



THE FRANCIS LEWIS SCHOOL

2009-10
SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)

SCHOOL: 25/ QUEENS/ 25Q079
ADDRESS: 147-27 15TH DRIVE WHITESTONE, NY 11357
TELEPHONE: (718) 746-0396
FAX: (718) 746-3103

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE 3

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

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE..... 5

Part A. Narrative Description 5

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot 7

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT 10

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS 14

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN 15

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010..... 22

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM Error! 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: P.S. 79Q SCHOOL NAME: Francis Lewis

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 147-27 15th Drive, Whitestone, NY 11357

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 718-746-0396 FAX: 718-746-3103

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Paula Marron EMAIL ADDRESS: pmarron@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON: Debbie Fine

PRINCIPAL: Paula Marron

UFT CHAPTER LEADER: John Bartley

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT: Christie Les

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE:
(Required for high schools) _____

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL SUPPORT ORGANIZATION (SSO) INFORMATION

DISTRICT: 25 SSO NAME: Queens Integrated Service Center (ISC)

SSO NETWORK LEADER: Peggy Miller

SUPERINTENDENT: Diane Kay

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
Paula Marron	*Principal or Designee	
Debbie Fine	* SLT Chairperson	
John Bartley	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Christie Les	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
Fran Walters	Member/ Assistant Principal	
Joan Weltz	Member/ Teacher	
Ellen Kazdan	Member/ Teacher	
Jennifer Cardillo	Member / Parent	
Frieda Christofides	Member/ Parent	
Nicholas Corrado	Member / Parent	
Sabina DiCamillo	Member/ Parent	
Domenick Palazzo	Member/ Parent	

* 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.

P.S. 79 has the unique distinction of being a one hundred nine year old building nestled in the heart of Whitestone, Queens. We currently are home to a diverse, multicultural community of 813 general and special education students. While the structure may be classified as an antique, the school overflows with energy, enthusiasm, and excitement.

SCHOOL MISSION

The community of P.S. 79 embraces the tenets of a balanced literacy approach in all core curricular areas. This includes oral and written expression and knowledge of all elements and genres of literature. We promote an environment that encourages both independent and cooperative learning. We support students as they become analytical problem solvers through an enriched Everyday Math program. Our social studies and science programs offer students strategies for discovery using hands-on and inquiry-based learning experience. The arts are an integral part of the curriculum infused throughout the academic experiences of each student.

BELIEVE AND ACHIEVE

At P.S. 79, we strive to bring together the ideas and commitment of a diverse community of students, teachers, staff, administration, and families. Together, we shape the direction of the school, developing lifelong learners who are confident, competent, responsible, and contributing members of society.

Children are at the heart of The Francis Lewis School. The building is well maintained and pride in the students' accomplishments is evident in every hallway and on every bulletin board. The community works together to provide our students with a variety of academic and social experiences that promote leadership, creativity, and individual responsibility. Together, we aim to achieve pride in our school and in our community, respect for cultural diversity, and support for a strong parental coalition.

A glimpse into the rich traditions established at P.S. 79 highlights community service and the arts:

- ❖ Partnership with Lighthouse International
- ❖ Penny Harvest
- ❖ Artists in Residency with the David Marquis Studios at every grade level:
 - a. Circus with Kindergarten Students
 - b. Puppetry with Second Graders
 - c. Visual Arts with First Graders
 - d. Content-based Creative Movement with Third and Fourth Graders
 - e. Percussion with Fifth Graders
- ❖ Young Audiences share "Cultures Around the World" with Grades 3, 4, and 5
- ❖ The Johnny Mercer Foundation

P.S. 79 has multiple outside affiliations for staff development:

- ❖ Teachers College Reading and Writing Project Staff Development
- ❖ NYC DOE Social Studies Grade 3 Pilot Project
- ❖ University Connections with Teachers College; Hofstra; Queens College; CW Post; and Queensborough Student Teachers and Observers

Parent involvement is critical to the success of any school. At P.S. 79, parents actively serve our School Leadership Team, consulting on policy for the school. Parent volunteers work tirelessly in a myriad of daily capacities, i.e. monitoring arrival procedures, lice checks, vision testing and immunizations, and school store. Through various fundraisers, parents help finance extras such as state-of-the-art technology i.e. SMART Boards, laptops, etc. Through the Learning Leaders Program, community members offer one-on-one tutoring for students. Finally, the P.S. 79's Parent Coordinator works as a liaison with the PTA Executive Board to develop new ways to build stronger community involvement at school-wide functions.

SECTION III – Cont’d

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT					
School Name:	P.S. 79 Francis Lewis				
District:	25	DBN #:	25Q079	School BEDS Code #:	342500010079

DEMOGRAPHICS									
Grades Served in 2008-09:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 Pre-K	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6 K	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 8 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 7
	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	<input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 11	<input type="checkbox"/> 12	<input type="checkbox"/> Ungraded			
Enrollment:				Attendance: % of days students attended					
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08*	2008-09		
Pre-K	65	54	55		94.9	95.0	96.0		
Kindergarten	122	152	123						
Grade 1	129	117	101	Student Stability: % of Enrollment					
Grade 2	124	131	144	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Grade 3	150	123	141		96.4	96.1	96.9		
Grade 4	134	145	141						
Grade 5	133	127	133	Poverty Rate: % of Enrollment					
Grade 6	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Grade 7	0	0	0		23.3	26.3	0.0		
Grade 8	0	0	0						
Grade 9	0	0	0	Students in Temporary Housing: Total Number					
Grade 10	0	0	0	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Grade 11	0	0	0		1	0	1		
Grade 12	0	0	0						
Ungraded	2	0	2	Recent Immigrants: Total Number					
				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Total	1004	983	830		2	0	0		
Special Education Enrollment:				Suspensions: (OSYD Reporting) – Total Number					
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Number in Self-Contained Classes	12	12	10						
No. in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	68	62	63	Principal Suspensions	3	5	0		
Number all others	67	49	49	Superintendent Suspensions	0	1	0		
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>									

