



UNITY CENTER FOR URBAN TECHNOLOGIES

2009-10

SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN

(CEP)

SCHOOL: UNITY CENTER FOR URBAN TECHNOLOGIES
ADDRESS: 121 SIXTH AVENUE, MANHATTAN, NY, 10013
TELEPHONE: 212-343-8038
FAX: 212-343-8044

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE	Error! Bookmark not defined.
SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE	Error! Bookmark not defined.
SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Part A. Narrative Description	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot	Error! Bookmark not defined.
SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT	10
SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS	Error! Bookmark not defined.
SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN	Error! Bookmark not defined.
REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010	Error! Bookmark not defined.
APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM Error!	Bookmark not defined.
APPENDIX 2: PROGRAM DELIVERY FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELLs) ... Error!	Bookmark not defined.
APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION	24
APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL TITLE I SCHOOLS	26
APPENDIX 5: NCLB/SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SINI AND SRAP SCHOOLS	30
APPENDIX 6: SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS UNDER REGISTRATION REVIEW (SURRE)	Error! Bookmark not defined.
APPENDIX 7: SCHOOL-LEVEL REFLECTION AND RESPONSE TO SYSTEMWIDE CURRICULUM AUDIT FINDINGS	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Appendix 8: CONTRACTS FOR EXCELLENCE (C4E) SCHOOL-BASED EXPENDITURES FOR 2009-2010	Error! Bookmark not defined.
APPENDIX 9: TITLE I, PART A – SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS IN TEMPORARY HOUSING (STH)	Error! Bookmark not defined.

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: 02M500 **SCHOOL NAME:** Unity Center for Urban Technologies

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 121 SIXTH AVENUE, MANHATTAN, NY, 10013

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 212-343-8038 **FAX:** 212-343-8044

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: FAUSTO DE LA ROSA **EMAIL ADDRESS:** FDELAROSA@SCHOOLS.NYC.GOV

POSITION / TITLE **PRINT/TYPE NAME**
SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON: Grace Villanona

PRINCIPAL: FAUSTO DE LA ROSA

UFT CHAPTER LEADER: Janet Griffith

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT: Juanita Cabey-Douglas

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE: Manuel Benitez
(Required for high schools)

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL SUPPORT ORGANIZATION (SSO) INFORMATION

DISTRICT: 02 **SSO NAME:** Community Learning Support Organization

SSO NETWORK LEADER: Joanne Mejias

SUPERINTENDENT: Francesca Pena Francesca Pena

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/RulesPolicies/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
FAUSTO DE LA ROSA	Principal	
Pamela Latt	Admin/CSA	
Grace Villanona	Admin/CSA	Comments: Yes
Alicia Ally	Admin/CSA	Comments: Yes

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

*** Core (mandatory) SLT members.**

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

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

The mission of Unity Center for Urban Technologies is to serve students in a small, nurturing, and academically rigorous environment. We stress the importance of a student-teacher connection because we believe it is the simplest and most effective way of providing guidance and support to all our students. We strongly believe that our young people can develop and enhance their skills at their own pace, in a supportive setting. Our primary goal is to prepare our students intellectually, culturally, and socially for entry into higher education as well as a technologically challenging global workforce.

This mission is realized by providing a program of strong academics and applied technology in a setting that emphasizes small group instruction and after school tutorials. We actively collaborate with colleges, businesses, parents, and The Door (a multi-service youth organization).

Our teaching staff is dedicated to providing the highest level of instructional practice possible with significant investment in staff-professional development, designed to enhance instructional expertise. The school strives to generate the inquisitive, internal drive in our students that will prepare them for a life of exploration and learning.

Regents-based academic preparation enables our students to successfully enter higher education programs. Unity's teachers and administrators examine all assessment data in order to develop alternative academic programs to strengthen student performance. Teachers are trained in Differentiated Instruction and technology to more effectively deliver a diversified curriculum.

SECTION III - Cont'd

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT					
School Name:	Unity Center for Urban Technologies				
District:	02	DBN #:	02M500	School BEDS Code #:	02M500

DEMOGRAPHICS									
Grades Served in 2008-09:	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-K	<input type="checkbox"/> K	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 7
	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12	<input type="checkbox"/> Ungraded			
Enrollment:				Attendance: - % of days students attended					
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Pre-K	0	0	0		79.3	76.8	TBD		
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		94.4	94.8	88.06		
Grade 4	0	0	0						
Grade 5	0	0	0	Poverty Rate: - % of Enrollment:					
Grade 6	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Grade 7	0	0	0			94.4	94.8		
Grade 8	0	0	0						
Grade 9	111	93	81	Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:					
Grade 10	47	59	56	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Grade 11	29	21	24		1	2	7		
Grade 12	20	29	22						
Ungraded	0	0	0	Recent Immigrants: - Total Number					
Total	207	202	183	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
					3.0	2.0	3		
Special Education Enrollment:				Suspensions: (OSYD Reporting) - Total Number					

(As October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
# in Self-Contained Classes	2	2	0				
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	0	41	7	Principal Suspensions	7	45	TBD
Number all others	28	2	30	Superintendent Suspensions	14	11	TBD
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>							
				Special High School Programs: - Total Number:			
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment (BESIS Survey)				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	CTE Program Participants	N/A	N/A	0
# in Trans. Bilingual Classes	0	0	0	Early College HS Participants	0	0	0
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0				
# receiving ESL services only	14	17	23	Number of Staff: - Includes all full-time staff:			
# ELLs with IEPs	1	2	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
<i>These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.</i>				Number of Teachers	14	15	16
				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	5	6	7
Overage Students: # entering students overage for grade							
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	N/A	0	0
	18	15	20				
				Teacher Qualifications:			
Ethnicity and Gender: % of Enrollment				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100.0	100.0	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.0	0.5	0.5	Percent more than two years teaching in this school	42.9	60.0	68.8
Black or African American	45.9	41.1	37.7	Percent more than five years teaching anywhere	42.9	40.0	68.8
Hispanic or Latino	51.7	55.4	59.0				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	1.4	2.0	2.2	Percent Masters Degree or higher	86.0	87.0	81.0
White	1.0	1.0	0.5	Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	100.0	100.0	76.2
Multi-racial							
Male	42.0	52.0	60.1				
Female	58.0	48.0	39.9				

