



P.S. 051

2009-10

SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)

SCHOOL: P.S. 051
ADDRESS: 87-45 117 STREET, QUEENS, NY, 11418
TELEPHONE: 718-850-0738
FAX: 718-850-0830

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: 27Q051 **SCHOOL NAME:** P.S. 051

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 87-45 117 STREET, QUEENS, NY, 11418

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 718-850-0738 **FAX:** 718-850-0830

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Magdaly Saint-Juste **EMAIL ADDRESS:** MSaintJ@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION / TITLE **PRINT/TYPE NAME**
SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON: Judith Luxenberg

PRINCIPAL: Magdaly Saint-Juste

UFT CHAPTER LEADER: Hadassah Rosenman

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT: Shirley Rice

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE: NA
(Required for high schools)

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL SUPPORT ORGANIZATION (SSO) INFORMATION

DISTRICT: 27 **SSO NAME:** Knowledge Network Learning Support Organization

SSO NETWORK LEADER: Joanne Brucella

SUPERINTENDENT: Michele Lloyd-Bey

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
Magdaly Saint-Juste	Principal	Electronic Signatures Approved at SLT Meeting of 12/21/09.
Judith Luxenberg	UFT Member	
Roxanne Russo	UFT Member	
Hadassah Rosenman	UFT Chapter Leader	
Jennifer Wolff	UFT Member	
Shirley Rice	PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
Patricia McCormick	Title I Parent Representative	
Doris Lopez	Parent	
Fatima Hussain	Parent	
Maka Samashuili	Parent	

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

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

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

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

VISION STATEMENT: Our school community wishes to be recognized and respected as a model for best early childhood education practices.

MISSION STATEMENT: PS 51 strives to create the best opportunity for all students to learn in a creative and nurturing environment. Our entire school community endeavors to provide excellence in education by developing a community of lifelong learners. In an atmosphere rich with cultural diversity, we provide a program that sets the highest standards for all students while celebrating individuality and encouraging creativity.

PS 51 is an Early Childhood School located in the Richmond Hill section of Queens, New York. We have two half day Pre-Kindergarten programs, five classes in Kindergarten (one of which is a CTT class) and four classes in Grade One (one self contained ESL class and one CTT class). The majority of students are from low-income families, and until this year, as a 4-year participant of the Universal Meals Program, 100% qualified for free lunch. This year we will once again be collecting lunch forms. Currently, Kindergarten and Grade One are successfully using a Balanced Literacy approach using classroom libraries, with fiction and non-fiction books used to teach the "Skill of the Week". In 2006-2007 both CTT classes started using "Foundations/Wilson Language Basics", a phonics program. The school population, as of October 8, 2009, of 248 students is comprised of students from many different cultures who speak several languages. The staff has participated in and will continue to participate in various workshops in order to foster a better understanding and appreciation of these differences. PS 51Q is part of the Knowledge Network LSO and has received a rating of Well-Developed on all three Quality Reviews.

Our Pre-kindergarten incorporates the Pre-kindergarten Core Knowledge (CK) Sequence in her daily lesson plans. Instruction in all our grades is aligned to the New York State Standards. Kindergarten and Grade One incorporate the CK curriculum in all areas, except literacy, where we follow a Balanced Literacy model. All classes use Foundations as their phonics supplement to Balanced Literacy. In 2008-2009 PS 51 applied for and was selected to be part of the Response to Intervention program using Foundations. We used Foundations as our AIS program during the 37 ½ minutes after school, using their Double Dose lessons and will continue this practice for the 2009-2010 school year. Our teachers were trained by Janet Stahl, Senior Innovative Program Specialist from the DOE's Office of Special Education Initiatives. There will be continuous training throughout the school year.

For 2009-2010 PS51Q applied for and was selected to design our own assessments. We will be using the WRAP(Writing and Reading Assessment Profile) 3 xs a year in Kindergarten and First Grade. We have also created Benchmark assessment in Math, social studies and science to be administered 3xs a year in Kindergarten and First Grade .In 2009-2010, we will be adding AIS math to our 37 1/2 minutes after school program for those students struggling in math.

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:	P.S. 051				
District:	27	DBN #:	27Q051	School BEDS Code #:	27Q051

DEMOGRAPHICS									
Grades Served in 2008-09:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pre-K	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> K	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 11	<input 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	36	36	36		93.4	TBD	TBD
Kindergarten	117	105	91				
Grade 1	114	117	101				
Grade 2	0	0	0	Student Stability: - % of Enrollment (As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 3	0	0	0		91.4	89.1	87.19
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			91.4	89.1
Grade 8	0	0	0				
Grade 9	0	0	0	Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:			
Grade 10	0	0	0	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 11	0	0	0		0	1	3
Grade 12	0	0	0				
Ungraded	0	1	0	Recent Immigrants: - Total Number			
Total	267	259	228	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
					2.0	1.0	1

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	0	0	0				
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	17	19	16	Principal Suspensions	5	3	TBD
Number all others	1	5	3	Superintendent Suspensions	2	0	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	0	0	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	51	56	47	Number of Staff: - Includes all full-time staff:			
# ELLs with IEPs	1	0	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	19	23	20
				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	3	4	3
Overage Students: # entering students overage for grade							
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	N/A	4	5
	0	0	0				
				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	95.7	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.0	1.5	0.0	Percent more than two years teaching in this school	78.9	69.6	80.0
Black or African American	7.1	6.2	6.1	Percent more than five years teaching anywhere	84.2	73.9	85.0
Hispanic or Latino	30.0	27.4	27.2				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	52.4	49.8	50.9	Percent Masters Degree or higher	95.0	87.0	100.0
White	10.5	15.1	15.4	Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	93.3	100.0	100.0
Multi-racial							
Male	56.2	56.4	55.7				
Female	43.8	43.6	44.3				

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 <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:					
Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2009-10 Based on 2008-09 Performance):							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In Good Standing (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:	IGS			ELA:		
	Math:	IGS			Math:		
	Science:				Grad. Rate:		
This school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for each accountability measure:							
Student Groups		Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
		ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad. Rate
All Students		X	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							
Student groups making AYP in each subject		0	0	0	0	0	0

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results - 2008-09		Quality Review Results - 2008-09	
Overall Letter Grade	TBD	Overall Evaluation:	W
Overall Score	TBD	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	W
School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)	TBD	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	W
School Performance (Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)	TBD	Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	W
Student Progress (Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)	TBD	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	W
Additional Credit	TBD	Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	W
<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?

PERFORMANCE TRENDS/DATA

PS 51Q continually gathers and analyzes data from all services available, including Quality Review Reports, teacher-created benchmark assessments, the Writing Reading Assessments Profile (WRAP), Everyday Mathematics Unit tests (Grade One), etc. and for the 2008-2009 school year we piloted the Group Reading and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE) and Group Mathematics and Diagnostic Evaluation (GMADE). We were not happy with the GRADE and GMADE assessments and so we are not using them for the 2009-2010 school year. Instead we applied to DYO (design your own) assessments and our plan was accepted. As part of the DYO, we will be using the WRAP (Writing, Reading Assessment Profile) 3xs a year and we will be adding performance tasks to our assessments in all subject areas. We also started longitudinally tracking the students who entered our own Pre-kindergarten classes in the fall of 2007. Such analyses conducted during faculty meetings, grade conferences, and data inquiry team meetings provide relevant and timely information about our trends.

Of the 110 Kindergarten children assessed using the WRAP in the first Benchmark taken in the fall of 2009, 14 met the benchmark of A or better as measured by Fountas and Pinnell. Our goal is to have 75% of our Kindergarten students on level C by June 2010. For the second benchmark taken in the winter of 2010 we hope to move 75% up 1 Fountas and Pinnell Reading level. Last year our Kindergarten Fall benchmark was < A. We felt that this benchmark was too low and therefore the number of students reaching the benchmark was not a good indicator statistically. Therefore we raised the benchmark to level A for fall 2009. In 2008-2009 26 kindergarten students who had attended our Pre-kindergarten program, 3 scored above that < higher 29, those Of Pre-Kindergarten. 29 2009-2010>

Of the 101 First Grade children assessed using the WRAP in the fall of 2009 71% met the benchmark level of "C" or above as measured by Fountas and Pinnell. Our goal is to have 75% on level F by the second benchmark given in the winter of 2010 and 75% on level I (grade level) by June,2010. In the fall of 2008 56.9% of the First Grade were writing at level 3. By the winter of 2009 70.8% were writing on level 3 and by May 2008 85.6% were writing on level 3. By June 2008 65.8% of the First Grade were writing on level 3 in 2 out of 3 benchmark assessments. Our disaggregated data for the first grade's benchmark on the WRAP also is consistent with this improvement. For instance, males went from a 53.1% meeting the benchmark in fall 2007 to 78.6% in fall 2008 females went from 70% to

69%. Special Education students went from 27.2% to 60%; and ELLs went from 9.1% meeting the benchmark to 23.4%. We are hoping to continue this upward trend in reading and writing for the 2009-2010 school year.

