



**HARRY EICHLER**

**2009-10  
SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN  
(CEP)**

**SCHOOL: 27Q056**  
**ADDRESS: 86-10 114 STREET, RICHMOND HILL, NY 11418**  
**TELEPHONE: (718) 441-4448**  
**FAX: (718) 805-1538**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

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

**SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE ..... 3**

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

**SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE..... 5**

**Part A. Narrative Description ..... 5**

**Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot .....Error! Bookmark not defined.**

**SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT ..... 9**

**SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS ..... 13**

**SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN ..... 14**

**REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010..... 21**

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

**APPENDIX 2: PROGRAM DELIVERY FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELLs)..... 25**

**APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION ..... 17**

**APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS ..... 18**

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

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

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

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

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

**SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE**

SCHOOL NUMBER: 56Q SCHOOL NAME: Harry Eichler

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 86-10 114 Street, Richmond Hill, NY 11418

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: (718) 441-4448 FAX: (718) 805-1538

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Ann Leiter EMAIL ADDRESS: [aleiter@schools.nyc.gov](mailto:aleiter@schools.nyc.gov)

**POSITION/TITLE**

**PRINT/TYPE NAME**

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON: Ann Leiter

PRINCIPAL: Ann Leiter

UFT CHAPTER LEADER: Camille Rodecker

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT: Margaret Kearns-Stanley

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE:  
*(Required for high schools)* \_\_\_\_\_

**DISTRICT AND SCHOOL SUPPORT ORGANIZATION (SSO) INFORMATION**

DISTRICT: 27 SSO NAME: Empowerment School Network #1

SSO NETWORK LEADER: Sandra Litrico

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/Administration/ChancellorsRegulations/default.htm>). *Note: If for any reason an SLT member does not wish to sign this plan, he/she may attach a written explanation in lieu of his/her signature.*

Name	Position and Constituent Group Represented	Signature
Ann Leiter	*Principal or Designee	
Camille Rodecker	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Margaret Kearns-Stanley	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
Benjamin Camacho	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
	Student Representative <i>(optional for elementary and middle schools; a minimum of two members required for high schools)</i>	
	CBO Representative, if applicable	
Maria Lamberti	Assistant Principal	
Anna Forte	Teacher	
Stefanie Podber	Teacher	
Sandra Naranjo	Parent	
Sonia Sukdeo	Parent	
Miriam Levy	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.

---

PS 56 has a rich cultural diversity. We are in our fourth year as an Empowered School. We have a unique structure as a grades 2-5 school; a gifted and talented class in grades 3, 4 and 5; an ESL push-in class in each grade, and Collaborative Team Teaching classes in grades 2, 3 and 4, as well as a grade 3/4 bridge self-contained 12:1 class. We have Smartboards in 100% of our classrooms. The staff has taken on the responsibility of weekly grade planning sessions. There is a high level of parent involvement at parent evening curriculum workshops in literacy, math, science, and social studies, as well as non-academic events including Family Games Night, Card Night, Mom & Me Night and Dad & Me Night. Staff pursues outside funding from Donors Choose, NY State Arts Grant, NY State Legislative Grant, and other independently funded special projects.

**SECTION III – Cont'd**

**CEP Section III: School Profile  
Part B: School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot (Version 2010-1B - April 2010)**

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT											
<b>School Name:</b>	P.S. 056 Harry Eichler										
<b>District:</b>	27	<b>DBN:</b>	27Q056	<b>School BEDS Code:</b>	342700010056						
DEMOGRAPHICS											
<b>Grades Served:</b>	Pre-K		3	√	7		11				
	K		4	√	8		12				
	1		5	√	9		Ungraded	√			
	2	√	6		10						
<b>Enrollment</b>				<b>Attendance - % of days students attended:</b>							
<i>(As of October 31)</i>	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	<i>(As of June 30)</i>			2007-08	2008-09	2009-10		
Pre-K	0	0	0				95.2	96.0	TBD		
Kindergarten	0	0	0								
Grade 1	0	0	0	<b>Student Stability - % of Enrollment:</b>							
Grade 2	111	112	102	<i>(As of June 30)</i>			2007-08	2008-09	2009-10		
Grade 3	117	114	122				94.5	90.4	TBD		
Grade 4	114	109	116								
Grade 5	128	117	111	<b>Poverty Rate - % of Enrollment:</b>							
Grade 6	0	0	0	<i>(As of October 31)</i>			2007-08	2008-09	2009-10		
Grade 7	0	0	0				66.7	63.3	77.3		
Grade 8	0	0	0								
Grade 9	0	0	0	<b>Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:</b>							
Grade 10	0	0	0	<i>(As of June 30)</i>			2007-08	2008-09	2009-10		
Grade 11	0	0	0				6	12	TBD		
Grade 12	0	0	0								
Ungraded	1	0	1	<b>Recent Immigrants - Total Number:</b>							
Total	471	452	452	<i>(As of October 31)</i>			2007-08	2008-09	2009-10		
									13	9	12
<b>Special Education Enrollment:</b>				<b>Suspensions (OSYD Reporting) - Total Number:</b>							
<i>(As of October 31)</i>	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	<i>(As of June 30)</i>			2007-08	2008-09	2009-10		
# in Self-Contained Classes	12	2	8	Principal Suspensions			1	9	TBD		
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	16	26	29	Superintendent Suspensions			3	1	TBD		
Number all others	22	20	20								
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>				<b>Special High School Programs - Total Number:</b>							
						<i>(As of October 31)</i>			2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
						CTE Program Participants			0	0	0
						Early College HS Program Participants			0	0	0
<b>English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:</b>				<b>Number of Staff - Includes all full-time staff:</b>							
<i>(As of October 31)</i>	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	<i>(As of October 31)</i>			2007-08	2008-09	2009-10		
# in Transitional Bilingual Classes	0	0	0								
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0	Number of Teachers			32	37	TBD		
# receiving ESL services only	75	66	60								

CEP Section III: School Profile

Part B: School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot (Version 2010-1B - April 2010)

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT							
# ELLs with IEPs	6	0	17	Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	7	8	TBD
These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.				Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	1	1	TBD
<b>Overage Students</b> (# entering students overage for grade)				<b>Teacher Qualifications:</b>			
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	0	0	TBD	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100.0	100.0	TBD
				% more than 2 years teaching in this school	68.8	64.9	TBD
				% more than 5 years teaching anywhere	56.3	54.1	TBD
<b>Ethnicity and Gender - % of Enrollment:</b>				% Masters Degree or higher			
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	% core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED	84.0	86.0	TBD
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.6	1.1	0.7		88.6	100.0	TBD
Black or African American	9.6	9.7	8.0				
Hispanic or Latino	34.8	30.8	31.9				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	45.9	47.8	47.1				
White	9.1	10.4	11.7				
<b>Male</b>	51.6	50.0	51.1				
<b>Female</b>	48.4	50.0	48.9				
2009-10 TITLE I STATUS							
√	Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP)						
	Title I Targeted Assistance						
	Non-Title I						
Years the School Received Title I Part A Funding:	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10			
	√	√	√	√			
NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY							
<b>SURR School (Yes/No)</b>	If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:						
<b>Overall NCLB/Diferentiated Accountability Status (2009-10) Based on 2008-09 Performance:</b>							
	<b>Phase</b>			<b>Category</b>			
	In Good Standing (IGS)	√	Basic	Focused	Comprehensive		
	Improvement Year 1						
	Improvement Year 2						
	Corrective Action (CA) – Year 1						
	Corrective Action (CA) – Year 2						
	Restructuring Year 1						
	Restructuring Year 2						
	Restructuring Advanced						

CEP Section III: School Profile

Part B: School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot (Version 2010-1B - April 2010)