2009-10 TITLE I STATUS

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

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

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

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In Good Standing (IGS)
<input type="checkbox"/>	School in Need of Improvement (SINI)Improvement - Year 1
<input type="checkbox"/>	School in Need of Improvement (SINI)Improvement - Year 2
<input type="checkbox"/>	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) - Year 1
<input type="checkbox"/>	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) - Year 2/Planning for Restructuring (PFR)
<input type="checkbox"/>	NCLB Restructuring - Year ____
<input type="checkbox"/>	School Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP) - Year ____

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

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				X	√	√
Ethnicity						
American Indian or Alaska Native						
Black or African American				-	-	
Hispanic or Latino				-	-	
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander				-	-	
White				-	-	
Other Groups						
Students with Disabilities				-	-	
Limited English Proficient				-	-	
Economically Disadvantaged				X	√	
Student groups making AYP in each subject	0	0	0	0	2	1

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

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

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	⊍	Well Developed
X*	Did Not Make AYP Due to Participation Rate Only	◇	Outstanding
<i>* = For Progress Report Attendance Rate(s) - If more than one attendance rate given, it is displayed as K-8/9-12.</i>			
<i>Note: NCLB/SED accountability reports are not available for District 75 schools.</i>			

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

Needs Assessment

For the 2008-09 school year, our school received a progress report grade of "A." In August of 2009, under NCLB, the school was identified as SINI Year 1 for the school's not making AYP in secondary ELA. Upon review of our progress report scores and NCLB accountability status, we have identified several areas to address for improvement in 2009-10. They are as follows, in order of priority:

1. Increase participation rate and performance on the New York State English Language Arts Regents exam for all students with a particular focus on the economically disadvantaged sub-group, students enrolled in ESL, and students identified for special education services.
2. Increase the percentage of students earning 10 or more credits in their 3rd year, with a particular focus on our lowest 3rd percent.
3. Implement academic programs and instructional strategies through the use of our inquiry teams and the development of group goals for students to increase their standardized testing performance and thus improve the number of students graduating in 4 years with and without a weighted diploma.
4. Using specific indicators from the 2008-09 Progress Report on the School Environment Survey, work to address the areas of communication and engagement identified by students and faculty.
5. Continue to work to improve teacher performance by running professional development programs throughout the school year during the professional period with a special emphasis on using data to improve student performance.

Student Performance Trends As indicated on the 2008-09 Progress Report, our school performed better than 58% of all citywide high schools. Our students made considerable gains in Mathematics (for a second year in a row) and in United States History and Global History.

Our 4 year graduation rate declined slightly from the 2007-08 year, but outpaced the City horizon significantly. Our weighted diploma rate declined as compared to the 2007-08 Progress Report but outpaced our peer schools and that of the City.

Our 6 year graduation rate improved significantly over the 2007-08 report; however, our 6 year weighted diploma rate declined slightly from 2007-08, however, remains above average when compared with our peers and with the City.

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 (SINI/SRAP/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.

Annual Goal	Short Description
By June 2010, All Students subgroup will improve their ELA performance by 3% as measured by the New York State Regents Exam.	Develop a system that will support all students with particular attention to the needs of students currently or previously enrolled in ESL and/or special education to increase the ELA student passing percentage. Improve ELA Regents passing percentage by 3% by June 2010. An action plan will be created for the target population to properly identify the students that have not been successful in passing the ELA Regents Exam. Those students' previously taken Regents Exams will be evaluated and an item analysis will be done to identify the major areas for success. A list of high frequency words will be distributed and discussed along with pertinent vocabulary words. Focus will be placed on the importance of independent reading and writing. A comment sheet for writing will be distributed to all content areas teachers with designated writing criterias aligned with the NYS standards. Weekly school-wide meetings will take place to share sample of students; work and to discuss and implement suggestions.
By June 2010, All Students subgroup will improve their Graduation Rate performance by 3% as measured by the New York State Assessment.	Improve the student graduation rate by developing individual student goals and monitoring these goals through teachers and guidance personnel.
By June 2010, All Students subgroup will improve their Science performance by 3% as measured by the New York State Regents Exam.	Increase the number of students enrolled in science classes and who successfully complete the course and regents exam.
By June 2010, All Students subgroup will improve their Other performance by 3% as measured by the New York State Regents Exam.	Increase the number of students who improve their weighted diploma rate for both 4 year and 6 year performance
By June 2010, All Students subgroup will improve their Social Studies performance by 3% as measured by the New York State Regents Exam.	Increase the performance of students enrolled in Regents social studies courses through changes in teacher expectations, professional development, and a better understanding of exam requirements.

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

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

**Subject Area
(where relevant) :**

ELA and ESL

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>By June 2010, All Students subgroup will improve their ELA performance by 3% as measured by the New York State Regents Exam.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To reinforce the principles of learning, academic rigor, and accountable talk into everyday English instruction supported by ESL methodology. • Use previously given Regents Examinations to help drive instruction around language reading and writing. • To continue providing extended day and tutoring to raise expectations for at risk student including those students with an IEP. • To provide professional development following the NYS standards, ELA Regents Examinations, methods of assessments, lesson planning and the use of rubrics. • Use data to drive daily instruction • Implementation of the workshop model with the focus on student centered learning and student work. • To analyze cohort data to determine students' needs as related to differentiated instruction for Regents preparation. • To focus attention to the Inquiry Team to monitor selected student progress to ensure passing of ELA Regents Examinations. • Use specific indicators from the 2008-09 School Progress Report on the School Environment Survey, work to address the areas of communication and engagement identified by student and faculty.