The GRADE and GMADE use the Growth Scale Value (GSV) to measure students' reading and math progress over time. It is also used to compare students' reading and math abilities to a reference group of students in the same grade. As part of the NYCDOE's pilot program, our students took the GRADE and GMADE in the Fall of 2008 and then again in January of 2009 for first grade and May 2009 for Kindergarten (both of which are referred to as Spring of 09). The GRADE national average GSV for Kindergarten in the Fall 2008 was 61, our students averaged a 58. For the Spring of 2009 the national average was 88 with our students scoring a 97. For First Grade the Fall national average was 106 our students scored a 97. In the Spring, the national average was 379 with our students scoring 364.

For the GMADE our Kindergarten students averaged a 461 GSV with the national average being 462. The Spring of 2009 had the Kindergarten scoring a 470 GSV with the national average GSV being 472.

The First Grade scored a 467 GSV in the Fall 2009 with the national average being 477 and 475 in the Spring of 2009 with national average being 477. Compared nationally our students were very close to or exceeded the national average GSV on both the GRADE and GMADE assessments.

As a Pre-Kindergarten to Grade One School, we do not have standardized testing. During the 2007-2008 school year, the teachers in grades K and One used the Everyday Mathematics assessments. However, a thorough analysis of the assessments themselves and of the results convinced the school of the need to revise those assessments to meet our needs (more student and teacher-friendly). In order to obtain data about our students for 2008-2009 teachers in Kindergarten and Grade one created three benchmark assessments to be given as baseline, median and end of year guides. These will help the teachers gather data and create more individualized lessons for their classes. Both Kindergarten and Grade One met the benchmark for fall of 2008 (respectively 82.4% and 83.2%). For our first benchmark this fall (2008), kindergarten met the benchmark (82%). Only 33.3% of special education students in Kindergarten met the benchmark while 90% in First Grade met the benchmark. Kindergarten males and females met the benchmark (78.4% vs. 87.5%). First grade males and females also met the benchmark (86.4% vs. 86.5%). Kindergarten ELLs just missed the benchmark (72.7%) while Grade One ELLs met the benchmark at 82.7%. By spring 2009 77.6% of Kindergarten students met the benchmark while 71.2% of first grade met the benchmark. Only 53.8% of Kindergarten ELL met the spring benchmark while 78.7% of first grade ELLs met the benchmark. In Kindergarten, more males, 80.8% than females, 73.9% met the benchmark. In first grade males and females scored more closely, 71.2% ,72.7% with females actually scoring higher. For the 2009-2010 school year, we are hoping to increase the percentage of students meeting the benchmarks by having math AIS for our struggling first grade students during the 37 1/2 minutes.

Clearly, all students, including ELL students, should continue to use manipulatives to support their understanding of mathematical concepts. Mathematics literacy is encouraged, as well as integration into other content areas. Problem solving should be stressed to develop students' higher order thinking skills.

The teachers are implementing the Kindergarten and Grade One curricula in order to meet the New York State Standards for social studies and science. This has been demonstrated by the use of teacher made tests, teacher observations of student performance and student portfolios. Benchmarks created by the teachers will be administered 3xs a year in order to individualize instruction, and in order to monitor progress. For 2009-2010 school year teachers will be creating 2 performance tasks to be administered between benchmark assessments. Teachers will continue to use trade books, non-fiction and fiction; the Core Knowledge Sequence, and a hands-on approach in order to continue to meet the NYS science and social studies standards.

In 2008-2009 ,Pre-kindergarten students were assessed twice a year on letter identification and drawing self-portraits. In September 2008, 9 of 36 students could identify only 10 or less letters. By May 2009, only 3 of 36 students could identify only 10 or less letters. In September 2008, 18 of 36 could identify more than 24 letters. By May 2009, 30 of 36 students could identify at least 24 letters. In September 2008, 22 of 36 students were drawing in the tadpole or scribble stage, 14 of 36 could draw a complete figure facing front. By May 2009, only 6 children were still drawing scribbles to tadpole stage pictures, while 27 were drawing complete figure facing front. For the 2009-2010 school year Pre-kindergarten children will be assessed three times a year in reading and twice a year in math using Everyday Math Pre-Kindergarten benchmarks.

Based on the data and by looking at student work found in their portfolios for Reading and Mathematics, we found that children in both Kindergarten and Grade One remarkably improved their literacy skills. These gains were demonstrated across all ethnic/racial groups, as well as ELL students, economically disadvantaged, and students with disabilities. Teacher observation of classroom performance supports this conclusion. There should also be the continuation of the 90-minute literacy block with flexibility for easier scheduling. The Primary Data Inquiry Team studied 15 ELL Kindergarten students and determined that more attention should be paid to rhyming skills in order for children to be able to differentiate sounds. For the school year 2009-2010 all classes will continue to be immersed in nursery rhymes and other poetry. We also found that oral language needed to be assessed explicitly with Let's Talk About It assessment from MONDO. Targeted children from the past year were monitored by the Secondary Inquiry Team. For the 2009-2010 school year, the Primary Data Inquiry Team will be focusing on Vocabulary as our targeted skill, again with 15 Kindergarten students. For the 2008-2009 school year, P.S. 51Q added two more assessments to be used for all Kindergarten and First grade students. All students will be using the Foundations/Wilson Language Basic program and their progress will be monitored during the year via prescribed assessments. In Kindergarten there are five Unit Tests. The children identified as neediest by the WRAP and teacher recommendation will be given a "Double Dose" of Foundations by an AIS teacher. In First grade there are 14 Unit Tests. The children identified as below grade level in reading will be given a "Double Dose" of Foundations during the 37 ½ minutes after school program. Due to our participation in the Foundations RTI program, all children identified as needing "Double Dose of Foundations will also be assessed with the Foundations Probe. We will continue to use these assessments for the 2009-2010 school year. Kindergarten children entering school in September 2009 with a reading level below A should be at level C by June 2010. We are longitudinally tracking the students who entered Prekindergarten in 2007 and stay until 2010 when they must leave our school to attend the second grade. First Grade children entering in September 2008 with a reading level of C will reach a level of F-G by January 2009 and level I by June 2009 (as measured by WRAP using Fountas and Pinnell levels). Professional development will be provided throughout the school year to support the teachers in Core Knowledge, Balanced Literacy, Foundations/Wilson Language Basics, differentiated instruction, ELLs, mathematics and the use of portfolios.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

1-Our parent coordinator, Andrea Kelly has worked to increase parent involvement by offering a variety of activities and programs to meet the parents' needs. During the 2007-2008 school year, she offered a well-attended six-week Mommy/Daddy and Me program for toddlers whose siblings attend our school. This program started again by popular demand in November 2008. Mrs. Kelly also has an ESL program for our parents, and at the end of the year she started used the Rosetta Stone computer program with the parents. This ESL program resumes in November of 2008 as well. School-sponsored family field trips last year included visits to the Liberty Hall of Science, the Atlantis Marine World Aquarium and the Alley Pond Environmental Center. Our parent coordinator keeps painstaking records of all parent activities. Surveys, questionnaires, agendas, and handouts all point to an increasing number of parents participating in school-based activities. Mrs. Kelly was designated as our web coordinator and since August 2008, has been updating our website with relevant

information. The School Leadership Team requested a brochure to welcome parents and it was published and disseminated as of September 2008 and updated in June 2009. Finally, in 2008-2009, in order to strengthen the parent-teacher connection, the staff devised feedback sheets to be sent to parents after each benchmark result in reading, writing, mathematics, science, and social studies. For 2009-2010 we will continue to provide the parents with feedback. We are trying to develop a computer program that will allow teachers to communicate with parents more effectively. We are also having monthly curriculum meetings (led by the Coach) for parents, alternating between morning and evening, in order to keep our parents informed about what is going on in the classrooms.

2- Professional Development is provided by the Literacy/Math Coach and Principal on an ongoing basis during faculty conferences, common preps, other preparatory periods and lunch periods. Also, the Literacy/Math Coach provides any additional help requested by staff and parents at a time conveniently agreed upon either during or after school hours. Professional development topics have included using the workshop model for both mathematics and literacy, Guided Reading and implementing Modeled Writing into the Kindergarten and Four Square Writing into Grade One classes, as well as, using the Principles of Learning and Cambourne's Conditions for Learning. Study groups are held at least twice a month for teachers. Some study group topics have been: reading strategies for early childhood classes, portfolios, the WRAP, conferring in Writing Workshop and looking at student work. For the 2009-2010 school year will be using the FOSS science program and will be focusing on PD for our teachers in order for them to better understand the program.