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT							
<b>Individual Subject/Area AYP Outcomes:</b>							
<b>Elementary/Middle Level</b>				<b>Secondary Level</b>			
ELA:	√			ELA:			
Math:	√			Math:			
Science:	√			Graduation Rate:			
<b>This school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for each accountability measure:</b>							
	<b>Elementary/Middle Level</b>			<b>Secondary Level</b>			
<b>Student Groups</b>	ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad Rate**	Progress Target
<b>All Students</b>	√	√	√				
<b>Ethnicity</b>							
American Indian or Alaska Native	-	-					
Black or African American	√	√	-				
Hispanic or Latino	√	√					
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	√	√					
White	√	√	-				
Multiracial							
<b>Students with Disabilities</b>							
Students with Disabilities	√	√	-				
Limited English Proficient	√	√	-				
Economically Disadvantaged	√	√					
<b>Student groups making AYP in each subject</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>				
<b>CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY</b>							
<b>Progress Report Results – 2008-09</b>				<b>Quality Review Results – 2008-09</b>			
<b>Overall Letter Grade:</b>	A			<b>Overall Evaluation:</b>	NR		
<b>Overall Score:</b>	103.9			<b>Quality Statement Scores:</b>			
<b>Category Scores:</b>				Quality Statement 1: Gather Data			
School Environment:	11.6			Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals			
<i>(Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)</i>				Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals			
School Performance:	22.5			Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals			
<i>(Comprises 25% of the Overall Score)</i>				Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise			
Student Progress:	60						
<i>(Comprises 60% of the Overall Score)</i>							
Additional Credit:	9.8						
<b>KEY: AYP STATUS</b>				<b>KEY: QUALITY REVIEW SCORE</b>			
√ = Made AYP				Δ = Underdeveloped			
√ <sup>SH</sup> = Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target				▶ = Underdeveloped with Proficient Features			
X = Did Not Make AYP				√ = Proficient			
– = Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status				W = Well Developed			
<b>KEY: PROGRESS REPORT DATA</b>				◊ = Outstanding			
NR = Data Not Reported				NR = No Review Required			
* = For Progress Report Attendance Rate(s) - If more than one attendance rate given, it is displayed as K-8/9-12.							
Note: Progress Report grades are not yet available for District 75 schools; NCLB/SED accountability reports are not available for District 75 schools.							
** <a href="http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/nyc/APA/Memos/Graduation_rate_memo.pdf">http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/nyc/APA/Memos/Graduation_rate_memo.pdf</a>							

## 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?
- 

The School Leadership Team and the CEP subcommittee reviewed the following documents: Progress Report, Item Analysis by grade, class and student results of the 2009 NYS Mathematics and ELA exams, EM Unit Assessments, Quality Review, and our Annual School Report Card.

In reviewing the Spring 2009 NYSESLAT, it was noted that in grade 5, 45% of students moved up at least one level. At the same time, 30% of students achieved an ADVANCED level in the Listening and Speaking, while also scoring Proficient in Reading and Writing. This result was discussed with the ESL teacher and the classroom teacher, as well as the administration and the School Leadership Team. In reviewing instructional focus, it was determined that test prep greatly supported student performance in the Reading and Writing component. In administering the Listening assessment, it was noted that students listen to a speaker read text via a cassette tape rather than listening to the familiarity of their teacher's voice, intonation, and pacing. This factor significantly impacted on student performance.

Thirty percent of students on the grade scored a proficient level on the exam, thereby testing out of the program.

In grade 3, of the 16 students who were tested for the NYSESLAT, 10 remained on the same performance level, 5 moved up at least one level, 1 scored proficient, and no students moved down a level.

In grade 4, of 23 students who were tested for the NYSESLAT, 11 remained on the same performance level, 12 moved up at least one level. No students moved down a level. Three students scored a proficient level. This grade as a whole performed the highest in student progress as compared to our other grades on the NYSESLAT. .

In reviewing the NYSESLAT Combined Modality Report of August 2009, we noticed the following performance trends for our current third, fourth and fifth grade ELL students. The overall finding indicated that ELL students scored in the Proficient range in Reading and Writing while also scoring in the Advanced range in Reading and Writing. Further analysis of specific grade level data indicated that out of 18 grade 3 students tested, when compared to results from the 2008 to 2009 NYSESLAT, 13 students made no progress in Listening and Speaking, while 9 students failed to make progress in Reading and Writing. When comparing test results for our 20 fourth grade youngsters 2008 to 2009 SNSESLAT, we found that 18 students made no progress in Listening and Speaking while only 12

failed to make progress in the Reading and Writing component of the test. Data gathered for 10 ELL students tested across both the 2008 and 2009 testing periods remained consistent with previous findings, 7 youngsters made no progress in Listening and Speaking while 6 made no progress in Reading and Writing. Results were discussed and the pattern noticed is that ELL students tend to need instructional support in the area of Listening and Speaking.

Our school-wide performance levels on the 2009 ELA exam were:

Grade 3: 74%

Grade 4: 87%

Grade 5: 84%

School-wide average for Level 3 and 4 performance is 81.4%

In reviewing the grade 3 ELA Spring 2009 exam results, it is noted that as a grade students performed an average of 54% on questions related to: 4.R.CS.2.9, *use specific evidence from stories to identify themes, describe characters, their action and their motivations relate a sequence of events*. Of the four questions, performance ranged from 43% to 50% to 60% to 71%; therefore, anywhere from half to a quarter of the students on the grade need support in this area.

In the area of "Identify a main idea and supporting details in informational texts, students did very well as a grade, scoring an average of 83% on all 3 tested questions.

On the 3 questions in "Collecting and interpreting data facts and ideas from unfamiliar text," the grade performed well in all classes except the ESL class where 67% of students were not able to answer this type of question correctly. A question was raised as to the impact of vocabulary and direction words in comprehension and test performance.

Our 2008-2009 grade 3 ELA Spring exam Item Analysis results reveal "Standard 3.2 Evaluate the content by identifying important and unimportant details as an area of low performance. An analysis of the data conducted by the team, indicated that of the 107 third grade students taking the Spring 2009 ELA, 64 students were unable to respond correctly to question four. Of the 3 questions on the exam relating to this Standard, the grade performed 43%, 61%, and 76%. As a result, we have established this area of weakness as the basis for a year long exploration as our school-wide Inquiry Team focus.

In reviewing the grade 3 NYS ELA results for Spring 2009, it was noted that the average class score in the area of evaluating the content by identifying important and unimportant details was 60%. This is the weakest area of performance for grade 3.

All grade 3 classes performed well and received an average of 2 out of 2 in the use of note taking and graphic organizers to record and organize information and ideas recalled from stories read aloud.

In reviewing the Spring 2009 grade 5 ELA items analysis some trends were found. In looking at the Literacy Elements Standard (5.RCS2.6) the grade did well. The average score for the 6 questions tested was 90% correct. In this standard, students were asked to identify literacy elements such as setting, plot and character across different genres. It was also noted that on Day 2, 90% of the students in grade 5 were able to identify essential details for notetaking (5.L.CS.12). It was also noted that only 73% of grade 5 students mastered the standard to collect and interpret data, facts and ideas from multiple sources (5R.CS.1.3) correctly. This was verified by analyzing 4 different questions on the exam. In both short response questions (notetaking and evaluating ideas and details), grade 5 students achieved a 1.6 out of 2 points.

Our school-wide performance levels on the 2009 Math exam were:

Grade 3: 92%

Grade 4: 98%

**MAY 2009**

Grade 5: 95%

School-wide average for Level 3 and 4 performance is 96.4%

In reviewing the grade 3 Spring 2009 NYS Mathematics exam results, it is noted that the grade generally did well in defining and using mathematics terminology, with 98% of students correctly answering the question associated with standard 3.CG.VS.SH.1 (Question #4). Ninety seven percent of students correctly answered questions associated with the number sense properties of 0 and 1 in multiplication (Questions 1 and 2).

A trend is seen in Standard 3.C.N.O.P.O.S.1, using a variety of strategies to add and subtract 3-digit numbers. Seventy-seven percent of students correctly answered the multiplication question associated with this performance indicator and on average students received 1.4 points out of two total for the short answer question.

In reviewing the data from all students, it is noted that 32% of students did not answer question 4 correctly. This question relates to Standard 3.C.N.R.N.NS.4, understanding place value structure of the base ten number system. Sixty-five percent of the students in our ESL class did not answer this question correctly.

At our most recent Quality Review we received the following recommendation:

“Deepen the analysis of progress data to determine the long-term progress of individual students and groups during their time in the school.”