<p>Aligning Resources:Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tax Levy • Title I • NYSTL • Contract for Excellences (C4E) • TL Children First Inquiry • All students will receive quality instruction which will be targeted to their specific needs.
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passing percentage in ELA content area classes will increase by 3% from September 2009 to June 2010. • Acuity Assessment • Semiannual Scholarship Reports • Parental participation via Parent Association Meeting and Workshops • Student use of new English and mathematics software tutoring programs

Subject Area
(where relevant) :

**English, Math, Science and
Social Studies**

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>By June 2010, All Students subgroup will improve their Graduation Rate performance by 3% as measured by the New York State Assessment.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To reinforce the principles of learning, academic rigor, and accountable talk into everyday instruction supported by ESL and other methodologies. • Use previously given Regents Examinations to help drive instruction around language reading and writing, speaking and listening skills. • To continue providing extended day and tutoring to raise expectations for at risk student including those students with an IEP. • To provide professional development following the NYS standards, Regents Examinations, methods of assessments, lesson planning and the use of rubrics. • Use data to drive daily instruction • Implementation of the workshop model with the focus on student centered learning and student work. • To analyze cohort data to determine students' needs as related to differentiated

	<p>instruction for Regents preparation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To focus attention to the Inquiry Team to monitor selected student progress to ensure passing of Regents Examinations. • Use specific indicators from the 2008-09 School Progress Report on the School Environment Survey, work to address the areas of communication and engagement identified by student and faculty
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tax Levy • Title I • NYSTL • Contract for Excellences (C4E) • TL Children First Inquiry • All students will receive quality instruction which will be targeted to their specific needs.
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passing percentage in content area classes will increase by 3% from September 2009 to June 2010. • Acuity Assessment • Semiannual Scholarship Reports • Parental participation via Parent Association Meeting and Workshops • Student use of new academic software tutoring programs

**Subject Area
(where relevant) :**

Science

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>By June 2010, All Students subgroup will improve their Science performance by 3% as measured by the New York State Regents Exam.</p>
--	---

<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To reinforce the principles of learning, academic rigor, and accountable talk into everyday instruction supported by ESL and other methodologies. • Use previously given Regents Examinations to help drive instruction around language reading and writing, speaking and listening skills. • To continue providing extended day and tutoring to raise expectations for at risk student including those students with an IEP. • To provide professional development following the NYS standards, Regents Examinations, methods of assessments, lesson planning and the use of rubrics. • Use data to drive daily instruction • Implementation of the workshop model with the focus on student centered learning and student work. • To analyze cohort data to determine students' needs as related to differentiated instruction for Regents preparation. • To focus attention to the Inquiry Team to monitor selected student progress to ensure passing of Regents Examinations. • Use specific indicators from the 2008-09 School Progress Report on the School Environment Survey, work to address the areas of communication and engagement identified by student and faculty
<p>Aligning Resources:Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tax Levy • Title I • NYSTL • Contract for Excellences (C4E) • TL Children First • Inquiry • All students will receive quality instruction which will be targeted to their specific needs.
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passing percentage in content area classes will increase by 3% from September 2009 to June 2010. • Acuity Assessment • Semiannual Scholarship Reports • Parental participation via Parent Association Meeting and Workshops • Student use of new academic software tutoring programs

**Subject Area
(where relevant) :**

Mathematics

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>By June 2010, All Students subgroup will improve their Other performance by 3% as measured by the New York State Regents Exam.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To reinforce the principles of learning, academic rigor, and accountable talk into everyday instruction supported by ESL and other methodologies. • Use previously given Regents Examinations to help drive instruction around language reading and writing, speaking and listening skills. • To continue providing extended day and tutoring to raise expectations for at risk student including those students with an IEP. • To provide professional development following the NYS standards, Regents Examinations, methods of assessments, lesson planning and the use of rubrics. • Use data to drive daily instruction • Implementation of the workshop model with the focus on student centered learning and student work. • To analyze cohort data to determine students' needs as related to differentiated instruction for Regents preparation. • To focus attention to the Inquiry Team to monitor selected student progress to ensure passing of Regents Examinations. • Use specific indicators from the 2008-09 School Progress Report on the School Environment Survey, work to address the areas of communication and engagement identified by student and faculty
<p>Aligning Resources:Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tax Levy • Title I • NYSTL • Contract for Excellences (C4E) • TL Children First • Inquiry • All students will receive quality instruction which will be targeted to their specific needs.

<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passing percentage in content area classes will increase by 3% from September 2009 to June 2010. • Acuity Assessment • Semiannual Scholarship Reports • Parental participation via Parent Association Meeting and Workshops • Student use of new academic software tutoring programs
--	--

**Subject Area
(where relevant) :**

Social Studies

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>By June 2010, All Students subgroup will improve their Social Studies performance by 3% as measured by the New York State Regents Exam.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To reinforce the principles of learning, academic rigor, and accountable talk into everyday instruction supported by ESL and other methodologies. • Use previously given Regents Examinations to help drive instruction around language reading and writing, speaking and listening skills. • To continue providing extended day and tutoring to raise expectations for at risk student including those students with an IEP. • To provide professional development following the NYS standards, Regents Examinations, methods of assessments, lesson planning and the use of rubrics. • Use data to drive daily instruction • Implementation of the workshop model with the focus on student centered learning and student work. • To analyze cohort data to determine students' needs as related to differentiated instruction for Regents preparation. • To focus attention to the Inquiry Team to monitor selected student progress to ensure passing of Regents Examinations. • Use specific indicators from the 2008-09 School Progress Report on the School Environment Survey, work to address the areas of communication and engagement identified by student and faculty

<p>Aligning Resources:Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tax Levy • Title I • NYSTL • Contract for Excellences (C4E) • TL Children First • Inquiry • All students will receive quality instruction which will be targeted to their specific needs.
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passing percentage in content area classes will increase by 3% from September 2009 to June 2010. • Acuity Assessment • Semiannual Scholarship Reports • Parental participation via Parent Association Meeting and Workshops • Student use of new academic software tutoring programs

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010

Directions: All schools must complete Appendices 1, 2, 3, 7, & 9. (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

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

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

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 (NOTE: APPENDIX 8 WILL NOT BE REQUIRED FOR THIS YEAR)

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

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								
7								
8								
9	100	100	100	100	30			
10	64	64	64	64	19			
11	12	12	12	12	1			
12	50	50	50	50	8			

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

- o 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.
- o 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.

