higher cognitive development resulting in increased use of convergent and divergent thinking skills in all content areas. Additionally, we are expecting increased student engagement in academic rigor and differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all learners.

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:
 - o Increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as extended school year, before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities.
 - o Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.
 - o Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.
 - o 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.
 - o Are consistent with and are designed to implement State and local improvement, if any.

MS 326 has undergone a transformation since becoming Principal in 2006. School wide reforms include increasing the technology in the building, creating professional learning teams in all core subjects, creating a bilingual team in which the same teachers teach all three bilingual classes, establishing a regents

class, provided extended day programs in math and science, continue increasing the number of special education students in LRE, and ensuring coherence of curriculum across the school. Our school wide reforms are associated with increased higher cognitive development resulting in increased use of convergent and divergent thinking skills in all content areas. Additionally, we are expecting increased student engagement in academic rigor and differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all learners.

3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.

With the exception of one teacher who passed her SED requirements in July, all of the teachers are highly qualified and continue to receive professional development from AUSSIE trainers, outside consultants, Leadership Support Organization Knowledge management team as well as other national conferences.

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 includes common preps for professional development as well as looking at student work as part of our initiative to have at least 90% of the teachers involved in inquiry. 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, and reviewing student work. There are subject meetings and grade meetings each month. The hiring of an outside literacy consultant for two days a week will help teachers improve their delivery of instruction and maintain uniform curriculum across the grades. In addition, there will be two Assistant Principals with the direct supervision of the subject areas (math, literacy, social studies, and science). AUSSIE consultants have been hired to work with the math teachers, science teaches and in technology. In addition, The Leadership LSO functions as a learning support organization and provides professional development program for its member schools. The parent coordinator has planned an ongoing program for parents and parent involvement.

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

Once the hiring restrictions are lifted for certain subject areas, the administration will contact Teaching Fellows and Teach for America to recruit highly qualified teachers. The Principal also collaborates with Teaching Fellows to provide a summer site for their teachers to begin teaching in the classrooms. We interview possible candidates and to plan for their internship with MS 326 students during summer school where pedagogical skills can be improved prior to the start of the academic year. Vacancies are posted within DHR to attract good teachers through the Open Market. Interviews are conducted throughout the year. The success of the school will spread the word that MS 326 is a school filled with staff that provides a quality education for students. Successful schools attract highly qualified teachers. Additionally, MS 326 has a working relationship with Teachers' College to place math graduate students in classrooms as well as social studies student teachers from St. Rose de Lima College in order to complete student teaching requirements. We also have a working relationship with the Wurtzweiler Institute of Social Workers for providing placement for graduate students of social work completing their externship requirements.

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

The parent coordinator holds 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. The school's website will be developed and will provide additional information for parents on school workshops and workshops through the DOE. In addition, the Parent Coordinator will be provided Professional Development to assist parents. The parents on the School Leadership Team have expressed a wish to be exposed to content which will help them assist their children i.e. reading instruction.

8. 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.

Not applicable

9. 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 through the five interim assessment tests and standardized tests as well as informal classroom assessment data using running records, unit tests, and other pre-post assessments. Teachers will be discussing student progress during common planning time throughout the year. It is an integral part of the new culture of our school. Every four and a half weeks students will be assessed using teacher made tests and progress reports will be sent home to parents. Assessment data/progress reports will be reviewed by Assistant Principals and information will be brought back to the PD/Intervention teams. Every Friday will be devoted to a clinic atmosphere in which teachers will be addressing individual needs as identified on tests and constantly conferencing students to push students to achieve the next level on standardized tests. Inquiry teams will focus on the needs of the students and will use interim assessments to monitor progress.

10. 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.

Interim assessments in all four core subjects (literacy, social studies, science and math), will help us provide targeted intervention to students. ACUITY has an item bank in which to develop specific tests to address specific student needs. Our focus is to assess 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 improve student understanding of the content through ITA's, running records, teacher pre- and post tests and Impact math unit-tests. 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 with other students who have similar weaknesses based on teacher input. Ongoing assessments (ITA's, predictives, performance series) 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. Great Leaps to use with students' who have difficulty with reading fluency, and Rewards to use

with students who need to strengthen their ability to read multi-syllabic words. Staff members will be trained to work with these programs and groups of students have been identified who could benefit from the programs and there will be ongoing assessment to ascertain student progress or the lack of progress. At the end of four weeks, progress reports will be sent home to parents..

While we work to identify new programs and assessments we also use guided reading, readers and writers workshops, and math tutorials to address our students' needs. We will also devote one day per week for a clinic in which students/teachers to address needs during the regular school day. 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.