Teachers will continue using technology in literacy along with math. Computer software has been purchased to assist children in literacy, math and keyboarding skills. The F-Status computer teacher will continue to work with small groups of children. Smart boards were purchased and professional development was given on their use. Continued professional development will be needed in order for teachers to become more proficient. This year, we formalized our process for teacher development through inter-visitations via a preset schedule, and are sending teachers to visit other like-classrooms in order to further their insight into best practices. Teachers are also benefiting from our inclusion into the two DOE pilot programs on assessments and Response to Intervention. Teachers receive ongoing critical professional development from an assigned specialist for the RTI program, and receive professional development for administering, gathering, and analyzing data. Teachers are recognizing the need for self-reflection, and have formulated goals for themselves which they review with the principal at least three times a year.

3-PS 51Q had a highly effective Data Inquiry Team during the 2007-2008 school year which continued into the 2008-2009 school year. This team gathered and analyzed data, created intervention measure for the 15 students in the study, and applied its findings to the rest of the student population. Because of the DIT, the school this year is addressing oral language development through the Let's Talk About It program from Mondo, and systematized rhyming instruction in kindergarten. This year, the school formed a secondary data team in order to track the performance of the 15 original targeted students who are now in Grade One. Both teams will continue for the 2009-2010 school year.

4-Finally, the school is extremely proud having been rated WELL-DEVELOPED on the last three Quality Review Reports.

AIDS/BARRIERS

The school environment is one that is completely suited to the development needs of our early childhood population. We are a Prekindergarten to Grade One School and are able to immerse ourselves into the needs of this specific age group, unlike a K-5 or K-8 school. On the other hand, due to the quick turnover of students, we have the challenge of maintaining parent involvement at our desired level on a year to year basis. Furthermore, parents of this specific age group must often be made aware of the importance of developing good school habits such as attendance and punctuality.

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
Goal 1--- Student Performance--PS 51Q will show improvement in student performance in Literacy, Math, Social Studies and Science through the creation and use of benchmark assessments administered three times a year, with at least 75% mastery in those areas, by June 2010.	Goal 1--- As an Early Childhood school with no formal assessments the staff of PS 51Q found it necessary to create its own assessment for literacy, Math, Social Studies and Science in order to meet the NYS Standards.
Goal 2--- Attendance--Attendance for all students, including ELLS and special education students will be at 94% or more as measured by ATS, by June 2010.	Goal 2--- We encourage our early childhood students to come to school by celebrating the class with the highest attendance each month with a reward, and posting the photos of students with best attendance.
Goal 3--- Parental Involvement--PS 51Q will have at least 12 parents participating in 15 school-sponsored activities such as workshops, and PTA/PAC meetings, 75% of the time, as measured by attendance sheets, by June 2010.	Goal 3--- Our parent coordinator works diligently organizing meaningful workshops and trips in order to encourage and increase parent participation in our school. This year, we are starting new initiatives such as Monthly Math Fridays, and FRED (Fathers Reading Everyday)
Goal 4--- Data Collection and Analysis--90% of the staff of PS 51Q will engage in data collection and analysis in at least 8 meetings during the school year in order to make decisions about grouping students according to need, refer students for academic intervention, and or special education services, as measured by attendance sheets and ARIS reports of interactions, by June 2010.	Goal 4--- The staff meets during grade conferences and faculty conferences as well as after school meetings in order to look at the data from each assessment in order to make instructional decisions for each child.
Goal 5--- Professional Development--By June 2010, I will demonstrate growth on 3 of the 5 elements of the California Teaching Standard for California Teaching Standard for Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students as measured by the successful completion of the evidence listed under each element of the graphic organizer and by	Goal 5--- All teachers are expected to focus particularly on that standard to inform teaching and learning, as well as to inform individualized professional development agenda.

my movement on the Continuum of Teacher Development.	
--	--

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) :**

Student Performance

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>Goal 1--- Student Performance--PS 51Q will show improvement in student performance in Literacy, Math, Social Studies and Science through the creation and use of benchmark assessments administered three times a year, with at least 75% mastery in those areas, by June 2010.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>Plan for Goal 1—</p> <p>All classes will follow Balanced Literacy Approach-120 minute Literacy Block</p> <p>Everyday Mathematics workshop model for instruction</p> <p>Fundations in all Classrooms</p> <p>Full time Literacy and Math Coach</p> <p>Full time reading teacher in grade 1 Full time AIS teacher in Kindergarten using Fundations Double Dose and RTI Probe</p> <p>Use of ELLIS program with ELL students by ESL teacher</p> <p>AIS for 1st grade in 37 1/2 minutes using Fundations Double Dose and RTI Probe</p> <p>After school program for ELLs and children needing reading help with Leap Track program from</p>

	<p>October 2008 thru May 2009</p> <p>Professional Development in science via CITE and Knowledge Network LSO</p> <p>Curriculum Mapping</p> <p>Data Collection and Analysis</p> <p>Data Inquiry teams</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Resources---</p> <p>All classroom teachers, funded personnel. Coach and Principal</p> <p>Tax levy teachers-11 classroom teachers</p> <p>EGCSR – 1 teacher, 1 AIS teacher, 2 cluster teachers</p> <p>1 full time IEP teacher</p> <p>3 after school teachers (1 Title I, 2 Title 3)</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Indicators---</p> <p>75% of Grade K and 1 students will be at least on level on 2 of 4 curriculum area assessments in Fall 2009.</p> <p>2. 1 75% of Grade K and 1 students will be at least on level on 2 of 4 curriculum area assessments in Winter 2010.</p> <p>3. 1 75% of Grade K and 1 students will be at least on level on 4 of 4 curriculum area assessments in Spring 2010</p>

**Subject Area
(where relevant) :**

Attendance

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>Goal 2--- Attendance--Attendance for all students, including ELLS and special education students will be at 94% or more as measured by ATS, by June 2010.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>Plan for Goal 2---</p> <p>September 2009-June 2010</p> <p>School Aides making daily phone calls</p> <p>Use of computer tracking system with DOE attendance teacher</p> <p>Awards for class with best attendance for the month</p> <p>Bulletin board for students with perfect attendance for the month</p> <p>Announcements over PA for best attendance monthly</p>
<p>Aligning Resources:Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Resources---</p> <p>Teachers, secretaries, aides, guidance counselor, DOE attendance teacher, Principal, Coach</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Indicators---</p> <p>Benchmark 1: Attendance for September-November 2009 will be at 90%</p> <p>Benchmark 2: Attendance for December 2009-March 2010 will be at 92%</p> <p>Benchmark 3: Attendance for April- June 2010 will be at 94%%</p>

**Subject Area
(where relevant) :**

Parent Involvement

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>Goal 3--- Parental Involvement--PS 51Q will have at least 12 parents participating in 15 school-sponsored activities such as workshops, and PTA/PAC meetings, 75% of the time, as measured by attendance sheets, by June 2010.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>Plan for Goal 3---</p> <p>September 2009-June 2010</p> <p>School Leadership Team meetings</p> <p>PTA meetings</p> <p>Classroom volunteers</p> <p>School Newsletter</p> <p>School Website</p> <p>Workshops for parents in Literacy, Math, Mommy Daddy and Me, Foundations, Core Knowledge Curriculum by Parent Coordinator, Principal, Coach and outside agencies such as Learning Leaders</p> <p>Technology based ESL program to increase English proficiency of parents of ELL students</p> <p>Volunteer workshop</p>
<p>Aligning Resources:Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Resources---</p> <p>Principal, Parent Coordinator, Coach, funded personnel</p> <p>Tax Levy, Title III \$5,000, LEP, Title I SWP \$12159 1% to be used parent resources and materials for parent workshops</p>

<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Indicators---</p> <p>Between September 2009 and December, 2009, 12 parents will attend at least 5 meetings</p> <p>Between January 2010 and March 2010, 12 parents will attend at least 5 meetings</p> <p>Between April 2010 and June 2010 12 parents will attend at least 5 meetings</p> <p>Agendas, attendance, evaluations</p>
--	---

**Subject Area
(where relevant) :**

Data Collection

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>Goal 4--- Data Collection and Analysis--90% of the staff of PS 51Q will engage in data collection and analysis in at least 8 meetings during the school year in order to make decisions about grouping students according to need, refer students for academic intervention, and or special education services, as measured by attendance sheets and ARIS reports of interactions, by June 2010.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>Plan for Goal 4---</p> <p>September 2009- June 2010</p> <p>All teachers will use the WRAP, Benchmark Assessments, Performance Tasks, Foundations, Double Dose Foundations (RTI Probe), portfolio pieces and teacher observation to improve individual students' performance including ELLs and Special education students, throughout the year.</p> <p>Longitudinally tracking students from Pre-K through Grade 1</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Resources---</p> <p>Principal, Coach, classroom teachers, AIS teacher, Reading teacher, IEP teacher</p> <p>Data Inquiry Teams 1 and 2 (per session for team 1)</p> <p>Data Specialist</p>

<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Indicators---</p> <p>A review of data will be done after each assessment is administered at least 8 times a year.</p> <p>Benchmark Assessments in all subjects 3xs a year</p> <p>WRAP : three benchmarks Fall, Winter, Spring</p> <p>RTI Probe: bi-Weekly</p> <p>Performance Tasks 2xs a year</p>
--	--