- o Students in Grade 9 who performed at Level 1 or Level 2 on NYS Grade 8 ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies assessments.
- o Students in Grades 10 – 12 who scored below the approved passing grade on any Regents examination required for graduation in English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies.

Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).
ELA:	One-to-one and group tutoring to help students improve on their ELA skills and to help them to be successful on the state required Regents exam.
Mathematics:	One-to-one and group tutoring to help students improve on their math skills and to help them to be successful on the state required Regents exam.
Science:	One-to-one and group tutoring to help students improve on their science skills and to help them to be successful on the state required Regents exam.
Social Studies:	One-to-one and group tutoring to help students improve on their social studies skills and to help them to be successful on the state required Regents exam.
At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:	One-to-one and group tutoring to help students improve on their understanding in credit accumulations and to help them to be successful on the state required Regents exam.
At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	One-to-one and group tutoring to help students improve on their emotional intelligence and to help them to be successful on the state required Regents exam.
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	NA
At-risk Health-related Services:	NA

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 (LAP) 2009-2010 for
The Unity Center for Urban Technologies (M500)

Our Language Allocation Policy is designed to reflect the individual needs of every ELL student enrolled in our school. The direction and qualitative characteristics of the instructional program depends on the initial assessment of the students' individual educational needs, cultural and linguistic specificity of student population, and the quality, scope and focus of professional development offered to the school personnel serving the ELL students. The languages and cultures of the ELL student body have become an integral part of The Unity Center for Urban Technologies (M500) culture. The ELL parental community has also become an integral part of The Unity Center for Urban Technologies (M500).

The Language Allocation Policy Committee members are the following:

1. Fausto de la Rosa, Principal
2. Grace Villalona, Assistant Principal, Organization/Supervision
3. Janet Griffith, UFT Chapter Leader
4. Mr. Anthony Monitto, ESL teacher
5. Ms. Catalina Cruz and Ms. Yesenia Fermin, Guidance Counselors
6. Ms. Ally, Data Specialist

Brief Summary of ELL student enrollment at The Unity Center for Urban Technologies (M500)

According to the latest statistics, we serve 37 English Language Learners (ELL). There are 4 beginners, 22 intermediate and 11 advance. They all receive 49 minutes of ESL, 49 minutes of English and 196 minutes of other content area subjects. In addition, 11 of those students receive pull out ESL services two times per week. We provide support for our Spanish dominant students and their families. Fifty percent of our faculty is fluent in Spanish. According to the parent program selection surveys, 70% of the parents who filled out the form prefer their children to participate in ESL classes. Our ELL population is pretty much evenly distributed in ESL levels, however, according to the NYSESLAT and/or LAB-R results, the majority of our ELL students are at the intermediate level of English Language proficiency.

All classes provide support for ELL students through the use of ELA instructional methodology and content in order to prepare the students for the English Regents examination. The variety of linguistic skills acquired during the ESL and ELA instruction will be transferred into the English

Language competencies necessary for the ELA Regents success. English – Native Language dictionaries, as well as cross-cultural content of ELA and ESL classes, will improve Speaking and Writing skills and allow the students to start the process of integration into American life.

The ELL students receive 1 period of Science, 1 period of Math, and 1 of Social Studies in an English Language classroom setting. The language allocation in each of these classes is differentiated according to the individual student's English language ability, as determined by the LAB-R /NYSESLAT scores and teacher observations.

The grouping in each classroom setting reflects the results of initial assessment of students' individual linguistic ability, as it is reflected in the LAB-R and/or NYSESLAT score. Constant formative evaluation conducted by each teacher provides the data for the flexible differentiated grouping according to the students' linguistic abilities. Since the focus of each content area lesson is not only the subject matter, but also the language development process, the grouping for instruction allows for interaction in both English and native language according to the individual educational needs of the students.

All ESL and content area teachers devote their time to the development of academic language skills. The use of glossaries, dictionaries, word walls, the structure and focus of various homework assignments foster the successful development of such skills. We organized a resource room for all ESL students in the library. The room contains systematic collection of ESL libraries available for both students and teachers. The classroom displays materials and other resources that allows the students to be grouped according to their programs and for the teachers, both ESL and content area, to coordinate their efforts in serving each student.

The ELL student-centered instruction is focused on the expansion of the students' Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky, 1966). Therefore, socialization is the main vehicle in the process of language development. The learning communities organized for this purpose are formed on the basis of compatibility of individual educational needs, including the linguistic ones, of all the participants. This is why the use of a WORKSHOP MODEL would be so effective. Such an educational approach foster the development of learning communities, allow for differentiated instruction and the appropriate use of both native and English language skills as appropriate, according to the individual educational needs of each student. Materials are made available in Spanish to support our student population. Scaffolding is appropriately selected for the educational benefit of each student. Assessment and evaluation instruments, while standard- based, reflect the need for qualitative analysis of individual student achievement. Culturally, specific curricular and assessment process reflect the ethnic and language diversity of the ELL students served.

Every teacher, paraprofessional, administrator, and other staff member are actively involved in the continuous staff development process focused on the issues of addressing the unique educational needs of ELL population in the building. The following topics will be addressed in a series of workshops offered to every staff member working with the ELL population:

- Scaffolding Instruction for ELLs
- Language Allocation policy
- The use of a native language in content-area classrooms
- Differentiated instruction
- Effective assessment and evaluation

- Using technology in ESL and content areas classrooms

The following are scaffolding tools used to develop a Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency for the ELLs...