#### What are the most significant aids or barriers to the school’s continued improvement?

Aids to school improvement include:

- Morning Tutoring Program, 37.5 minutes of small group instruction (10 students:1 teacher) via recent UFT contract, is used as a proactive math opportunity to prepare foundation skills for math lessons, all grades.
- We offer an After School Test Prep Program for at-risk grade 3, 4 and 5 students in ELA, Math and NYSESLAT.
- Innovative instructional design by some grade 2, 3 and 5 teachers to establish a co-teaching approach to reading and writing, sharing the talents and creativity of the teachers.
- P.S. 56Q has established partnerships with Molloy College and Hofstra University to work with student teachers and observers at our school for their practicum. This will provide us with access to a pool of potential teachers for future P.S. 56Q faculty.
- Pilot 3-D Reading Assessment in grade 2 to monitor student progress across the school year.
- Instituted a rubric measuring “Active” student listening behavior in an effort to improve student engagement. A corresponding grade is included each semester on the report card.
- Monthly Curriculum Calendars (Literacy and Mathematics) maintain grade level instructional consistency. A School-Wide Curriculum Mapping Committee consisting of at least 2 teachers per grade was established to create more coherency in curriculum across the grades and aligned to State Standards.
- Numbered parent letter are sent home to ensure parents receive all school-distributed information.
- We have a growing use of technology as instructional tools including: videoconferencing, United Streaming, and Smartboards in every classroom. We provide ongoing in-house professional development to staff.

Barriers to school’s continuous improvement include:

- We are an elementary school without a library for the past 18 years. Due to previous overcrowding and current growing numbers of Special Education classes assigned to the school, we do not have the space to designate for a school library. This denies the children

vital access to books, resources, and computer equipment for on-line research. The local library's juvenile section is very limited and outdated. Most children do not have the financial or material resources at home to compensate for this need.

- Students enter P. S. 56Q in grade 2. Most attend P. S. 51Q for Pre-Kindergarten, Kindergarten, and grade 1. The two schools share the same geographic zone. P. S. 56Q is an Empowered School; P. S. 51 is in a different SSO. P. S. 51Q is part of the Core Curriculum School-Based Organization. There is a lack of continuity and long-term educational goals for the children between the Early Childhood P. S. 51Q and P. S. 56Q. We continue to search for a consistent, reliable and common assessment system for literacy and math between P. S. 51Q and P. S. 56Q in order to convey consistent information to parents regarding student ability and performance levels.
- As a 100 year old facility, we do not have a formal gymnasium. Students use the yard area for physical education classes when the weather permits. At other times, a small common indoor area is used. This space does not provide sufficient area for a full range of physical education activities. It prohibits full implementation of the administration of Fitness Gram activity and assessments year long. We have also had to reduce the size of our schoolyard to accommodate two transportable classrooms. Their location necessitates the traveling of classes in the rain and snow to enter the main building for lunch, assembly, computers, gym, music, all related services, etc.

## SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

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

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

---

The Annual Progress Report assesses student progress per one year's growth in reading and math. Fountas & Pinnell measures one year's growth in grade 2 and beyond by progressing 3 reading levels/letters. **GOAL #1: By June 2010, 85% of all students will move up a minimum of 3 reading levels using the Fountas & Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System four times a year (October, January, April, June) to monitor progress.**

Our 2009-2010 school-wide Inquiry Team has identified Standard 3 related to evaluating the difference between important and unimportant information as our targeted area in need of improvement for grade 4. **GOAL #2: By June 2010, eight of the fifteen targeted grade 4 Level II students will achieve a Level III score on the 2010 NY State ELA Exam.**

After conducting our needs assessment, the School Leadership Team found that the ELL student group has under performed all other subgroups for the past three years. As a result, we have made progress for our ELL subgroup a priority goal for the 2009-2010 school year. **GOAL #3: By June 2010, a minimum of a 20% of students will increase in the Listening and Speaking component of the Spring 2010 NYSESLAT compared to the Spring 2009 NYSESLAT Exam results.**

**SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN**

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

**Subject/Area (where relevant):** \_\_\_\_\_ **GOAL #1:** \_\_\_\_\_

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>By June 2010, 85% of all students will move up a minimum of 3 reading levels using the Fountas &amp; Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System four times a year (October, January, April, June) to monitor progress.</p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> <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>The Fountas &amp; Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System will record students' instructional reading levels both over the course of the current school year and from grade 2-5 while at PS 56. A year's progress is being measured by moving up at least 3 reading levels, as per Fountas &amp; Pinnell. Our needs analysis shows fluctuations in students' reading performance from grade to grade. Therefore, we will monitor progress for consistency over time.</p> <p>All students will be assessed in reading using the Fountas &amp; Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System in October, January, April and June. Longitude Record of Reading Progress folders will be used to record each student's guided reading levels over the course of the school year as well as from year to year. Children will be tested using Fountas &amp; Pinnell Running Record Recording Forms for fluency, oral reading and comprehension. Grade 2 will utilize the DIBELS system also based on a running record system.</p> <p>In addition, students and teachers will set individual reading goals for each trimester. Information will be recorded on Pink Literacy Progress Sheets. Teachers will evaluate progress and students will self-assess their achievement of their goals at the end of each period. Parents will receive copies of the Pink Literacy Progress Sheets three times a year to keep them informed of student progress. (December, March, June)</p> <p><u>The Comprehension Toolkit</u> by S. Harvey and A. Goudvis provides strategies through non-fiction and realistic fiction text to develop higher order thinking skills. Children will be taught to analyze their thinking to synthesis the information. This approach also provides opportunities for children to engage in meaningful conversations and Accountable Talk.</p> <p>We will use the Scholastic Guided Reading Program, a multi-level and multi-genre program to support our guided reading component. Classes will also use the Reading A-Z website to access leveled materials and lesson plans. Classes will also use the Lessons in Literacy to support skills instruction in reading. Testing Fundamentals in grades 4 and 5 support the</p>

	<p>intergration of strategy instruction with literature instruction. We will utilize the leveled letter system developed by Fountas &amp; Pinnell to identify students' reading levels through the Benchmark System. We will use the workshop model for Balanced Literacy where instruction is facilitated using the strategies of flexible grouping. In our homogeneous classes, students with the greatest needs receive additional AIS supports in the form of a push-in staff member during the Guided Reading period. This will reduce the student-teacher ratio. Within these small groups, children will receive direct targeted instruction in reading skills and comprehension strategies according to individual student needs. During Guided Reading teacher conference 1:1 with students, providing direct feedback which will move student learning forward. This structure supports individual student goals.</p> <p>The School-Wide Enrichment Model Reading Framework (SEM-R), encourages children to monitor their own comprehension through self-regulation while reading independently. During this time, teachers will conduct 1:1 conferences to develop higher order thinking skills through strategy-embedded questions. The goal is to increase reading stamina, critical thinking and fluency. Identified ELL students will meet with a licensed ESL teacher during Guided Reading instruction. The teacher will embed ESL methodology according to student ESL levels, beginning, intermediate, or advanced. Flexible grouping include ELL, General Education and Special Education students. All staff support literacy instruction in their subject-specific programs. Classroom teachers will plan monthly units of study around the curriculum calendar. All students will be assessed in writing using unit rubrics. Teachers will evaluate students' performance using genre specific rubrics. Students will set individual goals for each unit of study and self-evaluate based on the rubric. Information will be recorded and evaluated on the Yellow Writing Progress Sheets and maintained over the course of the school year.</p>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b>  <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>All classrooms have classroom libraries. Scholastic leveled Guided Reading box sets are available in levels from E through Z in fiction, non-fiction and content areas to all staff in our Resource Center, Room 108. Every classroom and cluster teacher has a Smartboard, which supports and enhances teaching and learning. All classrooms have a minimum of 4 computers for students to access during independent work time. All classes will have access to the Renzulli Learning. Com, which support individual instruction based on student generated profiles.</p> <p>Staff members will receive professional development in integrating Smartboard Technology in classrooms, Simple Solutions, Renzulli Learning, mClass, DIBELS, ESL methodology training, intervisitations, attendance at workshops and conferences, professional literature, grade level study groups, and visits to other school sites. We will host student teachers from Hofstra and Molloy College, which will further reduces the student-teacher ratio. In addition, we have prioritized a reduced student-ratio in supporting standards by reducing class size in grades 2, 4 and 5, utilizing our Contract for Excellence funding. AIS staff members push-in during Guided Reading to support student learning.</p>

**Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment**

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

Children are administered the ACUIITY two times a year in addition to the predictive assessment in November. Data will be reviewed by administrators and grade level teachers to drive instruction. The Study Island assessment identifies individual student strengths and weaknesses in reading based on standards. Students will get individual feedback and use that to set individual goals for improvement. All children are expected to progress 3 reading levels in a school year.