11. 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 the Twenty-First Program students will participate in recreation programs and instructional programs during and after school. Parent workshops are sponsored by the CBO and the DOE. Students are receiving instruction in math and science after school four days a week followed by a wrap around recreation program.

Part D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS

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

1. Use program resources to help participating children meet the State standards.
2. Ensure that planning for students served under this program is incorporated into existing school planning.
3. Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically based research that strengthens the core academic program of the school and that:
 - a. Give primary consideration to providing extended learning time, such as, extended school year, before/after school, and summer programs and opportunities;
 - b. Help provide an accelerated, high –quality curriculum, including applied learning; and
 - c. Minimize removing children from the regular classroom during regular school hours;

4. Coordinate with and support the regular educational program;
5. Provide instruction by highly qualified teachers;
6. Provide professional development opportunities for teachers, principals and paraprofessionals, including, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff;
7. Provide strategies to increase parental involvement; and
8. Coordinate and integrate Federal, State and local services and programs.

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

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

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

Part A: For All Schools Identified for Improvement

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

Part B: For Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

¹ School Under Registration Review (SURR)

APPENDIX 6: SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS UNDER REGISTRATION REVIEW (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.
- **ELA Materials.** In a number of the audited schools, teachers interviewed indicate that they have sufficient amounts of curriculum materials available to them; however, the materials they have are not adequate to meet the needs of all learners, particularly English language learners, students with disabilities, and struggling readers. Further, the materials in use are reportedly often not relevant to

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

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

– **English Language Learners**

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

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

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

- Observations of teachers in classrooms
- Teacher collaboration during common planning periods as well as after school meetings
- Informal surveys of teachers which provide feedback to the administration.
- Analysis of student data
- Inventory of materials
- Feedback from parents
- Analysis of the effectiveness of the consultants

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

x Applicable Not Applicable

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

While our performance on the State ELA test has improved, only 40% of our students are performing on grade level in 2009. We continue to need to improve our literacy program. We continue to need to go deeper in developing our instructional program in order that we

improve our students' cognitive development. Additionally, we need to continue to address the needs of special education students and ELL's as our special education population comprise 21% of the total population and our ELL's comprise 39% of the total population.

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.

- Hiring of consultants to work with teachers in classrooms on improving ELL performance levels
- Continued development of curriculum maps
- Professional Development for teachers on increasing academic rigor in the ELA classroom.
- KM personnel from Leadership Organization will assist our coaches as they work with our teachers
- Increased collaboration among the ELA teachers as they look at student work as part of professional learning committees
- Continued purchase of literary materials to support instruction
- Integration of literacy and technology through a Title IID grant.

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.

- Observations of teachers in classrooms
- Teacher collaboration during common planning periods as well as after school meetings
- Informal surveys of teachers which provide feedback to the administration.
- Analysis of student data
- Inventory of materials
- Feedback from parents
- Analysis of the effectiveness of the consultants
- Analysis of the results from the math inquiry group

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

x Applicable Not Applicable

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

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

- Professional Development for teachers on increasing academic rigor in the math classroom.
- KM personnel from Leadership Organization will assist our coaches as they work with our teachers
- Increased collaboration among the math teachers as they look at student work as part of common planning group.
- Continued purchase of math materials to support instruction
- Inquiry group to focus on the needs of the seventh grade students in math

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.

- Observations of teachers in classrooms
- Teacher collaboration during common planning periods as well as after school meetings
- Informal surveys of teachers which provide feedback to the administration.
- Analysis of student data
- Inventory of materials
- Feedback from parents
- Analysis of the effectiveness of the consultants

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

x Applicable Not Applicable

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

Informal and formal observations revealed that there is a continued need to improve instructional coherence across all grades for ELA. Teachers plan units of study but there is a need to go deeper in order to address the needs of the special education population and the ELL's through differentiation of instruction. While our performance on the State ELA test has improved, only 40% of our students are performing on grade level and 60% was meeting minimum standards in 2009. We continue to need to improve our literacy program. We continue to need to go deeper in developing our instructional program in order to improve our students' cognitive development.

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.

- Hiring of consultants to work with teachers in classrooms on improving ELL performance levels
- Continued development of curriculum maps
- Professional Development for teachers on increasing academic rigor in the ELA classroom.
- KM personnel from Leadership Organization will assist our coaches as they work with our teachers
- Increased collaboration among the ELA teachers as they look at student work as part of professional learning committees
- Continued purchase of literary materials to support instruction
- Integration of literacy and technology as well as additional professional development through a Title IID grant.

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:

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

2B.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.