Subject Area
 (where relevant) :

Professional Development

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>Goal 5--- Professional Development--By June 2010, I will demonstrate growth on 3 of the 5 elements of the California Teaching Standard for California Teaching Standard for Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students as measured by the successful completion of the evidence listed under each element of the graphic organizer and by my movement on the Continuum of Teacher Development.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>Plan for Goal 5---</p> <p>Workshops/Study Groups/Professional books/Journal Articles</p> <p>Core Knowledge Planning/Co-Planning</p> <p>Inter-visitations/Intra-visitations</p> <p>Review and Analysis of Student Work and of Conference Notes</p> <p>ARIS/Online resources</p>

<p>Aligning Resources:Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Resources---</p> <p>Principal, Coach, all classroom teachers, funded personnel</p> <p>Per session</p> <p>Per diem</p> <p>Text book money</p> <p>Consultants</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Indicators---</p> <p>Benchmark 1: By December 15, 2009 75% of the teaching staff will improve their level of proficiency on one element of the California Teaching Standard for Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for all students as measured by the successful completion of the evidence listed under this element on the graphic organizer and movement on the Continuum of Teacher Development.</p> <p>Benchmark 2: By April 15, 2010, 80% of the teaching staff will improve their level of proficiency on two elements of the California Teaching Standard for Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for all students as measured by the successful completion of the evidence listed under this element on the graphic organizer and movement on the Continuum of Teacher Development.</p> <p>Benchmark 3: By June 15, 2010, 90% of the teaching staff will improve their level of proficiency on three elements of the California Teaching Standard for Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for all students as measured by the successful completion of the evidence listed under this element on the graphic organizer and movement on the Continuum of Teacher Development.</p>

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	27	26	N/A	N/A				
1	32	20	N/A	N/A				
2			N/A	N/A				
3			N/A	N/A				
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

<p>Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)</p>	<p>Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).</p>
<p>ELA:</p>	<p>AIS-ELA 1) Foundations Double-Dose Students in kindergarten are seen in small groups of six students on a daily basis. An AIS teacher delivers the services in a push in model. Students in Grade One also receive the same service but during the 37 ½ minute program. The groups range from three to four students per teacher. Teachers use the Probe every three-weeks to monitor student progress in their respective groups. 2) An after-school program for ELLs and at-risk students takes place twice a week from 3:15 to 4:15. This program uses the Leap Track Assessments System.</p>
<p>Mathematics:</p>	<p>1) During the day, teachers in Kindergarten and Grade One see their own students in ability-based small groups. Teachers use materials from the Everyday Math Intervention to address the needs of at-risk students. Teachers also use content based books during Read Aloud Time to instruct students in math areas such as counting, shapes etc. For 2009-2010, additional AIS math will take place during the 37 1/2 minutes for those First Grade students who are in need of extra math help and not ELA. 2) An after-school program for ELLs and at-risk students takes place twice a week from 3:15 to 4:15. This program uses the Leap Track Assessments System. AIS-Math</p>
<p>Science:</p>	<p>AIS needs in science are addressed in the classroom using differentiated instruction and small group intervention in the classroom itself. Skills and strategies are further developed in oral language, reading, and writing.</p>
<p>Social Studies:</p>	<p>AIS needs in social studies are addressed in the classroom using differentiated instruction, and small group intervention in the classroom. Skills and strategies are further developed in reading, oral language, and writing.</p>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:</p>	<p>Traditionally, the guidance counselor offers counseling on an individual basis and on a group basis. The guidance counselor also pushes into every classroom for specific lessons that address character development, discipline, and/or cooperation. This practice will continue this year if we have a guidance counselor.</p>

At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	School psychologist offers counseling services on individual basis as needed.
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	The social worker offers counseling on an individual basis, as needed.
At-risk Health-related Services:	N/A

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.

Public School 51Q
87-45 117 Street, Richmond Hill, NY 11418
Tel: (718) 850-0738 Fax: (718) 850-0830

Magdaly Saint-Juste
Principal

P.S. 51Q Language Allocation Policy –Language Allocation Policy

I. Language Allocation Policy Team Composition

Joanne Brucella, Network Leader
Magdaly Saint-Juste, Principal
Andrea Kelly, Parent Coordinator
Judith Luxenberg, Literacy/Math Coach
Nesrin Balkaya, Teacher
Chari Reinstein, Teacher
Shirley Rice, PTA/PA President

II. Teacher Qualifications

P. S. 51Q has two (2) state certified English as a Second Language Teacher and no (0) certified Bilingual Teachers. All teachers' licenses/certifications are kept on file in the office.

III. ELL Demographics

There are 248 students in our school. Forty-seven (47) students in Grade One and Kindergarten are identified as ELLS 19% of students in Grade One and Kindergarten therefore are ELLs.

We have a push-in/pull out model in our school. For Kindergarten, the ESL teacher pushes in eight periods a week to service the students. For first grade, we will have a self contained ESL class where the children will be taught using ESL techniques by a certified ESL teacher. A reading teacher gives additional services to first grade students and an AIS teacher gives additional services to kindergarten students. There are forty-seven (47) ELLs receiving ESL services for 3 years or less.

The following represents the number of ELLs by Grade in each language group in our Freestanding English as a Second Language program: For Kindergarten, we have Spanish (13), Bengali (1), Arabic (4), Punjabi (4), Chechen (1) for a total of 23 students.

In First Grade, we have Spanish (10), Bengali (1), Urdu (5), Punjabi (6), Arabic (1), and Hebrew (1), a total of 24 students.

IV. Parent Program Choice

1. What structures are in place at your school to ensure that parents understand all three program choices?

Parents are invited in May for Kindergarten orientation and the ELL program options for P.S. 51 are explained at that time. Notices are translated into Spanish, Punjabi, Urdu, Russian, Arabic, and Chinese. Parents' surveys and letters are sent home in thirteen different languages. In October, the parents of ELL students are invited for an Open House where both ESL teachers explain the different program choices and show the parents a DVD in various languages.

2. After reviewing the Parent Survey and Program Selection forms for the past few years, what is the trend in program choices that parents have been requesting?

Over the past several years, parents have requested the free-standing English as a Second Language (ESL) program as their program choice. Parents who wish to enroll their children in a self-contained bilingual class are given that option. This current year, no (0) parents chose to send their children to a school other than P.S. 51Q.

3. Are the programs offered at your school aligned with parent requests? If no, why not? How will you build alignment between parent choice and program offerings? Define specific steps underway.

Our program is aligned with parent requests. Parents have requested the Free-standing ESL program we are offering. They have indicated a preference for this model over the transitional bilingual class model. The program is designed to meet the needs of our beginner, intermediate and advanced ESL students. We are using a push-in model for Kindergarten and a self contained ESL class in Grade 1 designed to meet New York State Standards.

V. Assessment Analysis

Part A.

The NYSESLAT results for Kindergarten (Spring 2009) (currently these students are in Grade One) indicated 5 beginners, 15 intermediate, and 4 advanced for a total of 24 students. Aggregate performance results for NYSESLAT Spring 2009 will be available in September 2009. The LAB-R was administered in the Fall 2009 to incoming Kindergarten and newly admitted First Grade students with the following results: Kindergarten, 10 beginners, 13 intermediate for a total of 23 students; First Grade 0 beginners for a total of 0 students. Aggregate performance results are not applicable. All children are taught in English however our ESL teachers, as well as all our teachers, are aware of the cultural differences and needs of ELL students and use inclusive techniques in the classroom to provide appropriate supportive instruction.

Part A. Questions:

1. What is revealed by the data patterns across proficiency levels and grades?

Across proficiency levels, all students scored higher in listening and speaking than in reading and writing. ELLs in Kindergarten were tested in the fall of 2009 with the LAB-R, which evaluates English skills in listening, speaking and reading. Based on the ESL teachers' observations, most of these students scored higher on the listening and speaking sections than they did on the reading section. In first grade, the spring 2009 NYSESLAT was used. Twenty-two (22) ELLs, who currently attend P.S. 51Q, took the spring 2008 NYSESLAT (the other 2 students are

transfers from other schools/countries). In the fall of 2009, 67 kindergarten students were eligible to be tested with the LAB-R to determine ELL status and eligibility to receive ESL services. Of those students, 23 were deemed not English proficient and in need of ESL services. There were 4 newly enrolled First Grade students who also took the fall 2009 LAB-R. Of those, all 4 scored proficient in English.

2. How will patterns across the four modalities, listening, speaking, reading, and writing, affect instructional decisions?

Instruction will be based on student results in the four modalities. Since the first grade students scored in the beginner and intermediate levels in reading and writing, those areas of instruction will be given greater emphasis in our effort to raise those levels to advanced and beyond. Additional attention will also be given to developing students' listening skills.