**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):** GOAL #2

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2010, eight of the fifteen targeted grade 4 Level II students will achieve a Level III score on the 2010 NY State ELA Exam.</p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>Through targeted instruction based on NYS ELA item analysis and data, each teacher in grade 4 will target 3 students to monitor progress in the area of “Evaluating the contents by identifying important and unimportant details” over the course of the school year. Five grade 4 teachers, two grade 3 teachers and two administrators will form an Inquiry Team to review, analyze, plan, structure, implement, and assess a variety of skills, strategies, activities and instructional plans to develop each students’ ability in the targeted area.</p> <p>The team members collaboratively brainstormed multiple variables to examine in the pursuit of this exploration. They include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• wording of test questions</li> <li>• time per passage</li> <li>• Test Sophistication</li> <li>• What do you do when you don’t understand?</li> <li>• a test of multiple choice along verses taking a test of both multiple choice and written response, genre variety: non-fiction, poetry, procedural, narrative</li> <li>• number of questions per passage</li> <li>• vocabulary</li> <li>• all children completed the test</li> <li>• survey the children as to their experience taking a formal exam right after a practice exam</li> <li>• give feedback to children regarding the actual time they spend productively working on the test compared to the full time allotted for the exam</li> <li>• teacher to model how to check work</li> <li>• How is the grade 4 test different from the grade 3 test?</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of a magnet to indicate beginning, middle and end of a task time period</li> <li>• Student set up and organization of desk for test taking and daily work</li> <li>• Observe how children test. What do they do?</li> <li>• Student self-monitoring</li> <li>• Sustainability and reading stamina</li> <li>• Writing organization skills/structure</li> <li>• Utilizing learning styles during practice tests as well</li> <li>• Vary genre, level, passage length for assessment of Inquiry Team goals</li> <li>• What if scenarios (...my pencil breaks, I run out of time, I can't read...)</li> </ul> <p>Variables will be prioritized.</p> <p>The team will meet bi-monthly or as needed to select a concept or skill, develop a plan of instruction, student implementation and assessment. Teachers will maintain notes on observations, successes, concerns and outcomes. Data will be shared and discussed at the subsequent team meeting. The professional dialogue among staff regarding student work is a major factor in the staff's understanding of student thinking and impact on instructional procedure.</p>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b>  <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>The greatest resource in this project is the level of staff contributions to shared discussions throughout the year. The team consists of five grade 4 teachers including a Data Specialist, two grade 3 teachers and 2 administrators.</p> <p>The active involvement of all classes on the grade enables curriculum consistency across the grade. Teachers are paid per session from the Inquiry Team allocation.</p> <p>Material Resources also include the item analysis of the grade 4 NYS ELA exam, classroom Smartboards, and previous NYS ELA exam questions.</p> <p>The team will meet bi-monthly beginning on October 1, 2009 or as needed. They will meet on Thursday afternoons, beginning at 3:15 PM.</p>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b>  <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Multiple assessments will be used over the course of the project. The skill of "Evaluating the contents by identifying important and unimportant details" will be specifically assessed through questions on former grade 4 NYS ELA exams for Standard 3.2, relating to that skill. In addition select pre-skills will be measured as determined by the team in planning meetings. These will include internalizing and utilizing specific blurbs of time, questions comprehension, and reading and test taking stamina.</p> <p>Assessments using previous state exams for Standard 3.2 will be administered 3 times a year to compare baseline (November 2009), midyear (March 2010) and final (May 2010) level of performance.</p> <p>Interim assessment results will be compared to 2010 grade 4 NYS ELA exam performance for Standard 3.2. It is projected that a minimum of 8 out of 15 targeted students will show an increased performance on the grade 4 exam as compared to the grade 3 exam performance.</p>

## SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

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

**Subject/Area (where relevant):** GOAL #3:

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>By June 2010, a minimum of a 20% of students will increase in the Listening and Speaking component of the Spring 2010 NYSESLAT compared to the Spring 2009 NYSESLAT Exam results.</p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> <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>Support will be provided for all ELL students in grades 2-5 in a variety of learning opportunities.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mandated instruction for ELL students will focus on increasing time and expectations for students to engage in verbal exchanges between teacher and students as well as between student to student in partner work, small group discussions, and oral presentation. This will be consistent whether ESL teacher or classroom teacher.</li> <li>2. All ESL classes will establish a Listening Center, which will be utilized as a center during Independent Reading periods from October to June over the course of the school year.</li> <li>3. ELL students will have the opportunity to take home books on tape/CD to listen to the reading of authentic literature being modeled.</li> <li>4. A 10-week After School Program will be scheduled from February to May to support development of NYSESLAT test sophistication skills for students in grades 2, 3, 4 and 5. There will be one class per grade. This will address the refinement of skills prior to the administration of the 2010 NYSESLAT exam.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b> <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Materials for the Listening Center will include Read Naturally .8 and 1.3 texts and CDs and site licenses, as well as appropriate trade books on comparable levels on CDs. A CD/tape player will be provided for each ESL classroom 2-106, 3-107, 4-202 and 5-104. Children will be provided with tape/CD players to take home for additional time on task beyond the school day. These materials will be used after school as well as in daily classrooms.</p> <p>The After School Program will provide text sophistication materials through “Getting Ready for English Language Proficiency Assessment.” Both teaching staff per session and material purchases will be funded through our Title III allocation.</p> <p>Professional development for ESL staff will be provided by Title I SWP allocation, which will be used for admission fees and substitute teacher per diem during staff attendance.</p>

	<p>Teaching staff for the After School Program will attend an After School Professional Development session to review, plan and align materials across the grades. This will take place on February 1, 2010 at 3:15 PM, funded by Title III allocation.</p>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b>  <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>ELL students in grade 3, 4 and 5 will take the ESL Periodic Assessments twice a year. Students will be assessed for Listening and Speaking skills based on an in-house assessment designed by the ESL teacher. It will be based on the rubric used for scoring the NYSESLAT assessment. This data will be used to monitor progress, language acquisition and comprehension. Children in the After School Program will have their performance on the 2010 NYSESLAT compared to their 2009 performance in each component; Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing. It is expected that a minimum of 20% of students will move up one level in the Listening/Speaking component of the exam.</p>

## **REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010**

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

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

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

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

**APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENT FOR ALL TITLE I SCHOOLS**

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

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

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

**APPENDIX 8: CONTRACTS FOR EXCELLENCE (C4E) SCHOOL-BASED EXPENDITURES FOR 2009-10 – SED REQUIREMENT FOR ALL C4E-FUNDED SCHOOLS (NOTE: APPENDIX 8 WILL NOT BE REQUIRED FOR THIS YEAR)**

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

**APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM**

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

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

Grade	ELA	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	At-risk Services: Guidance Counselor	At-risk Services: School Psychologist	At-risk Services: Social Worker	At-risk Health-related Services
	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS				
K	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	30	30	N/A	N/A	2	1	2	1
3	32	32	N/A	N/A	1	2	2	0
4	27	6	7	4	7	1	1	0
5	18	3	9	5	2	0	0	0
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

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

**Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services**

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	<b>Description:</b> Provide a brief description of <b>each</b> 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.).
<b>ELA:</b>	IEP teacher and AIS teachers in grades 2 to 5 will support students through the Glass Analysis, Schoolwide Enrichment Model Framework in Reading, Foundations, Read Naturally and reduced class size groups through push-in Guided Reading Support. Grade 2 has an average class size of 120. We used reduced class size as our primary AIS support. In addition an AIS teacher pushes in during Guided Reading. Classroom teachers also group children for targeted instruction.
<b>Mathematics:</b>	37.5 minutes Morning Tutoring provides targeted small group instruction on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday for students performing below grade level.
<b>Science:</b>	An after school program provides support to grade 4 and 5 children 3 days a week from 3:00 – 4:30. Instruction will include test sophistication strategies, Brain POP video, and test segments. In addition, students in grade 4 have access both at home and at school to the Study Island on-line educational program where teachers can customize assignments. The program is aligned with NY State Standards.
<b>Social Studies:</b>	AIS support is provided for grade 4 and 5 children during the school day through the use of social studies theme in Shared Reading and Guided Reading, embedding reading strategies with social studies content knowledge. Children in grade 5 also have access to Study Island Social Studies where teachers can customize assignments. In computer, students work on Social Studies content based webquests to support and project based learning.
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:</b>	The Guidance Counselor will provide at risk counseling on a crisis basis. The position is a 2-day position with a full mandated schedule during school.
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:</b>	School Psychologist will devote available time in her schedule to at-risk prevention services through 1:1, small group and family support counseling. Our Schoolwide OLWEUS Bully Prevention and Social Decision Program supports the work for at-risk students in behavior management.
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:</b>	Social Worker will service the needs of Spanish speaking students and families with social and family concerns. She will also work with children identified as at-risk to provide counseling within small groups. The Social Worker will also provide classroom support to teachers and students in the areas of organization, socialization and behavior management.