- Presentation of each lesson should manifest measurable goal/objective:
 - What should the students be able to accomplish at the end of the session?
 - What tool is used to measure the accomplishment/non-accomplishment of the students in performing each assigned task?
 - What are the alternative processes/routes for those students who completed each assigned tasks unsatisfactorily?
- Conduct a brainstorming session for vocabulary building and exploration of ideas and presentations.
- The structure and sequence of each task is clear/well defined for the varied levels of ELLs. (Step by step process of the task should be laid out.)
- Provide other scaffolding measures such as demonstration/provision of a model.
- Provide regular conference periods to monitor the use of academic language.
- Allow each student to share orally their finished work. Every student should express themselves in complete sentences.
- Allow the students to rate their own work according to the rubrics set up for the activity.

The above process should be done regularly. The tasks should not be very lengthy and complicated. Frequent process like this would develop certain speaking/writing discipline for the students.

A system of inter-visitations will allow for constant formative assessment and evaluation of the methodological approaches, linguistic specificity, and cultural adjustments to be made in the classes. It will also provide an opportunity for integrated approach to curriculum planning among the various staff members.

The Effects of Student Demographics on Instruction

How will the patterns in the time range of skill acquisition affect instructional decisions across the four modalities? The instructional practices are based on the results of the research that is already in place. The basic premise that content should be the primary focus of instruction and academic language skills can be developed as the need emerges from the content as it is done through various modalities. This way the Speaking and Listening skills will substantiate the content for Reading and Writing. Another component of Literacy training that is already in place is the Accountable Talk. In this component, the students will be able to organize their thoughts in speech. This organization should contribute in the development of ideas in writing. It is then imperative that content should drive the ESL curriculum rather than Language. Although, content areas are used as springboards for instruction, English language Arts development should also be stressed and become the co-focal point in the process. It is important that students develop knowledge in different subject areas. These content areas should sustain them in their appropriate coursework. Different materials from different content areas should be used from which the development of the language should be derived. Besides, students tend to be more interested when they are learning content as opposed language only. This approach will definitely help in the development of Reading and Writing skills of the students. The staff development of the ESL program should therefore provide venues for the ESL teacher and other content teachers to learn different strategies to teach ESL through the content areas.

The four modalities: Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing should be taught as an integral element in the ELA and ESL classrooms. This approach is not only suited to the mainstream students but to the ELLs as well (although the mode of presentation and discussion are applied in individualized/“differentiated” approach).

Brief Description of Program Selection Process for the ELLs

Once the determination of eligibility to the program has been established based on the response criteria in the Home Language Identification Survey, interviews conducted during the registration and result of the LAB-R as well as the NYSESLAT test during the previous spring semester, the parents of newly admitted ELLs are invited to an orientation that presents the option to choose from the three available programs: TBE (Bilingual Education), DL (Dual Language: English and Native Language), ESL (Free Standing English as a Second Language). Besides that the orientation materials have translations in their native language, parent translators are also assisting in helping parents from their country of origin. The DOE translation resources are also in place for consideration. There are times that the help of students and adults who speak the same language is solicited.

Approximately about 98% have traditionally chosen Freestanding English for service of choice. Conviction on this choice is highly influenced by other parents who strongly believe that the way to succeed is to become proficient in the English language. There are those parents who would rationalize that if their students should need to learn their native language, the parents themselves could teach their students. For them the immediacy of immersion in the mainstream is through ESL. This trend holds through across all language groups. In fact the prevalent attitude of parents is, if the students are immersed with the mainstream classes without having to be in the self-contained ESL classes, the better it is and the prouder the parents are.

About 2% of the parents who chose TBE (Bilingual Program) or DL (Dual Language) are never placed according to their choices because the school never reached the mandated number of students to open a class in any preferred language. There has never been any parent who has opted to take out their student from The Unity Center for Urban Technologies (M500) and enroll them in another school/district where the Bilingual Program of their choice is available.

To be able to present the parents’ options of the ELL Models objectively:

- The information is given verbatim.
- All the “scenarios” for the different options are explained in language the parents would understand, predominately in Spanish.
- Their students are sometimes involved in the decision making.
- Hand-outs are given to assist in their decision-making process.

However the orientation is presented; parents just naturally choose the ESL model. This decision is tied up with their perception that in order to function in the mainstream, English is the primary language to master.

Determination of Language Proficiency and Placement into classes

A series of summative evaluations conducted by the LAP team will allow ELLs to acquire special attention in terms of individual programming, since the LAP demands the devotion a certain number of hours a day to ESL and ELA instruction depending on the level of English proficiency of each individual student. These requirements put certain constrictions on the programming of content area classes. All this limits the opportunities for individual programming, and creates a system of “block programming” for many students. Such programming, however, allows for the development of tightly connected learning communities able to interact productively to help and support one another.

Long term ELLs are receiving additional services from our AIS and Inquiry teams. These services allow the students to strengthen their English and /or Native Language skills, as well as their test taking skills.

Our newly admitted ELLs and their parents have a chance to meet with the school’s Parent Coordinator, Carla Briceño, who assists them during the admission and/or program selection process. Special informational meetings for the parents of newcomers are organized on an as needed basis. Translators and interpreters are assisting the parents and families during these meetings. All written communications sent home are translated in the parents’ native language.

According to the results of the LAB-R, NYSESLAT and performance indicators, the ELLs strongest and weakest modalities on grade level are the following: at the beginners’ level, for 30% of the students, listening and reading is the strongest modality. For 60%, speaking and writing is the weakest modality. At the intermediate level, 10th graders, the strongest modality is reading and listening while speaking and writing is the weakest. At the advanced level, the strongest modality is listening, speaking and reading and the weakest modality is writing.

Our guidance office of ELLs keeps track of the academic progress of those ELLs who reach proficiency. They have an option to continue participating in related content area classes with their parents’ permission for up to one school year. This allows for smoother transition of many former ELLs into the English-only classes. We are planning to organize counseling group sessions for ELLs who have trouble adjusting to the mainstream programs and informational sessions for the ELL/ former ELL graduates and their parents regarding the college admission process.

ELL ENROLLMENT INFORMATION
as of 10.13.09

Language	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12
Spanish	19	11	1	4
French	1	1		1

The following is a recommended formula for instruction:

- Identify the Standard
- From the standards, design the instruction,
- Statement of the goals (skills to be developed) that should be acquired by the students within the given time of instruction.
- Assessment

- Re-structure/Maintain/Enhance/Apply the skills (based on the result of the assessment.)