Part B: Assessments

When assessing in the Fall 2009, using the Writing and Reading Assessment Profile (WRAP) all Kindergarten ESL students were below Level A. By June 2010, we hope to have 75% reading on level C (grade level).

When assessing in the Fall 2009, using the Writing and Reading Assessment Profile (WRAP) in First Grade, 1 student was below level A, 4 students were on level A, 7 students were on level B, 5 student were on level C, 4 students were on level D and 1 student was on level E. By June 2010, we hope to have 75% reading on grade level I.

Spanish LAB: Of the thirteen (13) ELL students administered the Spanish LABR, nine (9) scored in the proficient range.

Part B Questions:

1. Examine student results. What are the patterns across proficiencies and grades? How are ELLs faring in tests taken in English as compared to the native language?

In both Kindergarten and First Grade, ELL students tend to score better on the Listening and Speaking parts of the LAB-R and NYSESLAT assessments than on the reading and writing sections. Most of the Spanish speaking students did better on the Spanish Lab in the Listening and Speaking sections. We attribute this to fact that they are young and their primary language in the home is Spanish.

2. Describe how the school leadership and teachers are using the results of the ELL Interim Assessments.

The leadership team meets monthly to discuss school policies and educational instruction. They have been advised of the NYSESLAT and LAB-R results, and together with the administration and ESL teacher, have incorporated ESL teaching strategies into every classroom. This information has been incorporated into our CEP (Comprehensive Education Plan).

3. What is the school learning about ELLS from the Interim Assessments? How is the Native Language used? The implications for the school's LAP and instruction? How is the Native Language used?

Students will receive instruction based upon their individual needs and proficiency levels. Age and grade appropriate ESL materials in the content areas will be utilized. Planning will be done in collaboration with the classroom teachers to ensure continuity of instruction in literacy and mathematics. Level appropriate and varied materials (audiovisual, manipulatives, technology) will be used to increase the students' proficiency of the English language. Major emphasis will be placed on reading and writing instruction. Several native languages are

represented at P.S. 51Q; our free-standing ESL program addresses the needs of our ELL population. This year, we are also using the ELLIS program, a computer based program for English Language Learners.

- 4. a) Not applicable.
- 4. b) Not applicable.
- 4. c) Not applicable.

VI. Planning for ELLs

1. How is Instruction Delivered?

For 2009-2010 we will be using a push-in/pull out model that is designed to meet New York State Standards. In First Grade we will have a self contained ESL class.

Kindergarten students receive services grouped by their proficiency level which is beginner. First grade students will be receiving differentiated instruction in a self contained ESL classroom. The AIS and reading teachers travel to the different classrooms.

There are a variety of ways in which instruction is delivered. Instructional techniques include modeling, bridging, conceptualization, schema building, text representation, and meta-cognitive development. Using a thematic approach, students are exposed to all areas of literacy: reading, writing, listening and speaking. In addition, the five ESL approaches are employed, including Cooperative Learning, The Natural Approach, Total Physical Response, The Language Experience Approach, and the Whole Language Approach. For students at the beginning language level, instruction focuses on Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS). The focus shifts to Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) as students reach the intermediate and advanced levels of language.

2. How does your school assure that the mandated number of instructional minutes is provided according to proficiency levels in each program?

a. The ESL teacher analyses the results of the NYSESLAT to determine the proficiency levels of each student. Groups are created based on the language level and the grade level of students. Kindergarten beginner and intermediate students receive 360 minutes per week of ESL instruction. First grade students will be in a self contained class and therefore will receive the mandated 360 minutes of instruction. Students in Kindergarten and Grade One at the advanced level receive 180 minutes of ESL instruction per week as well as 180 minutes of ELA instruction per week. As new admits enter the school, they are placed in the appropriate group based on the results of the LAB-R.

b. How is explicit ELA delivered in each program?

The curriculum for ELL students is the same curriculum taught by classroom teachers. All components are addressed, including Shared Reading, Read Aloud, Guided Reading, and Writing. The ESL teachers use ESL methodologies, strategies and techniques in order to maintain the same high standards for their students. The ESL teachers also uses a technology-based program ELLIS, as well as the Mondo Publishing Program Now I Get it! Additionally, all kindergarten and first grade classes are using the Foundations program to specifically address phonics and phonemic awareness needs.

c- How is explicit NLA instruction delivered in each program model to comply with mandates?

P.S. 51Q has a free-standing ESL program in which the language of instruction is English. We do encourage the children to discuss their culture and customs. In this way, we are incorporating Native Language Arts into the curriculum. We do not have an explicit NLA program.

d. How are the content areas delivered in each program model?

The curriculum for ELL students is the same curriculum taught by classroom teachers. All students use the Everyday Mathematics program in

grades Pre-K, K, and 1. Lessons are reinforced using ESL methodologies. Science lessons follow NYS initiatives and beginning in September 2009 the FOSS Science Curriculum will be used in all classes including ELLs. Social Studies lessons are also based on NYS standards, as well as the Core Knowledge Curriculum which the school has been implementing since September 2007.

3. How do you differentiate instruction for ELL subgroups?

a. Plan for SIFE Students

Currently, there are no SIFE students in our school. We are a Pre-kindergarten to Grade One school.

b. Plan for ELLs in U.S. schools less than three years (newcomers)

As an Early Childhood Center with Grades Pre-K to Grade One, P.S. 51Q ELL students have all attended US schools for less than three years. ELLs in Kindergarten are provided the mandated instructional time, with a push in ESL teacher, as prescribed under CR Part 154. For 2009-2010 first grade will have a self contained ESL class where the students will receive the mandated instructional hours with their certified ESL teacher. The reading teacher will be pushing in for extra periods into the ESL classroom. First grade students do participate in an ESL extended day program one hour two days a week. The ESL afterschool program uses the LeapTrack System.

c. Plan for long-term ELLs identified as having special needs

Since we are an Early Childhood Center, our students leave P.S. 51Q after Grade One and are promoted to a neighboring school. We have no long-term ELLs at P.S. 51Q.

d. Plan for ELLs identified as having special needs

Students with special needs participate with their peers in ESL instruction as mandated by their IEPs. Their instruction is modified, as needed, depending on their abilities. ELL students in First Grade with special needs are included in the extended day program. The program is designed to provide varied and intensive instruction in reading and mathematics. For 2009-2010 the ELL students with special needs will push into the self contained ESL classroom with their paraprofessionals for their mandated instructional time.

4. Describe your plan for continuing transitional support for students reaching proficiency on the NYSESLAT.

Since we are an Early Childhood Center, most of our ELL students do not reach proficiency until the end of first grade. We articulate with the receiving school where they will attend second grade. If however, we do have children reaching proficiency, their teachers are trained in ESL methodologies and strategies for continued support. Classrooms teachers would collaborate with the ESL teachers to acquire additional ways to promote continued achievement. In addition, students would be encouraged to attend our other extended day programs.

VII-Resources and Support

1. What instructional materials are used to support ELLs (include content area as well as language materials)?

A variety of instructional materials are used to support the learning of ELLs. In the small group push-in class, ELLIS software program, Foundations, as well as trade books, fiction and non-fiction books are used for the instruction of Balanced Literacy. The Mondo "Let's Talk About It" program is used in all classrooms to develop oral language. For 2008-2009 the ESL teacher used an additional program by Mondo called "Now I Get It". We will look into having the program in the self contained class for 2009-2010. Everyday Math is used to support our ELLs Mathematics needs. Big books and Core Knowledge materials are used for Science, Social Studies and Art. ELLs students for the most part use the same materials as their classmates. In our after school program the Leap Track program is used to support ELLs in reading and math. This past year we purchased NYSESLAT prep books (Getting Ready for the NYSESLT and Beyond) and an ESL Library.

2. Describe the professional development plan for all ELL personnel at the school.

Our professional development plan as explained below covers the entire school year and provides more than the 10 hours required by Jose P. legislation.

The ESL teachers attend staff development along with their colleagues to increase their knowledge of ELA and Mathematics curriculum. In addition, they are expected to attend DOE or District 27 ESL professional development meetings. When applicable, they share their knowledge and turn-key information to their colleagues at meetings. The ESL teachers will train any new staff not already certified in ESL training. Several topics are covered including language acquisition approaches, strategies for developing thinking skills, and questioning techniques. At least once a year the staff participates in a book study group specifically geared toward ELLs. In addition PS 51Q provides its staff with professional development by outside NYC approved vendors such as Center for Integrated Teacher Instruction (CITE), Mondo Publishing, New York Hall of Science, and Math Solutions who are targeting our ELL students.

3. How is Native Language support delivered in each program model?

PS 51Q does not provide Native Language Arts support in the classes.

VIII. Program descriptions

P. S. 51Q has a Push in/Pull Out ESL program for Kindergarten and a self contained ESL class for Grade One students. The program provides for intensive English language instruction for ELL students. Our goal is to assist students to meet New York State Standards. ELLs are actively engaged in standards-based work whether in a self contained ESL classroom or with the ESL push in teacher.