**At-risk Health-related Services:**

The school nurse will provide direct information and medical services as needed. The Parent Coordinator will provide information regarding related community services to students. The nurse provides Open-Airways program to asthmatic students.

**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. – Copy is attached.**

---

**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) 2-5      Number of Students to be Served: 75 LEP \_\_\_\_\_ Non-LEP \_\_\_\_\_

Number of Teachers 1      Other Staff (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview**

**Title III, Part A LEP Program**

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

---

P.S. 56Q is a grade 2-5 elementary school with 15%, or approximately 75 of our students eligible for ESL services. Our Title III program goals are focused on supporting ESL students to gain proficiency in English language skills in the elementary school setting.

After analyzing the data of the 2009 NYSESLAT and the 2009 NYS ELA exams of ESL students, we have identified that students are making steady progress in grades 4 and 5 in the reading and writing components but need additional support in the listening and speaking components. The majority of our grade 2 and 3 students performed on the Advanced level back in grade 1, yet they continue to perform on the Advanced level in grades 2 and 3 rather than achieve proficiency. As a result, we have made ESL students' needs one of our 2009-2010 CEP goals.

The students we have targeted are students in the Advanced performance level category including 12 in grade 2, 9 in grade 3, 15 in grade 4, and 7 in grade 5. These children are at risk of becoming Pre-Long-Term ELLs.

A. Curricular: Briefly describe the school's literacy, mathematics and other content area programs and explain ELLs' participation in those programs. Briefly describe supplemental programs for ELLs (i.e., AIS, Saturday Academies).

We implement a Balanced Literacy approach in reading and the Writing Process approach in writing to integrate reading, writing, speaking and listening. There is a strong emphasis on modeling. In mathematics we use the Everyday Math Program throughout the school. It is a standards-based program that emphasizes a cyclical hands-on approach. Vocabulary is reinforced for ELL students.

We have two designated science teachers, one for the upper grades and one for the lower grades. Classroom teachers provide instruction in Social Studies. Instruction follows the NYC Scope and Sequence and the State Standards in both subject areas. Teaching accommodations include increased visual aides through Smartboard technology to access united streaming and BrainPop to support the needs of ELL students.

B. Extracurricular: Briefly describe extracurricular activities available in your school, and the extent to which ELLs participate.

To support our students we will provide multiple after school programs. For children in grades 2, 3, 4, and 5 we will offer an after school test prep program focusing on the components of the NYSESLAT exam of Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. The program will be taught by one licensed ESL teacher and three Common Branch teachers who are acquiring their ESL licenses. The program will run three days a week (Tuesday-Wednesday-Thursday) from 3:00 PM – 4:30 PM, for a ten week period from February 23, 2010 to May 6, 2010. A certified ESL teacher will rotate on a half-hour period each day to provide explicit ESL to students in the class of the three CB teachers. Materials will include test prep materials, multi-level books, listening centers, books on tape, flashcards and materials in children's native language as available and appropriate.

In addition, we will offer an after school tutoring program for grade 2 and 3 students that will address targeted language skills identified by their classroom teacher. We will service up to 24 students. The language of instruction will be English. The program will be supported by three bilingual paraprofessionals to support student comprehension skills. The program will run three days a week (Tuesday-Wednesday-Thursday) from 3:00 PM – 4:30 PM from November 26, 2009 to February 5, 2010. The paraprofessionals will be under the direction of a licensed ESL teacher.

Extra curricular activities include the After School Program, an Outside of School Tutoring Program run by the Child Center of NY. It is available to all students including ESL, Monday-Friday from 3-6 PM and on vacation days and during the summer at PS 254Q. After School support in test prep for Math, Reading and NYSESLAT is offered exclusively to ESL students 8 weeks prior to state testing dates on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday from 3:00 PM to 4:30 PM.

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

---

Professional Development begins by providing the 7.5 hours of mandated training in ESL methodologies to all new teachers here at P. S. 56 by a licensed ESL teacher. This training is open to all staff members. It is provided after school from 3:00 – 4:30 PM over 5 consecutive Wednesdays early in the school year addressing teacher modeling, student assessment, reviewing student work, and interpretation of student data. This supports school-wide policy of data based instruction and individual student goals to support student achievement.

Professional Development sets the foundation for instruction that will support our program goals. A licensed ESL teacher will design the ten week course of study for the after school program. Delivery of instruction will be supported by Common Branch teachers in the process of acquiring accreditation in ESL and by bilingual paraprofessionals. All staff members will receive professional development in ESL techniques and language acquisition. Staff members will initially meet for a planning and training session. They will then link monthly for one hour for a duration of each program to monitor progress, review material effectiveness and needs, and plan for next step instructions.

#### Parent and Community Involvement:

All ESL students and their families are invited to participate in all day and after school events. In order to strengthen the academic link between school and home, parents of ESL families will be invited to attend individual parent training sessions for classroom teachers to model activities parents can implement at home to support their child's academic progress. Initial sessions will be one hour in length with a one hour follow-up session to assess progress and provide next step training four weeks later. Teacher per session rate will be paid by Title I Parent Involvement funds. Title III funding would provide the materials including books, flashcards, books on tape, skills materials, etc. Thirty families have been invited to participate in this opportunity. A minimum of two hours per family will be allocated. Our goal is to have at least 30% of families participate.

**Form TIII – A (1)(b)**

School: PS 56

BEDS Code: 34-27-00-01-0056

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

<b>Allocation Amount:</b>		
<b>Budget Category</b>	<b>Budgeted Amount</b>	<b>Explanation of expenditures in this category as it relates to the program narrative for this title.</b>
<b>Professional salaries (schools must account for fringe benefits)</b> - Per Session  - Per Session	\$11,819.00	- Teacher Per Session - \$49.89 x 216 hours = \$10,776  - Paraprofessional Per Session - \$28.98 x 36 hours = \$1,043
<b>Supplies and materials</b> - Supplies	\$3,180.00	Materials for After School Program and Parent Involvement training sessions.
<b>TOTAL</b>	\$14,999.00	

### **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.

The ATS (Automate The Schools) Home Language Report identified each child's home language as stated by the family at the time of the child's initial registration into the NYC Department of Education school system. Using the data from this report, we can calculate the percentage as well as individual children/families by home language.

According to our calculations, 21% of our families speak Spanish as their primary language at home, 1% Russian, 1% Arabic and 1% Mandarin. As such, we had several parent letters translated into Spanish, Arabic, Russian and Mandarin. We sent them home to families in those languages according to the Home Language Report. Most families responded that they preferred notes in English. Several were appreciative of the opportunity to receive the information in their native literate language, and we will continue to provide this as much as possible. A list was compiled of the families preferring notes in their native language. Notes are translated through the Department of Education Translation and Interpretation Unit as often as possible, at which time they are sent to the families according to their expressed preference.

We offer oral language translations in Spanish and Punjabi at meetings and family events as much as possible. Parents appreciate this resource and have been attending events in increasing numbers.

The Bill of Parents Rights and Responsibilities is provided in addition to all DOE policies in multiple languages. They are distributed to families as per their preferred language by adult on the Home Language Identification Survey. Additional copies are made readily available for parents at the table by Security Agent's desk at the main entrance. The Parent Coordinator maintains additional copies for parents as requested. Parents use translation rights and options as posted in multiple languages on the parent bulletin board.

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.

As stated above, P.S. 56's school language needs fall predominantly within Spanish, Russian, Arabic and Mandarin. Parents appreciate and utilize both written and oral translations provided by the school for school policies, announcements, and general information. Ninety-eight families receive Spanish translations of parent letters and other important DOE information as per their request. Two families receives information in Russian, seven in Arabic and two in Mandarin.