- Observations of teachers in classrooms
- Teacher collaboration during common planning periods as well as after school meetings
- Informal surveys of teachers which provide feedback to the administration.
- Analysis of student data
- Inventory of materials
- Feedback from parents
- Analysis of the effectiveness of the consultants
- Analysis of the results from the math inquiry group

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

- Formal and informal observations revealed limited technology in math classrooms
- Analysis of data revealed that some teachers engage students better than others
- Student activities were limited to independent activities

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.

- Professional Development for teachers on increasing academic rigor in the math classroom.
 - KM personnel from Leadership Organization will assist our coaches as they work with our teachers
 - Increased collaboration among the math teachers as they look at student work as part of common planning group.
 - Continued purchase of math materials to support instruction
 - Inquiry group to focus on the needs of the seventh grade students in math
 - Teachers will attend NCTM conference to participate in national workshops.
-

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.

- Analysis of teacher turnover rate and reasons for turnover
- Conferencing with teachers who are leaving school
- Review of teacher observation reports

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

Applicable x Not Applicable

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

In 2009, teachers left MS 326 for the following reasons:

- Two Teach For America teachers completed their two year commitment
- Two teachers relocated out of NY State
- One teacher used open market to find a position in one of the outer boroughs due traveling hardship
- One teacher left for a school with a musical emphasis
- One teacher was discontinued due to underperformance
- Another teacher wanted to teach at the high school level

Overall, the staff is stable. Due to budget reduction, most of these positions were not filled and I was able to close the budget gap through attrition.

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

KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

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

- Observations of teachers in classrooms
- Conferencing with teachers
- Teacher collaboration during common planning periods as well as after school meetings
- Informal surveys of teachers which provide feedback to the administration.
- Analysis of workshop participation and agendas from workshops
- Analysis of the effectiveness of the consultants

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

x Applicable Not Applicable

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

- Observations of teachers in classrooms show limited knowledge of ELL strategies
- Conferencing with teachers revealed similar results
- Analysis of workshop participation and agendas from workshops support limited involvement
- Analysis of the effectiveness of the consultants

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.

- Hiring of consultants to work with teachers in classrooms on improving ELL performance levels
- Continued development of curriculum maps
- Professional Development for teachers on increasing academic rigor of ELL students in the classroom.
- KM personnel from Leadership Organization will assist our coaches as they work with our teachers
- Increased collaboration among the teachers as they look at student work as part of professional learning committees
- Continued purchase of literary materials to support instruction
- Integration of literacy and technology as well as additional professional development through a Title IID grant.
- Additional teachers attending outside workshops on ELL matters
- Participation in the OELL workgroup

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.

- Observations of teachers in classrooms
- Conferencing with teachers
- Agendas and handouts from common planning meetings
- Teacher collaboration during common planning periods as well as after school meetings
- Informal surveys of teachers which provide feedback to the administration.
- Analysis of workshop participation and agendas from workshops
- Analysis of the effectiveness of the consultants

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

Applicable x 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?

- Data from Progress Report...MS 326 received double extra credit for moving ELL's
- Observations of teachers in classrooms
- Conferencing with teachers
- Agendas and handouts from common planning meetings
- Teacher collaboration during common planning periods as well as after school meetings
- Informal surveys of teachers which provide feedback to the administration.
- Analysis of workshop participation and agendas from workshops
- Analysis of the effectiveness of the consultants

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

KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

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

- Observations of teachers in classrooms
- Conferencing with teachers
- Agendas from school based meetings and outside workshops
- Teacher collaboration during common planning periods as well as after school meetings

- Informal surveys of teachers which provide feedback to the administration.
- Analysis of workshop participation and agendas from workshops

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

Applicable X 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?

- MS 326 received double extra credit for moving 49% of the special education students a year and half in both literacy and math
- Agendas from workshops and meetings
- Conferencing with teachers

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

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

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

- Results of Educational Planning Conferences and IEP meetings
- Conferencing with teachers
- Agendas from school based meetings and outside workshops in which special education topics were covered.
- Teacher collaboration during common planning periods as well as after school meetings
- Informal surveys of teachers which provide feedback to the administration.
- Analysis of IEP's and FBA's.

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

Applicable x 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?

- Results of Educational Planning Conferences and IEP meetings
- Conferencing with teachers
- Agendas from school based meetings and outside workshops in which special education topics were covered.
- Teacher collaboration during common planning periods as well as after school meetings
- Informal surveys of teachers which provide feedback to the administration.
- Analysis of IEP's and FBA's.

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

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

This appendix will not be required for 2009-10.

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

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

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:

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

Supporting Students in Temporary Housing (STH)

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

Part A: FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

Nine

2. Please describe the services you are planning to provide to the STH population.
 - Counseling services
 - At-risk academic intervention, if necessary.

Part B: FOR NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

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