Grouping is based primarily on ability levels: beginner, intermediate and advanced. The language of instruction is English. Our target students speak the following languages: Punjabi, Spanish, Russian, Urdu, Bengali, Arabic, Hebrew, and Chechen. Students are taught core content using ELL methodologies.

Parent/community involvement is an essential part of our ESL program. An orientation meeting is held at the beginning of the school year, as well as on-going workshops during the school year. Parents have an opportunity to learn more about the program and to gain knowledge about how to support their children at home. PS 51Q seeks to involve parents in the school by inviting them to family day trips at least four Saturdays during the school year, monthly workshops, and any PTA run activities. Additionally, the Parent Coordinator offers an ESL class once a week for parents in the morning.

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)

Kindergarten and Grade 1

Number of Students to be Served:

LEP 49

Non-LEP 0

Number of Teachers 2
Other Staff (Specify) N/A

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.

All children are identified as ELL students through their home language survey and LAB-R results. The ESL teacher administers the LAB-R to each new student. The ESL teacher administers the NYSESLAT to all ELL students in the spring. PS 51Q became part of the Knowledge Network in July 2007. As such, PS 51Q is implementing the Core Knowledge Foundation program. All students in the school from PreK to Grade 1, including ELLs, participate in Core Knowledge. For the 2009-2010 school year P.S. 51 will be using a push in ESL program in Kindergarten and self contained class in First Grade. The program will provide for intensive English language instruction for ELL students in their classrooms. Our goal is to assist students to meet New York State Standards. The teacher will work in the classrooms with small groups of students. The language of instruction is English. Our target students speak the following languages: Punjabi, Spanish, Russian, Arabic, Bengali, Urdu and Chinese. Instruction will be improved for ELLs by aligning all programs for ELLs with the comprehensive core curriculum in mathematics and literacy along with the Core Knowledge curriculum. Core content areas are taught using ELL methodologies that allow for the acquisition of academic materials. ELLIS (English Language Learning Instructional System) for Kids, a technology-based ESL software program that combines basic vocabulary with beginning reading instruction to promote proficiency in literacy skills, was purchased for all the classrooms. In March 2008, the school decided to also add the following resources to instruct ELLs in Kindergarten and Grade 1; Now I Get It! and Let's Talk About It! (amended 3/10/08). For 2009-2010 we will have two full-time licensed ESL teachers. In addition, all teachers will use the Let's Talk About It program by Mondo, which encourages the development of oral language through pictures. For the 2009-2010 school year we will be purchasing a software program from Imagine Learning for our ELL students to increase their language skills through the use of phonics and vocabulary instruction. In addition our ELL students will be involved in the hands on discovery of science through the Hall of Science Outreach Lessons. The ESL teachers will also be using review books purchased to help our young students understand test-taking skills for the NYSESLAT called Getting Ready for the NYSESLAT.

Our after school Title III program will provide small group instruction for 10-15 Grade One ELL students. The after school program will be 2 days a week, Tuesdays and Wednesdays from 3:15-4:15 pm for 1 hour per session. The duration of the program will be from October 2009 to May 2010. Title III funds for ELL enrichment/supplementary activities will facilitate additional instructional time through the LeapTrack System which is a computer program that allows the teacher to individualize and assess each child's instruction and progress on an ongoing basis throughout the school year. LeapTrack addresses both reading and math needs. The instructors will differentiate instruction based on results from Leap Track assessments. Partner learning will be encouraged as well. The teacher will also be using a new software program from Imagine Learning which individualizes lessons for every student based on his/her needs. Title III will purchase the initial licenses and 10 additional licenses for the Imagine Learning software program and Instructional Supplies to support the After School Program Chart tablets. In order to further support our English as a Second Language (ESL) class, a parent ELL class is held on Thursday morning from 9-10 am. The computer program Rosetta Stone is used and the course is facilitated by our parent coordinator. The program runs from October 2009 through May 2010.

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.

The ESL teacher will provide training to all teachers and paraprofessionals throughout the year on an ongoing basis and as necessary. The staff was given a Saturday training in May 2008 in order to be ready for the implementation of the Mondo Publishing program Let's Talk About It. We disaggregate our data for our ELL students and use that data to inform professional development and instruction on an ongoing basis. Other ongoing professional development includes the use of technology-based programs for our ELLS (ELLIS), as well as many opportunities for the ESL teacher to support classroom teachers and language professionals on the use of ESL techniques and/or programs. The new software program from Imagine Learning also supplies data for each student along with individualized lessons for every student. There will also be one day of professional development for implementation of the program. Our ESL teachers and classroom teachers with ELL students in their classes will participate in workshops from Schoolwide Inc., The Hall of Science, Math Solutions, CITE and Tequipment. The two ESL teachers will participate on a monthly basis in professional development workshops offered by the Knowledge Network LSO. The ESL teachers will also participate in the response to Intervention professional development and in the science curriculum professional development that are ongoing for the 2009-2010 school year. Eleven teachers with ELL students in their classrooms will be sent to workshops from Schoolwide Inc. In February 2010, 5 teachers will be attending a workshop titled Reading Like Writers: A Close Look at Author's Craft. The teachers will be shown how to help their students use a touchstone text to imagine new possibilities in their writing. In March 2010, 3 teachers will attend a workshop titled Poetry Unit of Study where the teachers will learn how to use poetry in the exploration of language and expression in order to reinforce important skills such as word choice, organization or shape and sentence fluency. In April 2010, 3 teachers will attend the workshop titled Revision where they will learn how help students to better understand the importance of revision and how authors incorporate it into their own writing in order to become better writers. The Literacy Coach will then work with these teachers after school for, 6 hours after the teachers attend the workshops, on writing lessons for their students in order to incorporate the ideas from the workshops. These lessons will be downloaded on to ARIS for the rest of the teachers to incorporate into their daily lesson plans. Title III funds will pay for per diem subs for teachers to attend these workshops and for the common planning sessions after school to create units of studies and lesson plans for the activities.

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

School: 051Q

BEDS Code: 342700010051

**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	\$8096.58	After School Program 1 teacher x 2 hours a week x 30 weeks x \$49.89 = \$2993.40 Professional Development 9 days of per diem subs for teachers attending Schoolwide Inc. Workshops 9x \$167.60 = \$1511.10 After school workshops 1 literacy coach x 6 hours x 49.89 = \$299.34 11 teachers x \$49.89 x 6 hours = \$3292.74
Purchased services - High quality staff and curriculum development contracts	\$2695.00	Professional Development from Schoolwide Inc. 11 x \$245=\$2695.00
Supplies and materials - Must be supplemental. - Additional curricula, instructional materials. - Must be clearly listed.	\$58.42	Instructional Supplies to support the After School Program Chart tablets \$58.42
Educational Software (Object Code 199)	\$4150.00	Imagine Learning first license= \$2650 Licenses for ELL students \$150 per license x 10=\$1500.00.
Travel	NA	NA
Other	NA	NA
TOTAL	\$15,000.00	

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

Requirement under Chancellor's Regulations – for all schools

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

Part A: Needs Assessment Findings

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

Needs Assessment Findings: We reviewed the RPOB report listing the specific languages and their frequency by family for our school. Our parent coordinator compiled information on our families by class and language. Home language Surveys are reviewed, ATS, and emergency cards are used to record and maintain information

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.

Findings: A large number of our families are non-English speaking and need support in their homes languages, particularly Punjabi, Urdu and Spanish. 37% of our parents have requested translators for meetings and workshops. These needs have been discussed at our SLT and PTA meetings in addition to ways in which to assist our school community.

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.

1-Parent letters explaining school policy, procedures, school calendar, upcoming educational workshops and events, regulations and school programs will be translated into other languages. A translated Bill of Rights and Responsibilities is available in both the principal's and parent coordinator's offices. The requests will be submitted to our DOE approved translation unit. In-house school staff will be used as needed.

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.

2- Oral interpretation services will be provided to parents at PTA meetings, workshops and during the parent-Teacher conferences. We provide live translations as well as over the phone translations. The services will be provided by outside contractors, in-house school staff and parent volunteers. The languages provided are Spanish, Punjabi, Hindi and Urdu.

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>.

3- Parents will be notified of their rights regarding translation and interpretation services at the start of the school year. A sign in the covered languages will be posted on the parent board in the lobby. All parents will be assisted to ensure access to the school's administrative offices. The translation unit will be used whenever necessary to ensure that non-English speaking parents receive important information from the school. Parents will also be informed about the DOE's website. The parent coordinator created a school handbook and it is given out to each new parent. The handbook explains the procedures for translations.