This data was reported to the School Leadership Team at the June 2007 general meeting and was shared with the parent body at the June 2007 PTA meeting. In addition, each School Leadership Team representative is responsible for conveying the information to their respective constituents.

## **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.

The three most common language groups at P. S. 56 are Spanish, 21%; Punjabi, 14%; and Urdu, 4%. Information and communication are the keystone to a successful partnership between the home and the school. To this end, we will utilize the services of the NYC Department of Education Translation and Interpretation Unit for parent letters as much as possible. These letters provide school policies and general information including the school calendar, curriculum matters, and health and safety issues.

Regular parent notices are numbered so that families can more easily keep track of all distributed materials. Notices are also posted on the PS 56Q website. When a note is available in a language other than English a = will be present at the end of the assigned number. (ex: Parent Letter #23 =.

September information letters will be forwarded to the Translation Unit in June to allow for adequate time to translate, return, and duplication, ready for distribution upon our return to school. A similar procedure will be followed throughout the year.

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.

Our school assessment of oral translation needs indicate a need for oral translations to be available in Spanish, Arabic, Russian and Mandarin at Curriculum Information Sessions, all trip related events, and school-wide social events. Two bilingual (Spanish/English) staff members are available at these events. Translators sit together with their respective parent group at school events to allow for on-going translations of presentation information, parent questions, and small group discussions.

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>.

The school will meet the requirement for parental notification for translated and interpreted services by:

- a. Using NYC Department of Education Translation Unit services for written documents for on-going parent letters and notification of school policies, events, and general information.
- b. A list of preferred languages for written information will be utilized for letter distribution.
- c. Letters from DOE through the Chancellor's Office are usually available in multiple languages. We will access this information and utilize these documents.

d. A bilingual staff member will be available at as many Parent Information Sessions, Workshops, and family events as possible. The Department of Education oral phone translation service will be utilized for parents for EPC and Parent Teacher Conference when translators are not readily available.



**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:	246,963	28,238	275,201
2. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside for Parent Involvement:	2,469		
3. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside to Improve Parent Involvement (ARRA Language):		2,823	
4. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified:	12,345		
5. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect – HQ PD (ARRA Language):		14,115	
6. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Professional Development:	24,690		
7. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect (Professional Development) (ARRA Language):		28,230	

8. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2008-2009 school year: \_\_\_100%\_\_\_\_\_
9. If the percentage of high quality teachers during 2008-2009 is less than 100% describe activities and strategies the school is implementing in order to insure that the school will have 100% high quality teachers by the end of the coming school year.

## Part B: TITLE I SCHOOL PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT POLICY & SCHOOL-PARENT COMPACT

### 1. School Parental Involvement Policy – Attach a copy of the school’s Parent Involvement Policy.

**Explanation:** In support of strengthening student academic achievement, each school that receives Title I, Part A funds must develop jointly with, agree on with, and distribute to, parents of participating children a written parental involvement policy that contains information required by section 1118(a)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The policy establishes the school’s expectations for parental involvement and describes how the school will implement a number of specific parental involvement activities. It is **strongly recommended** that schools, in consultation with parents, use a sample template as a framework for the information to be included in their parental involvement policy. The template is available in the eight major languages on the NYCDOE website. Schools, in consultation with parents, are encouraged to include other relevant and agreed upon activities and actions as well that will support effective parental involvement and strengthen student academic achievement. The school parent involvement policy must be provided and disseminated in the major languages spoken by the majority of parents in the school. For additional information, please refer to the 2008-09 Title I Parent Involvement Guidelines available on the NYCDOE website.

### 2. School-Parent Compact - Attach a copy of the school’s School-Parent Compact.

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

## Part C: TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM SCHOOLS

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

1. A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school that is based on information on the performance of children in relation to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards.  
*A comprehensive needs assessment of school-wide academic performance of State academic content and State academic achievement standards will be accomplished through:*

- a. *An analysis of data of grade 3-5 State exams for the last 3 years in ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies. It will identify patterns of school-wide strengths and weaknesses.*
- b. *An annual Quality Review Self-Assessment will be conducted to collect input from multiple stakeholders, including administration, pedagogical staff, parents, and students.*
- c. *Informal in-house assessments will be reviewed for progress toward State standards in literacy and math at 6-8 week intervals. Assessments will be administered and reviewed 5 times throughout the year.*
- d. *Student writing pieces will be reviewed and analyzed every 6 weeks by an administrator. Grade-level teachers will review student work to identify teaching strengths and needs as reflected in student performance. Teachers and students will use a pre-determined rubric to guide instruction, student efforts and final scoring as well as student self-evaluation.*

See Needs Assessment, pages 9-11.

## 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 major reform strategy that will be implemented to assist children in meeting the State's proficiency and advanced levels of academic achievement are:

- o AIS staff will push into classes with children performing below grade level during Guided Reading periods to reduce teacher:student ratio.
  - o We will use homogenous grouping of children according to reading ability and reduce class size register in classes with the greatest needs to increase one to one academic support. This will allow more enrichment and project-based learning to occur in classes performing on or above grade level.
  - o Provide additional small group support with additional AIS staff in each grade. They will push in during Guided Reading.
  - o Morning tutoring, 150 minutes weekly, will be devoted to Math AIS for all students performing below grade level.
  - o Align curriculum with State Standards through curriculum mapping.
  - o Develop and implement curriculum maps in ELA that meet the State Standards.
  - o Continue to implement Pacing Calendars in all grades for the Everyday Mathematics program to adjust for the indicators.
  - o Monitor student progress towards reading 25 books per year.
  - o Institute benchmarks for monitoring student progress across reading levels.
- b) Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically-based research that:
    - o Increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as extended school year, before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities.
    - o Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.
    - o Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.
    - o Address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of low academic achieving children and those at risk of not meeting the State academic content standards and are members of the target population of any program that is included in the Schoolwide Program. These programs may include counseling, pupil services, mentoring services, college and career awareness/preparation, and the integration of vocational and technical education programs.

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

Our instructional strategies and methods will include:

- reducing the student:teacher ratio in classrooms during the Guided Reading period each day. We will do this by providing a highly qualified reading specialist within a Push-In support design. The classroom and AIS support teacher will form a Teaching Partnership for the school year. They will actively share the responsibilities of individual instruction for each child by co-planning, teaching, and assessing all children in the class for one school year.
- the 37.5 minute tutoring time will be used to support students in Math by:
  - scaffolding background math skills to provide support for upcoming Everyday Math instruction
- Implement performance reading and repeat reading techniques to improve word recognition, reading fluency and comprehension through the Read Naturally Program.
- P.S. 56 has a gifted and talented class for intellectually gifted children on each grade 3-5. The program provides opportunities for Project-based learning. Many children in grades 3-5 participate in Thinkquest, a New York City technology-based competition where teams produce a theme-based website. Thinkquest is also becoming a major learning vehicle of a grade 5 non-gifted and talented class.
- Our greatest underserved population is the newly admitted children from Guyana, designated an “English speaking country.” The children are familiar with local dialects rather than standard English. The educational opportunities between the two countries are very different, and the children admitted in the upper grades are commonly 2 or more grade levels below our Standards for grade level proficiency. The children do not qualify for the deeply needed additional language support or transition time needed before becoming eligible to take State exams. To support the children’s language acquisition, they will be provided ESL strategies instruction with ELL student groups, as space permits. They will be invited to participate in all ESL after school language development programs. In addition, the children will be given support through the Wilson or Foundation Reading Program in small group settings and benefit from the Learning Leaders Program.
- All children who display low academic performance regardless of class placement from the gifted and talented class to general education, to CTT, self-contained, SETSS, or ESL are eligible to be presented to the IEP Teams for review. The PPT Team consists of the Principal, Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselor, School Psychologist, SETSS Teacher, Social Worker, IEP Teacher, and Speech Teacher. As teachers, whether classroom teacher, support specialists, or cluster, note significant delays in academic performance, they can submit their observations, student performance data, supports offered, and anecdotes to the team for review. The child’s academic, social, family, and health issues are considered. Appropriate Academic Intervention Support services, AIS, are initiated and monitored for progress. AIS services included STARS, 37.5 minute targeted tutor for their special subject area of need, at-risk counseling, outside counseling, Individual Tutoring with Parent Involvement, at-risk speech services, Learning Leaders, Wilson or Foundations Reading Program, etc.
- Provide Wilson Reading Program as an AIS support option.
- Have trained staff implement the Schools Attuned Programs to provide accommodations to support student needs.