The use of Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, Time-bound objectives should be the guiding formula for every academic activity. Any ELL who is unable to achieve any of the designated goals should have a program of remedial / intervention activities until he/she is able to adapt to her/his grade level.

Action Plan for Creating a Successful ELA program

Unity Center for Urban Technologies (M500), a small high school located in District two of Lower Manhattan with 192 students from grade nine through grade twelve (http://schools.nyc.gov/OA/SchoolReports/2008-09/Quality_Review_2009_M500.pdf). The school population is comprised of thirty-seven percent Black, fifty- nine percent Hispanic, and three percent of students from other backgrounds. Male students account for fifty- two percent of the enrollment and females account for forty-eight percent. The student body consists of twelve percent English language learners (ELL) and twenty percent special education students. The average attendance rate for the school year 2009-2010 is eighty-two percent (<http://schools.nyc.gov/SchoolPortals/02/M500/AboutUs/Statistics/attendance.htm>). The school receives Title 1 funding with eighty-seven percent eligibility. The principal is in his second year and the school is located on the fourth floor of a five story building, that houses other businesses and not-for profit organizations (http://schools.nyc.gov/OA/SchoolReports/2008-09/Quality_Review_2009_M500.pdf).

The mission of the school is to serve students in a small, academically rigorous environment by preparing students intellectually, culturally and socially for entry into higher education and a technologically challenging global work force (<http://www.ucfut.net/Home>). By providing a multitude of differentiated opportunities, students not only become empowered with knowledge and have high self-esteem, but can become engaged problem solvers who are equipped to take on the challenges of tomorrow.

Currently M500 is faced with many challenges that include low attendance rates and below average scores on the required English Language Arts (ELA) Regents examination as compared to New York City schools (http://schools.nyc.gov/OA/SchoolReports/2008-09/Progress_Report_2009_HS_M500.pdf). This is evidenced in the 2008-2009 Progress Report, where M500 obtained a sixty percent pass rate as compared to a seventy-five percent New York City average. These reports are troubling because M500 has plummeted in its ELA Regents score as compared to the scores from the previous school year (http://schools.nyc.gov/OA/SchoolReports/2007-08/Progress_Report_2008_HS_M500.pdf). Although M500 has managed to maintain a B average on the progress report for the 2008-2009 academic school year, it is now targeted due to its delineation in ELA Regents scores as compared to the previous school year. M500 is now labeled as a school that is in need of improvement (SINI) (<http://schools.nyc.gov/NR/rdonlyres/89CE1497-592F-4AAE-9B4E-D20E3357A55B/23115/ManhattanSINI.pdf>).
Change Scenario

M500 is now classified as SINI because it did not meet the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) goals determined by New York State to measure achievement levels in ELA (<http://schools.nyc.gov/RulePolicies/NCLB/Overview/default.htm>). AYP is the minimum level of academic performance schools must achieve every year. While M500 has produced improvements for many of its students in other disciplines, an insufficient number of students passed the in state-required ELA Regents examination (http://schools.nyc.gov/OA/SchoolReports/2007-08/Progress_Report_2008_HS_M500.pdf). As a SINI school, M500 will be required to implement a variety of interventions to help improve their instructional programs and management. Through the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) initiative, students who attend a SINI school for at least one year

and who are not in their final grade in school have the opportunity to transfer to a non-SINI school (<http://schools.nyc.gov/RulesPolicies/NCLB/Overview/default.htm>).

At M500, change must occur in order to increase the passing percentages of students taking the required ELA Regents examination. According to Fullan (2007), after deciding which change is necessary in a building, “it is always crucial to make sure that the best people are working on the problem” (p. 44). This translates into choosing the most talented group of individuals to work on a particular project. The author believes that sometimes it is hard as a leader to know who will prove to be the most effective group of individuals for a particular job. However, judgment will play a key role in this particular situation at M500.

To begin this change initiative, an ELA Inquiry Team will be created that consists of English teachers, the assistant principal of instruction and supervision and the data specialist. The administrator will lead the meetings and help to channel the team in brainstorming, and problem solving with hurdles that accumulates along the way. The English teachers will be invested in the process because they want their students to succeed on the ELA Regents examination. Additionally, the data specialist position will serve a critical role because all students’ informal and formal assessments must be carefully analyzed and tracked to determine progress or lack thereof. This initiative will no doubt prove to be valuable because the key stakeholders are invested in this process. According to David (2008) if a collaborative approach is used, “teachers work together to identify common challenges, analyze relevant data, and test out instructional approaches. The idea behind this approach is that the systematic, collaborative work will increase student’s learning” (p. 88). In the author’s experience when teachers work collectively, there is a better chance of seeing results than if they worked alone.

A second important element in a successful change initiative is to “stay the course through continuity of good direction by leverage leadership” (Fullan, 2007, p. 59). This translates into nurturing individuals and assisting them into becoming leaders of their own. If while part of a task force the assistant principal demonstrates that the ELA Inquiry Team’s opinions are valued, allows them to be self-reflective, and helps them to evolve, these steps can help to cultivate them and create future leaders. This would ultimately lead to a self-sustaining group which could handle the demands of the ELA Inquiry Team.

A third key element in this successful change initiative is to “build internal accountability linked to external accountability” (Fullan, 2007, p. 60). By allowing internal assessments to align to external goals, this will allow for great accountability at M500. If schools can use their own data and create item analysis of the result, they can decide the next steps and determine how far or near they are away from their goals. As a result, the use of Prentice Hall’s Acuity Predictive Assessment in ELA will be administered to all students. The team will use the results from these exams to keep track of students’ progress by quickly diagnosing students’ weaknesses and develop individualized action plans as they prepare for the ELA Regents examination.