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:	101,232	13,895	115,127
2. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside for Parent Involvement:	1012		
3. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside to Improve Parent Involvement (ARRA Language):		140	
4. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified:	5062		
5. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect – HQ PD (ARRA Language):		150	
6. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Professional Development:	10123		
7. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect (Professional Development) (ARRA Language):		1389	

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

9. If the percentage of high quality teachers during 2008-2009 is less than 100% describe activities and strategies the school is implementing in order to insure that the school will have 100% high quality teachers by the end of the coming school year. We have 100% highly qualified staff.

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.

STATEMENT OF PARENT POLICY

P.S. 51Q is committed to developing and implementing a parent policy that fosters a partnership between the home, school and community. We have identified six key areas that contribute to a partnership that supports greater student achievement.

- The school will join parents in providing for the health and safety of our children, and in the maintenance of a home environment that encourages learning and positive behavior in schools. The school will provide training and information to help families understand their children's development and how to support the changes the children undergo.
- The school will reach out to provide parents with information about school programs and student progress. This will include phone calls, report cards, parent conferences, as well as new information on topics like school choice. Communication will be in a form that families find understandable and useful.
- Parents can make a significant contribution to the environment and functioning of our school. Our school will encourage parent volunteerism and make every effort to match the experience and talents of our parents to the needs of the school.
- With the guidance and support of the school, family members can assist their children with homework and other school related activities. Our school will encourage parents to join in learning activities at home (library cards, home reading corner, Parent Teacher Association (PTA) resource centers, book sales, following directions, reading recipes, etc.)
- The school will work to assist parents in having meaningful roles in the school decision-making process. The school will provide parents with training and information so they can make the most of this opportunity.

- The school will help parents gain access to support services by other agencies, such as health care, Supplemental Educational Services (SES), Academic Intervention Services (AIS), and childcare programs.
- Parents will be encouraged to attend PTA meetings that will be held at times that are convenient for parents. A rotational schedule of PTA meetings will be developed in coordination with the PTA executives and the school in order to accommodate parents that cannot attend evening meetings only. When necessary, translators will be available, so those parents will understand all of the proceedings at PTA meetings. Additional accommodations will be made for parents with disabilities so that they too can attend meetings.
- Through the efforts of the Parent Coordinator, the PTA President with appropriate support, an outreach will be made to parents of Students in Temporary Housing (STH) so that these families will be involved in all parent/school activities.
- Parents will be invited to attend culminating celebrations marking their child's success at the school.
- Student of the month and or/ art show celebrations marking their child's success and accomplishments will be held throughout the school year.
- School publications (i.e. pamphlets, newsletters, and letters to parents) will be used to apprise parents of important upcoming events including assessment dates, school events and open school.
- The school calendar will be disseminated each month to all parents.
- English as a Second Language (ESL) workshops will be held for parents.
- At an Open House, the parents of English Language Learners/Limited English Proficiency (ELL/LEP) students will receive an orientation session on state standards assessment program, school expectations and general program requirements for bilingual education and/or free standing ESL programs.

Parent workshops will focus on basic educational concerns, health care, and financial planning.

Professional Development:

Monthly professional development for parents provided by regional parent coordinators. This professional development will focus on school life for students, curriculum standards, assessments, and health and medical issues for families.

Professional Development is provided by professionals at monthly PTA meetings in areas of health, school curriculum, assessment and other matters pertaining to family social and educational issues.

Professional Development is provided for parents on the School Leadership Team (SLT) in order to assist team members in making informed decisions about school matters.

ELL Professional Development: Regional monthly ESL/Bilingual professional development will be made available to all parents of ELLs. Parents will be afforded opportunities to learn about NYS-ESL standards, instructional strategies and NYS and NYC assessments given to their children.

Students with disabilities/Professional Development: Regional monthly professional development will be made available to all parents of students with disabilities. Parents will be afforded opportunities to learn about NYS standards, instructional strategies and NYS and NYC assessments given to their children.

Annual evaluation of the Parent Involvement Policy

At the end of each year, the school's parent involvement policy will be evaluated for its usefulness in meeting the needs of all parents of students at the school. This evaluation will be coordinated with the executives of the PTA and the school's parent coordinator and administration.

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

School-Parent Compact

The school and parents working co-operatively to provide for the successful education of the children agree:

The School agrees:

- To provide high quality curriculum and instruction in literacy, mathematics, science, and social studies using the uniform curriculum and prototype, and by addressing the NYS Standards.
- PS 51 staff will be positive role models for students and will create a nurturing environment that addresses the needs of all students.
- To provide instruction and hands-on usage of technological resources, including computers, digital cameras, and audio-visual equipment.
- To implement the Chancellor's initiatives and to provide the opportunity for all students to read and write at or above grade level.
- To implement a K-1 homework policy that includes parents and is developmentally appropriate.
- To convene an annual meeting for Title I parents to inform them of the Title I programs and their rights; to provide timely information on school programs.

- To actively involve parents in planning, reviewing and improving Title I programs.
- To hold Parent-Teacher Conferences in November and March, as well as Meet the Teacher Night in September.
- To provide parents will frequent reports on their children's progress, including report cards at our scheduled conferences and in June, phone calls, and letters.
- To provide several opportunities for parents to volunteer and to participate in their child's class through Open School Week, trips, special events, Learning Leaders, Family Day, and workshops.
- To offer a flexible number of opportunities for parents to meet with teachers and other staff members (including our Parent Coordinator) either before, during or after school.

The Parent/Guardian agrees:

- To share responsibility for improved student achievement.
- To send their child/children to school appropriately dressed, prepared to learn and on time.
- To provide information to the school on the type of training and assistance they would like and/or need to help them to be more effective in assisting their child/children in the educational process.
- To support and share their children's interests in technology.
- To volunteer in their child's school and participate in school activities.
- To become involved in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the school/parent involvement policy.
- To work with their child/children on their schoolwork and to read 15 to 30 minutes per day with their child.
- To attend Parent-Teacher Conferences and curriculum meetings.
- To monitor their child/children's attendance, homework, and television watching; to sign the completed homework.
- To use community resources and cultural institutions to support learning.
- To participate in the school's PTA and School Leadership Team.

- To encourage and enhance their children’s reading and writing skills at home by providing home literacy activities (i.e. reading, writing, speaking and listening).
- To take advantage of the school’s programs, including our English as a Second Language Program for Parents.

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.

Needs Assessment:

PS 51Q continually gathers and analyzes data from all services available, including Quality Review Reports, teacher-created benchmark assessments, the Writing Reading Assessments Profile (WRAP), Everyday Mathematics Unit tests (Grade One), etc. and for the 2008-2009 school year we piloted the Group Reading and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE) and Group Mathematics and Diagnostic Evaluation (GMADE). We also started longitudinally tracking the students who entered our own Pre-kindergarten classes in the fall of 2007. Such analyses conducted during faculty meetings, grade conferences, and data inquiry team meetings provide relevant and timely information about our trends. For the 2009-2010 school year we will be adding performance tasks to our assessments in all subject areas.

Of the 96 Kindergarten children assessed using the WRAP in the first Benchmark taken in the fall of 2008, 100% met the benchmark of Below Level A. Our first benchmark results on the Kindergarten were on par with the previous year: 100% of students met the benchmark scoring at least Below level A.

Of the 101 First Grade children assessed using the WRAP in the fall of 2008 70% met the benchmark level of “C” as measured by Fountas and Pinnell. By the second benchmark given in the winter of 2009 67% were reading at level “F”, and by the spring of 2008 75.65% had reached the benchmark goal of level “I”. In the fall of 2008 56.9% of the First Grade were writing at level 3. By the winter of 2009 70.8% were writing on level 3 and by May 2008 85.6% were writing on level 3. By June 2008 65.8% of the First Grade were writing on level 3 in 2 out of 3 benchmark assessments. This year, the first grade students scored 70% at level C which is a significant improvement over the previous year’s first benchmark. Our disaggregated data for the first grade’s benchmark on the WRAP also is consistent with this improvement. For instance, males went from a 53.1% meeting the benchmark in fall 2007 to 78.6% in fall 2008 females went from 70% to 69%. Special Education students went from 27.2% to 60%; and ELLs went from 9.1% meeting the benchmark to 23.4%.

The GRADE and GMADE use the Growth Scale Value (GSV) to measure students’ reading and math progress over time. It is also used to compare students’ reading and math abilities to a reference group of students in the same grade. As part of the NYCDOE’s pilot program, our

students took the GRADE and GMADE in the Fall of 2008 and then again in January of 2009 for first grade and May 2009 for Kindergarten (both of which are referred to as Spring of 09). The GRADE national average GSV for Kindergarten in the Fall 2008 was 61, our students averaged a 58. For the Spring of 2009 the national average was 88 with our students scoring a 97. For First Grade the Fall national average was 106 our students scored a 97. In the Spring, the national average was 379 with our students scoring 364. For the GMADE our Kindergarten students averaged a 461 GSV with the national average being 462. The Spring of 2009 had the Kindergarten scoring a 470 GSV with the national average GSV being 472. The First Grade scored a 467 GSV in the Fall 2009 with the national average being 477 and 475 in the Spring of 2009 with national average being 477. Compared nationally our students were very close to or exceeded the national average GSV on both the GRADE and GMADE assessments.