### 3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.

Highly qualified and committed staff is essential to student success. According to our most recent BEDS survey, the PS 56 staff notes the following:

100% work within their license area

93% have a Master's Degree or higher

100% have been teaching 2 years or more

40% have been teaching 10 years or more

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.

Professional Development is essential to providing high quality instructional services. To maintain our collective knowledge base and evolving techniques within teaching and learning, we will establish Study Group opportunities for staff across grades and among specialists to form self-selected groups for curriculum exploration.

In addition, high quality outside workshops in literacy, math, gifted education, etc. will be sought for staff attendance. Admission will be paid by Title I 5% professional development allocation. We will be providing complementary text and instructional resources as well. Collaborations, including, author lecturers, and in-house mentoring will be enlisted as possible to explore a targeted area of instruction such as a specific writing genre or mathematical approach. Courses will include a broad spectrum of instructional techniques and methodologies.

In addition, grade level staff meets weekly for common planning sessions. They co-plan lessons, develop curriculum and collaboratively learn about the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process through looking at student work.

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

A broader base of candidates will be sought to interview. Our goal is to have all staff work within their licensed areas or be in the process of completing licensing requirements. Staff will be interviewed for their license eligibility, experience, content knowledge, knowledge of assessment data instruments, analysis and implementation to instruction. We will also recruit from our pool of student teachers from Hofstra University and Molloy College.

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

P. S. 56 has an extensive parent involvement program. Our events include numerous curriculum information sessions (see pages 34-35), family collaborative learning events, specialized events focusing on father/male caregiver and child, families of ELL children, families new to the school – grade 2, Glee Club performance, etc. All events focus on the role of learning whether it is the development of social skills or acquisition of background knowledge. In addition we offer 1:1 teacher/parent:child individual tutoring to directly model for parents a child-specific skill they can reinforce at home. This effort mirrors a classroom structure.

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.

P. S. 56 is a grade 2-5 school. We do not have any Pre-K children.

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.

Teachers on each grade are directly involved in creation and evaluation of each writing genre. Teachers will meet each week as a grade to discuss instructional planning and assessments. Teachers will include co-planning this year in an effort to improve instructional planning. In addition, teachers involved in partnerships will meet once a week to confer on planning and assessment for individual children. They will collaboratively assign report card grades.

Teacher representatives from each grade are part of our Curriculum Mapping Committee, which is conducted on individual grades as well as in vertical planning sessions to align curriculum for children across grade levels.

In June, staff meet on grade level to address curriculum planning for Writing, Reading, Social Studies and Science for the 2008-2009 school year. There is also vertical planning to ensure scaffolded instruction and continuity of learning.

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.

Children who enter a school year with a level 3 or 4 in a subject area and subsequently experience difficulty maintaining or achieving continued success would be supported through the IEP Team as described in #2 of this section, as well as classroom AIS services and small group classroom instruction.

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.

P. S. 56 works closely with our local community advocate, The One Stop Richmond Hill Community Center. They provide many support services to our families including food drives, emergency preparedness information, fire safety, personal safety, health information, immigration services, student tutoring, summer camp, holiday programs, etc. One Stop Richmond Hill Community Center representatives are asked to speak at P. S. 56 PTA meetings to inform our parents of the available services. Most recently, the Community Center and P. S. 56 teamed up to form a joint educational technology-based program for children in an after school setting.

P. S. 56 has a Nutrition Program. Staff, students, and a parent representative serve on the committee. They survey the children for breakfast and lunch favorites as well as suggestions for improvements. Results are shared with the local Department of Education nutritionist.

## Part D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS

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

1. Use program resources to help participating children meet the State standards.
2. Ensure that planning for students served under this program is incorporated into existing school planning.
3. Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically based research that strengthens the core academic program of the school and that:
  - a. Give primary consideration to providing extended learning time, such as, extended school year, before/after school, and summer programs and opportunities;
  - b. Help provide an accelerated, high –quality curriculum, including applied learning; and
  - c. Minimize removing children from the regular classroom during regular school hours;
4. Coordinate with and support the regular educational program;
5. Provide instruction by highly qualified teachers;
6. Provide professional development opportunities for teachers, principals and paraprofessionals, including, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff;
7. Provide strategies to increase parental involvement; and
8. Coordinate and integrate Federal, State and local services and programs.

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

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

**NCLB/SED Status:** \_\_\_\_\_ **SURR<sup>1</sup> Phase/Group (If applicable):** \_\_\_\_\_

### **Part A: For All Schools Identified for Improvement**

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

### **Part B: For Title I Schools Identified for Improvement**

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

---

<sup>1</sup> School Under Registration Review (SURR)

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

*All SURR schools must complete this appendix.*

**SURR Area(s) of Identification:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SURR Group/Phase:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Year of Identification:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Deadline Year:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Part A: SURR Review Team Recommendations** – On the chart below, indicate the categorized recommendations for improvement resulting from the SED Registration Review Visit/Report and all external review and monitoring visits since the school was first identified as a SURR. Indicate the specific actions the school has taken, or will take, to address each of the recommendations.

<b>Type of Review or Monitoring Visit</b> (Include agency & dates of visits)	<b>Review Team Categorized Recommendations</b> (e.g., Administrative Leadership, Professional Development, Special Education, etc.)	<b>Actions the school has taken, or plans to take, to address review team recommendations</b>

**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)*<sup>2</sup> 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

---

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

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

– **English Language Learners**

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

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

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

A school-based sub-committee was formed to assess whether Finding 1A was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee met on five occasions. Committee members include two teachers, the UFT representative, the Principal and the Assistant Principal. The committee reviewed our CEP and evaluated school data to determine if the state findings were applicable to our school. We did not find evidence to support the identification gaps increasing among the grades as they progress through the years within the written curriculum. Each grade has writing units of study that are aligned with the State Standards. These units increase in complexity, and scaffold across the grades.

In terms of Curriculum Mapping, we agree with the finding that the curriculum maps we use are primarily topical. We agree with their finding for ELA target curriculum in respect to Standard 4, spoken presentation and language for social interaction. We agree that current ELA materials do not meet the needs of all students in regards to interest, culturally relevant books, and articles for school use.

While we agree that our ESL program is planned at the individual teacher level, there is also an awareness of the NY State Learning Standard for ESL in instruction implementation.

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

X  Applicable     Not Applicable

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

## Curriculum Maps

Although our school has a Curriculum Map for ELA, based on these findings, it was determined that the context of the map was designed to match curriculum topics with Standards and student skills and strategies within a given period of time by grade level. We note that the curriculum maps lack student outcomes to be attained. They were written to be a guide for the teacher more than an assessment for student performance.

## Target Curriculum

In reviewing our target curriculum, we find that we do address Standards 1, 2, and 3 through our literacy program. As a result of classroom observations, teacher collaborative planning, and report card graded areas, we find that the spoken component of the taught curriculum in all classes is limited.

We find that while we have resources available, it is difficult to find appropriate published materials for our higher level readers as well as our lower level readers, including English Language Learners.

Our classes have classroom libraries to meet the reading levels of the students in each room, yet our school has not had a school library for the past 18 years as due to lack of space and funding. As a result, there is a limited availability for all students.

All students including ELL students benefit from high quality instruction aligned with the grade curriculum. Instructional planning is aligned with grade level curriculum through collaborative planning.

Our Literacy Program is aligned with the New York State Standards and Performance Indicators.

Students receive strong literacy instruction through grade to grade focused lessons and independent practice designed around a Balanced Literacy framework. Instructional time is carefully divided among the four different standards. Daily instruction encompasses practice in all four English Language Arts standards focused on monthly genre studies to provide students with numerous, varied and targeted opportunities to learn to read and write. Teachers follow trade developed Curriculum Maps to guide genre instruction that includes grade specific performance indicators. Our Literacy Program draws primarily from the research supported works of Fountas & Pinnell, Guiding Readers and Writers, Continuum of Literacy Learning, Garvey and Goudvis', Strategies That Work, Primary Comprehension Toolkit and Toolkit," and Lucy Caulkins', Units of Study for Primary Writing," and "Units of Study for Teaching Writing Grade 3-5."

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.

We found that the findings were applicable to curriculum maps, taught curriculum, and ELA materials. We will form a committee across the grades to explain the curriculum needs to meet all required State Standards.