The three selected elements of change from Fullan (2007) as discussed by the author are just a few of the criteria necessary to create successful change initiatives. The author strongly believes that these are the three most important elements in a successful change initiative: to ensure that the leader chooses the best people for the job, to allow room where the members can grow and become new successful leaders, and incorporate both internal and external accountability which serves as a road map to determine current location and next steps. By keeping these three major elements in mind, one can achieve grand scale successes and continue to raise the bar in educational institutions.

By completing the proposed change initiative successfully in improving the students passing percentages on the ELA Regents examination, not only will students benefit, but also parents, administrators, the staff, and teachers. After being removed from the SINI list, M500 would return to good standing and help to raise the bar for peer schools within District two.

The ELA Inquiry Team will target students who have not passed the ELA Regents examination. According to the current transcripts there are thirty-eight students who have not successfully passed the ELA Regents examination. As a result, these students will be monitored closely starting the Fall semester of the 2009-2010 academic school year. The ELA Inquiry Team members consisting of staff and administrators will first create a baseline mock ELA Regents examination for students. After doing an item analysis of the results, they will look at the students' deficiencies as a cohort and meet on a weekly basis after school for two hours to participate in creating daily, mini lessons on context clue questions, cause-effect, and repetitive phrases, etc. They will also create single statements about what students have to write about with each of the four tasks of the ELA Regents examination including the state published rubrics. Students will also be asked to identify the major templates for success on each of the four tasks (i.e., Task I – creative response of listening skills. Task II, III, and IV – paragraph #1 will rephrase the task/directions, paragraph #2 will discuss the first passage/book/play/graph, paragraph #3 will discuss the second passage/book/play/graph, and paragraph #4 will summarize the entire essay and restate paragraph #1). These interventions will be passed on to the staff that will use this system in their classroom to monitor the targeted students.

These initiatives will be translated to the staff members in the form professional development workshops. These meetings will take place on Mondays and Wednesday during sixth period, a school wide common preparation time allocated for such meetings. Teachers will learn how assess each student as individuals and carefully monitor each of their progress separately. They will learn the necessary skills needed to move this work forward. The teachers will conduct academic intervention throughout the term and will keep students folders as evidence of all progress. Additionally, the teachers will meet with the students individually and in groups on a regular basis to discuss student progress. Indicators of success would include student ability to define and write a controlling idea, note taking skills that support their writing, ability to exhibit a logical sequence of ideas through the use of appropriate devices, and student attendance and performance report.

Before this program can move forward, the ELA Inquiry Team, the teachers, administrators, and the parent coordinator will arrange a meeting with the parents of this targeted group to explain the school's plan to help their child succeed. By explaining the initiative to these parents, they will walk away with a better understanding of their child's education and will help to motivate their child. This meeting will occur on a monthly basis to keep parents informed about their child's progress. At the end of every meeting, a survey will be provided to allow parents to express their likes, dislikes, and concerns about their child's advancement. These surveys will be used by the ELA Inquiry Team to help them and the parents understand the students better.

After accessing the allocation category totals of the school budget from Galaxy, money from the Contract for Excellence FY 09 HS (\$180,434) and Title I Targeted Assistance (\$28,931) will be used to support the needs of this initiative (<http://schools.nyc.gov/AboutUs/funding/schoolbudgets/fy10SchoolBudgetOverview.htm?schoolcode=M500>). This will be used to account for per session activities of the ELA Inquiry Team, materials for the students, and any supplies needed by the classroom teachers including books, dictionaries, etc.

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)

NA

Number of Students to be Served:

LEP NA

Non-LEP NA

Number of Teachers NA

Other Staff (Specify) NA

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.

NA

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.

NA

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

-

School: NA

BEDS Code: 310200011500

**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) - Per session - Per diem	NA	NA
Purchased services - High quality staff and curriculum development contracts	NA	NA
Supplies and materials - Must be supplemental. - Additional curricula, instructional materials. - Must be clearly listed.	NA	NA
Educational Software (Object Code 199)	NA	NA
Travel	NA	NA
Other	NA	NA

TOTAL	0	
-------	---	--

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.

Since the overwhelming majority of our ELL students (99%) are from Spanish speaking environments, each year, the administration has chosen to continue to hire staff who are bilingual Spanish.

Besides orientation materials provided that have translations in their native languages, parent translators are also available to assist parents in Spanish, the most common language. The DOE translation resources are also in place for consideration. There are times that the help of students and adults who speak the same language is solicited.

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.

The Unity School staff has been adept at providing on the spot services to our ELL families. Whether by communicating in person, on the telephone, or through print, Unity families have been positive and supported through staff services.

In our parent meetings and through our parent coordinator, students and their families have been served in a positive and proactive maner.

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.

Our families are served in a variety of ways through oral and print materials to address the needs of their students. All services have been provided through current staff and continue to prove as the most successful method.

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.

All oral interpretation services are provided by in house staff. Our students speak Spanish (98%) and 50% of our staff are bilingual Spanish speakers.

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>.

Our families are served in a variety of ways through oral and print materials to address the needs of their students. All services have been provided through current staff and continue to prove as the most successful method.

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:	165513	16717	182230
2. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside for Parent Involvement:	1655		
3. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside to Improve Parent Involvement (ARRA Language):		167	
4. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified:	8276		
5. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect – HQ PD (ARRA Language):		835	
6. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Professional Development:	16551		
7. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect (Professional Development) (ARRA Language):		0	

8. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2008-2009 school year:
79.19

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.

- Professional development
- One to one professional development with YCDOE Human Resources to keep them post of their certification requirements
- Hiring highly qualify teachers

PART B: TITLE I SCHOOL PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT POLICY AND SCHOOL-PARENT COMPACT

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.

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

PART C: TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM SCHOOLS

Directions: Describe how the school will implement the following components of a Schoolwide Program as required under NCLB.

Note: If a required component is already addressed elsewhere in this plan, you may refer to the page numbers where the response can be found.