2. Schoolwide reform strategies that:

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

The curriculum is structured in a way that allows students to work at the State's proficient and advanced levels of academic achievement. Assessment is ongoing, and instruction is tied to assessments. Based on results, teachers assign students in flexible groups which allows them to work at their own ability level. Moreover, the type of curriculum choices we have made over the past years, such as Core Knowledge, balanced literacy, curriculum mapping, Foss science programs, and a certified art teacher are all additions that ensure that all students meet the State's standards

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.

During the 37 1/2 minute program, students will receive AIS in small group settings in mathematics as well as in literacy. In literacy, the teachers will be using Response to Intervention with Foundations Double-Dose, while they will adapt the Everyday Mathematics curriculum to address the needs of at-risk students. Additionally, two teachers will be providing after school remediation twice a week using the Leap Track Assessment System for literacy and math. Additionally, members of the Data Inquiry Team will be providing additional services to identified students, and various teachers will be engaged in inquiry involving 2-3 students at a time.

- o Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.

PS 51Q practices the workshop model which allows instruction to be differentiated when students are in their small groups. In the balanced literacy model, students are able to read independently at their just-right level, and they meet with teachers in groups of six for their guided reading lesson. This allows students who are high-achievers to continue growing at their own pace. Students are grouped (flexible grouping) based on data, so that group needs, and individualized needs are met. The

science and social studies curriculum allows teachers to differentiate for their high-achievers via differentiated tasks and projects.

o Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.

This year, our ELL population is benefiting from the services of two licensed ELL teachers. Additionally, the ELL students also receive services from a licensed reading teacher who pushes into the first grade class. Materials such as software, Let's Talk About It, and Now I Get It! also serve to enhance instruction. The special education students also benefit from a reading teacher who pushes into their classroom, an IEP teacher who gives additional services in small group to students who lag far behind their classmates, and both groups of students participate in Response to Intervention.

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.

The following programs are in place to address the needs of the students: AIS during the day, AIS during 37 1/2 minute program four times a week, afterschool program from October to May twice a week, inclusion in Data Inquiry Team process, etc.

o Are consistent with and are designed to implement State and local improvement, if any.

All programs are consistent with NYS standards.

3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.

All staff at PS 51Q are deemed highly qualified.

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

We participate in the Response to Intervention program which allows a specialized consultant to provide professional development to groups of teachers, as well as to individual teachers in their classroom. This is ongoing from September to June. Additionally, teachers participate in relevant professional development offered by the Knowledge Network LSO, as well as offered by consultants

such as those from CITE and Math Solutions. In-house professional development includes regular data analysis professional development, book studies, and inter class visitations, and inter-school visitations.

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

Our teachers are highly qualified.

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

The parent coordinator conducts weekly ESL workshops, plans family trips that are educational in nature, and offers curriculum workshops to parents that are taught by the literacy/math coach. This year, the school implemented a monthly Math Friday so that parents can spend one math period in their child's classrooms, engaging in math games/instructional activities. This was done to improve the home-school connection as well as to help parents understand their child's curriculum.

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.

The school allows Head Start programs in the neighborhood to come in during the spring to visit the site, and to meet prospective teachers. Moreover, an orientation is held in the spring for parents as well.

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.

Regular data collection and analysis meetings are held. Teachers' opinions are gathered via grade conferences. Thus, teachers were instrumental in the decision to not use the GRADE, GMADE assessments this year, and to instead continue using the WRAP. Additionally, teachers devise benchmark assessments, and revise the curriculum maps.

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.

Ongoing assessment is a hallmark of our school, whether through running records, unit tests in math, performance tasks, or benchmark assessments.

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.

n/a

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.

We are not a Title I Targeted Assistance school.

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

3. Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically based research that strengthens the core academic program of the school and that:

- a. Give primary consideration to providing extended learning time, such as, extended school year, before/after school, and summer programs and opportunities;
- b. Help provide an accelerated, high –quality curriculum, including applied learning; and
- c. Minimize removing children from the regular classroom during regular school hours;

4. Coordinate with and support the regular educational program;

5. Provide instruction by highly qualified teachers;

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

7. Provide strategies to increase parental involvement; and

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

APPENDIX 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.

Q1A.1---

PS 51Q is a prekindergarten to grade one school. For the past two years, the faculty members have been meeting on a weekly basis to develop and revise curriculum maps and monthly interdisciplinary units of study. At the end of the year, the faculty reassesses the effectiveness of the curriculum map at a small group retreat, and continually seek to align it to the NYS standards for Grades K and One.

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?

Q1A.3---

Although PS 51Q uses a balanced literacy model, it is one which is richly supplemented. The ELA curriculum explicitly addresses the seven components mentioned in the study, via recently added programs such as Wilson Foundations, Mondo Publishing's oral language program Let's Talk About it, ELLIS for English Language Learners.

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

N/A

1B. Mathematics

Background

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

on March 15, 2005: The process strands (Problem Solving, Reasoning and Proof, Communication, Connections, and Representation) highlight ways of acquiring and using content knowledge. These process strands help to give meaning to mathematics and help students to see mathematics as a discipline rather than a set of isolated skills. Student engagement in mathematical content is accomplished through these process strands. Students will gain a better understanding of mathematics and have longer retention of mathematical knowledge as they solve problems, reason mathematically, prove mathematical relationships, participate in mathematical discourse, make mathematical connections, and model and represent mathematical ideas in a variety of ways. (University of the State of New York & New York State Education Department, 2005, p. 2) When curriculum guides lack precise reference to the indicators for the process strands, then explicit alignment of the curriculum to the process strands is left to the interpretation of the individual classroom teacher.

Specific Math Alignment Issues:

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

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

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

Q1B.1---

PS 51Q is a Prekindergarten to Grade One school. We will look more closely at the content of Everyday Mathematics process strands and address them through our curriculum map and the pacing calendar.

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?

Q1B.3---

The study says that Everyday Mathematics is aligned to the NYS content strands.

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.

Q1B.4---

We will investigate the process strands and address in our curriculum map and/or our interdisciplinary plan

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.

Q2A.1--

The school analyzes snapshots, formal and informal observations, walkthroughs, lesson plans, and Quality Review reports plans to assess the relevance of this finding.

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?

Q2A.3--

Teachers differentiated instruction based on ability, and via tasks, questioning. Lesson plans make note of differentiated needs.

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

N/A

2B – Mathematics Instruction

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

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

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

Q2B.1--

The school analyzes snapshots, formal and informal observations, walkthroughs, lesson plans, and Quality Review reports plans to assess the relevance of this finding.

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?

Q2B.3--

Teachers differentiated instruction based on ability, and via tasks, questioning. Lesson plans make note of differentiated needs.

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.

Q2B.4--N/A

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.

Q3.1---

Statistical reports will be used.

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?

Q3.3---

Teacher turnover has not been high.

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

N/A

KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT - ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

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

Q4.1---

Attendance at professional development, agendas for professional development are used.

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?

Q4.3--

The ESL teachers regularly attend professional development activities. Moreover, classroom teachers also attend professional development activities related to the ELL population. The ESL teacher for the past couple of years has been using a push-in model which allows her to interface more effectively with her collaborating classroom teachers. The ESL teachers are involved in an individualized professional development plan based on the California Teaching Standards.

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

N/A

KEY FINDING 5: DATA USE AND MONITORING - ELL INSTRUCTION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

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

Q5.1---

Disaggregated scores specifically addressing the ELLs (as well as other groups) are disseminated to the whole school and addressed at faculty conferences and grade conferences. The Data Inquiry Team has also focused on the ELL population since the inception of this team at PS 51Q.

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?

Q5.3---
The Data Inquiry Team's binder attests to the work done with our ELL population and to the way they disseminated information to the rest of the faculty.

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

N/A

KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT - SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

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

Q6.1---
The school reviewed its snapshots, walkthroughs, formal and informal observations, agendas from various professional development activities.

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?

Q6.3---
The school based support team meets with the classroom teachers to make recommendations at IEP meetings. All staff who directly teach our special education students receive a copy of the students' IEPs. A list of staff members who are authorized to look at documents is generated, and the location of the relevant documents is disseminated.

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

N/A

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

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

Q7.1---
As a Prekindergarten to Grade One school, PS 51Q does not administer standardized testing. IEPs are reviewed to ensure that we are following accommodations and or modifications, such as language paraprofessionals. Because we are an early childhood school, in general, students who come to us with an IEP do not have a behavioral plan on their IEPs. However, if that is needed as per team consensus, behavioral plans have been generated for those students.

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?

Q7.3---

The evidence is in the IEPs.

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

N/A

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

At the present time, we have one student who is in Temporary Housing.

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

Outreach by the social worker.

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).

We have one student in temporary housing.

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

Social worker will reach out to the family.

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.

N/A