Curriculum development support is available from the Central Office for a fee. We would appreciate an annual school-wide stipend toward appropriate professional development. In addition, we will reach out to our Network to collaborate with other schools.

---

## **1B. Mathematics**

### **Background**

**MAY 2009**

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.

A school-based sub-committee was formed to assess whether Finding 1B1 was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee met on five occasions. Committee members include two teachers, the UFT representative, the Principal and the Assistant Principal. We agree with the findings that the EVERYDAY MATH K-5 is aligned with the NY State Content Strands and that it is lacking alignment to the NY State Process Strands.

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

X  Applicable    Not Applicable

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

We are implementing the Everyday Math Program in grades 2-5 as designed. We utilize the pre and post Math Indicators to inform instruction.

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.

The finding is applicable for our school. We will address it through articulation among the grades to ensure that we adhere to the pre and post Math Indicators. We are addressing the Problem of the Day and Constructed Responses to mirror test sophistication. We will support the Everyday Mathematics by implementing Problem of the Day and Constructed Response questions that align with the Process Strand.

Students are taught mathematical concepts and skills to master across six mathematical strands. The Everyday Math is aligned to the NYSED performance indicators. Monthly grade level calendars are used by classroom teachers to ensure adequate pacing of content across the school year.

Teachers use Kaplan, Scantron and Study Island as a way to further enhance the mathematics instructional program by extending student opportunities to apply strategies to the content.

---

## **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.

A school-based sub-committee was formed to assess whether Finding 2A was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee met on five occasions. Committee members include two teachers, the UFT representative, the Principal and the Assistant Principal. The committee reviewed our CEP and evaluated school data to determine if the state findings were applicable to our school.

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?

The findings are not applicable to our school because we use the Readers Workshop Model, the Writers Workshop Model, the School-wide Enrichment Model Reading Framework, and the Renzulli Learning Program. Our Balance Literacy Approach supports flexible grouping and self-paced assignments. Almost all classrooms and programs utilize Smartboard technology to engage students.

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

---

## **2B – Mathematics Instruction**

Auditors noted that although high academically focused class time was observed either frequently or extensively in 80 percent of K–8 mathematics classes, it was observed at this level only in 45 percent of the high school mathematics classes. Further, a high level of student engagement was observed either frequently or extensively in 52 percent of Grades K–8 and 35 percent of Grades 9–12 mathematics classrooms. *School Observation Protocol* (SOM<sup>3</sup>) 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

---

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

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.

A school-based sub-committee was formed to assess whether Finding 1A was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee met on five occasions. Committee members include two teachers, the UFT representative, the Principal and the Assistant Principal. The committee reviewed our CEP and evaluated school data to determine if the state findings were applicable to our school.

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?

The findings are not applicable to our school. We implement the Everyday Mathematics program in all classes. The program is designed to include daily components of whole class, small group and independent work. Students model their thinking through the use of games and hands-on activities.

Technology is our primary mode of instruction, including a Smartboard in almost every class. Students interact directly with the equipment in order to develop higher order mathematical thinking.

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

---

### **KEY FINDING 3: TEACHER EXPERIENCE AND STABILITY**

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

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.

Our School Leadership Team Sub-committee reviewed the organization sheet comparing 2007-2008 to 2008-2009. We identified the number of new teachers over the course of that period school wide. We also reviewed the 2007-2008 BEDS report.

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

Applicable XX  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?

We disagree with the findings regarding a high turn over rate, identifying a 4% change in staff. One teacher returned from childcare leave, one teacher resigned, a long-term sub was hired to replace her and subsequently appointed to the school. A second long-term sub became and NYC Teaching Fellow and was appointed as full-time staff. One music teacher was hired to fulfill a license requirement.

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

---

#### **KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS**

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

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

The School Leadership Team Subcommittee invited the Grade 2 ESL teacher to our meeting for insight and contributions on this topic. As a result, we consider the findings regarding the sharing of information about available PD not applicable. At PS 56Q, we

offer annual on-site new teacher ESL training, which is made available to all staff. In addition, teachers who service ELL students are invited to attend periodic off-site PD in ESL.

The findings regarding policies and plans for ESL programs not being effectively communicated to teachers is not applicable. Staff is aware of the after school ESL program, ELL instructional models (self-contained ESL grade 2 class, push-in in grades 3-5 program) ESL family trips and after school vacancies through public postings, and faculty conferences.

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?

Our School Leadership Subcommittee discussed professional development opportunities in the past that we have participated in, the process of informing ESL professional development courses with staff and how we share ELL instructional plans and policies with staff. We also discussed funding sources matching programs with ESL allocations.

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

---

#### **KEY FINDING 5: DATA USE AND MONITORING—ELL INSTRUCTION**

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

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

The School Leadership Team Subcommittee invited the grade 2 ESL teacher to our meeting for insight and contributions on this topic. We discussed the multiple forms of assessment data, including RLAB, NYSELAT, LAB-R, which we collect on ELL students. We discussed the use of data for instructional grouping and on-going monitoring in all subject areas.

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

Applicable XX  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?

P.S. 56Q uses a variety of assessment tools to identify and monitor ELL academic progress and English Language Development. For example, we use the NYSELAT results, the ELL Pilot Assessment results, the RLAT report and the LAB-R. As with all students at PS 56, ELL students participate in DIBELS, Scantron, ACUITY, Item Analysis Report, Everyday Mathematics Unit Assessments, Guided Reading, teacher observations, and writing based on a genre specific rubric. As data is received, (Spring 2008 NYSELAT received in August 2008, and RLAT in September 2008), it is reported to all teachers who instruct ELL students. The new NYC Exam History Report identifies grade level, official class, lab raw score, NYSELAT 2008, 2007, 2006 data.

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

---

#### **KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SPECIAL EDUCATION**

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

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

Our School Leadership Team Subcommittee met with a representative Special Education teacher to review our school-wide program and staffing assignment, a collaboration of general education and special education staff to link and share professional information, instructional techniques, and IEP information for consisting of delivery of instruction for special education children. A review of the BEDS survey revealed staffing assignments.

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

Applicable XX  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?

This finding is not applicable to our school as our school has 3 CTT classes, one 12:1 class, Resource Room services, Related Services, a school-based support team with a full-time School Psychologist, and an itinerant Guidance Counselor and Social Worker.

All staff is fully informed of each IEP student's independent learning goals. All staff receive professional development at a faculty conference each year regarding the State mandate to be fully notified and apply IEP mandates for all IEP children. Every general education teacher is assigned a special education buddy teacher to assist in reviewing IEPs of their students. All classroom teachers receive a list of the testing accommodations for children in their class. Our testing coordinator informs every classroom teacher of the NY State testing accommodations policies and procedures.

Special Education teachers prepare an IEP matrix with children's individual learning goals across curriculum to share with general education staff in order to pinpoint specific curriculum needs. Accommodations are made accordingly.

Children receive differentiated instruction in the classroom according to IEP goals and needs across the curriculum. Classroom environment and instruction and assignments are designed to accommodate accordingly.

Classroom management workshops are available to all staff. They provide information on strategies to address students with behavioral needs. Staff is also informed of ways to implement a variety of techniques to establish behavioral supports. This can include behavioral intervention plans at varying levels. In addition, we have implemented the Olweus Bully Prevention Program school-wide to address bullying and aggressive behaviors.

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

---

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

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

Our School Leadership Team Subcommittee met with a representative Special Education teacher to review our school-wide program and staffing assignment, a collaboration of general education and special education staff to link and share professional information, instructional techniques, and IEP information for consisting of delivery of instruction for special education children. A review of the BEDS survey revealed staffing assignments.

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

Applicable XX  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?

This finding is not applicable to our school-generated IEPs. Our staff reviews IEPs and writes goals that consistently specify accommodations and for modification for both the classroom environment and instruction. There is alignment between goals, objectives, and modified promotion criteria. Children's promotion criteria are aligned with their current grade-level placement. IEPs do include Behavior Plans according to student needs.

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

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

*This appendix will not be required for 2009-10.*

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

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

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

*All schools must complete this appendix.*

### **Directions:**

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

### **Supporting Students in Temporary Housing (STH)**

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

---

### **Part A: FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS**

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

We currently have no Students in Temporary Housing.

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

### **Part B: FOR NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS**

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