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

- The Administrative Cabinet consisting of Principal, Assistant Principal (A.P.O.) and Data Specialist review available data including: 2008-2009 Parent, Student, Teacher Surveys; ARIS; NY Start; 2008-2009 School Progress Report and ATS reports.
- Cabinet identifies priority areas for improvement during upcoming school year
- Priority areas are shared with School Leadership Team
- Priority areas are shared with Teachers at weekly grade-level Inquiry Team Meeting and Monthly Department Meetings
- Together as a unit, the faculty and the school counselors create goals for addressing priority areas and action plans
 - Grade Level Inquiry Teams monitor cohorts of students progress in meeting goals

2. Schoolwide reform strategies that:

a) Provide opportunities for all children to meet the State's proficient and advanced levels of student academic achievement.

- Subject content teachers provide students with support in afterschool and Saturday programs.
- Guidance counselors work with students to develop personal and school goals for improvement.
- Goals are shared with teachers and then teachers and counselors meet with students in common interest groupings to discuss action planning.

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.
- After school and Saturday programs are available for English Language Learner students and students who are not meeting state standards
- 37.5 minute small group instruction programs are designed for students who do not meet standards on state standardized assessments
- o Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.

- Principal, Assistant Principal, and data specialist work with teachers on lesson and unit plan development that will address the differing needs of students in a classroom
 - Academic departments develop curriculum maps and pacing calendars in order to plan challenging and enriching 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.

3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.

4. High-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals (and, where appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff) to enable all children in the Schoolwide Program to meet the State's student academic standards.

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

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

7. Plans for assisting preschool children in the transition from early childhood programs, such as Head Start, Even Start, Early Reading First, or a State-run preschool program, to local elementary school programs.

8. Measures to include teachers in the decisions regarding the use of academic assessments in order to provide information on, and to improve, the achievement of individual students and the overall instructional program.

9. Activities to ensure that students who experience difficulty mastering the proficient or advanced levels of the academic achievement standards are provided with effective, timely additional assistance. The additional assistance must include measures to ensure that students' difficulties are identified on a timely basis and to provide sufficient information on which to base effective assistance.

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

PART D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS

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

1. Use program resources to help participating children meet the State standards.

NA

2. Ensure that planning for students served under this program is incorporated into existing school planning.

NA

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;

NA

b. Help provide an accelerated, high –quality curriculum, including applied learning; and

NA

c. Minimize removing children from the regular classroom during regular school hours;

NA

4. Coordinate with and support the regular educational program;

NA

5. Provide instruction by highly qualified teachers;

NA

6. Provide professional development opportunities for teachers, principals and paraprofessionals, including, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff;

NA

7. Provide strategies to increase parental involvement; and

NA

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

NA

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 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.

²To 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.

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

1A.1: Describe the process your school engaged in, during the 2008-2009 school year, to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.

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

- Applicable
- Not Applicable

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

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

1B. Mathematics

Background

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

Specific Math Alignment Issues:

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

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

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

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

- Applicable Not Applicable

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

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

KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION

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

2A – ELA Instruction

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

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

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

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

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

- Applicable Not Applicable

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

- All ELA teachers in grades 9-12 use a workshop model where direct instruction accounts for approximate 40% of the class time
- 50% of class time is devoted to small group work or independent work or work on student goals
- 10% of classtime used for personal goal development
- Small group and independent work is focused on discussing reading or writing; independent reading or writing; conferring with teacher individual or in small group
- ESL methodology used throughout ELA lessons

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

2B – Mathematics Instruction

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

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

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

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

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

³To 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.

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.

School faculty attend professional development on data, quality review, teaching development strategies, ARIS, leadership. City and State data analysis to facilitate differentiation of instruction according the state standadards. CLSO members constantlyl meets with teachers and administrator for continuous improvement efforts

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

Teacher turnover resulted from various issues: transfer to schools out of NYC, changes in credentials, and through the evaluation system

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.

NA

KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT - ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

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

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

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

KEY FINDING 5: DATA USE AND MONITORING - ELL INSTRUCTION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

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

ELL students are enrolled in ESL classes and/or pull out and Native Language classes. They are encouraged to attend tutoring and Saturday Academy to enhance their ELA communication skills.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

5.3: Based on your response to Question 5.2, what evidence supports (or dispels) the relevance of this finding to your school's educational program?

Individual students' progress report, individual students' goals, item analysis assessments, acuity, report cards, ARIS, teacher observations and Regents/RCTs.

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.

NA

KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT - SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

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

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

Applicable Not Applicable

6.3: Based on your response to Question 6.2, what evidence supports (or dispels) the relevance of this finding to your school's educational program?

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

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

Although IEPs clearly specify testing accommodations and/or modifications for students with disabilities, they do not consistently specify accommodations and/or modifications for the classroom environment (including instruction). Further, there appears to be lack of alignment between the goals, objectives, and modified promotion criteria that are included in student IEPs and the content on which these students are

assessed on grade-level state tests. Finally, IEPs do not regularly include behavioral plans—including behavioral goals and objectives—even for students with documented behavioral issues and concerns.

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

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

Students with IEPs are programmed for SETSS or CTT classes. the SETTS classes are scheduled to reinforce all content areas classes, to prepare students for Regents/RCTs and to allow them to complete quizzes/exams for the extended time entitled. IEPs are viewed and updated to ensure that students are addressed.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

7.3: Based on your response to Question 7.2, what evidence supports (or dispels) the relevance of this finding to your school's educational program?

Individual students' learning style lets the teachers know how to present information to students, ARIS lets the teachers know each student performance level in their content area, IEPs lets the teachers know specific students ability, all the teachers have access to IEPs in order for them to adapt adapt lessons accordingly.

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.

NA

APPENDIX 8: CONTRACTS FOR EXCELLENCE (C4E) SCHOOL-BASED EXPENDITURES FOR 2009-10 (NOTE: APPENDIX 8 WILL NOT BE REQUIRED FOR THIS YEAR)

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.)

NA

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

Students placed in shelters or alternative housing continue to receive regular academic services on a daily basis. Since our students come from 4 or five boroughs, there is no impediment to academic services. Once a counselor or staff member is informed of the alternative housing placement, staff provide assistance as needed to maintain academic attendance.

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).

NA

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

NA

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.

NA