DEMOGRAPHICS							
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment: (BESIS Survey)				Special High School Programs: Total Number			
(As of October 31)				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	CTE Program Participants	0	0	0
# in Trans. Bilingual Classes	0	0	0	Early College HS Participants	0	0	0
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0				
# receiving ESL services only	77	71	74	Number of Staff: Includes all full-time staff			
# ELLs with IEPs	2	11	8	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
<i>These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.</i>				Number of Teachers	56	56	55
Overage Students: # entering students overage for grade				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	7	8	8
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	5	3	4
	0	0	0				
				Teacher Qualifications:			
Ethnicity and Gender: % of Enrollment				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100.0	100.0	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.5	0.4	0.5	Percent more than two years teaching in this school	78.6	83.9	89.1
Black or African American	0.5	0.2	0.1	Percent more than five years teaching anywhere	67.9	66.1	72.7
Hispanic or Latino	13.7	13.7	15.3				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	31.2	30.2	29.3	Percent Masters Degree or higher	96.0	95.0	96.0
White	54.0	55.5	54.7	Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	100.0	98.8	100
Multi-racial							
Male	54.8	52.8	51.7				
Female	45.2	47.2	48.3				

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

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY		
SURR School: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:	
Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2009-10 Based on 2008-09 Performance):		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In Good Standing	<input type="checkbox"/> Improvement – Year 1	<input type="checkbox"/> Improvement – Year 2
<input type="checkbox"/> Corrective Action – Year 1	<input type="checkbox"/> Corrective Action – Year 2	<input type="checkbox"/> Restructured – Year ____
* = For Progress Report Attendance Rate(s) - If more than one attendance rate given, it is displayed as K-8/9-12.		

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

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

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

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

Key: AYP Status

√	Made AYP	X	Did Not Make AYP	X*	Did Not Make AYP Due to Participation Rate Only
√ ^{SH}	Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target	-	Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status		

Note: NCLB/SED accountability reports are not available for District 75 schools.

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results – 2008-09		Quality Review Results – 2008-09	
Overall Letter Grade	A	Overall Evaluation:	Proficient
Overall Score	82.6	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	Proficient
School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)	6.1	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	Proficient
School Performance (Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)	16	Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	Well-Developed
Student Progress (Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)	55.2	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	Proficient
Additional Credit	5.3	Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	Well-Developed

Note: Progress Report grades are not yet available for District 75 schools.

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

P.S. 79 maintained a high level of overall performance in English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies as evidenced in test scores for the past three years. The percentage of students at proficiency (levels 3 and 4) in ELA was 89.3% in 2009, 81.9% in 2008, 81.3% in 2007, and 79.7% in 2005. In math, the proficiency rates trends reflect a similar pattern: 97.5 in 2009, 96.2% in 2008, 95.3% in 2007, and 91.7% in 2006. The percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 in science was 93% in 2008, 89% in 2007 and 90% in 2006. Finally, the core subjects of science and social studies have achieved acceptable levels of Annual Yearly Performance (AYP) according to state reports.

P.S. 79's school leadership combined with strong teaching within the broad and appropriate curricula resulted in the high levels of student performance. The school community maintains high expectations in all areas for students and staff. Families have a clear and essential role in their children's education. There is a strong and active parent teacher connection at P.S. 79.

The school has excellent procedures for targeting support for high need students. Goals are individualized based on data-informed processes and assessment results. For example, the 2008-2009 Core Inquiry Team focus is a select group of students who scored at the lowest third on the 2008 ELA tests. The team identified short and long-term goals that then targeted instructional strategies with matched assessments. The school's core inquiry team consists of the principal, the assistant principal, the data specialist, and one primary teacher, one upper grade teacher, one resource teacher, and one cluster teacher. The core team represents a model for multiple mini-inquiry teams at different grade levels. This work, in addition to the work of three additional inquiry teams, resulted in focused progress for targeted students scoring at the lowest third. 94.6% (108.6% relative to our peer schools) of students scoring at levels 1 and 2 on the ELA made at least one year's progress. The average change in student proficiency levels for students at these lowest levels was .63 or 111.4% as compared to our peer schools. Progress was off the charts.

One area of focus for the school continues to be the growing number of English language learners and special education students. P.S. 79 successfully concentrated on improving the performance of these two subgroups in an effort to close the achievement gap. This is evidenced in the fact that in 2009, 80% (73.6% in 2008) of these high-need students within the school's lowest third made exemplary progress in proficiency rates in ELA.

The review of P.S. 79's educational program informed by the qualitative data regarding student performance trends provides further evidence of the school's success. School leadership and faculty collaborate regularly on instructional planning decisions and assessments. Strategic planning decisions, such as budgeting and staff development, are aimed at meeting the school's learning goals. This is illustrated by the decision to create a literacy committee for the purpose of creating a spiraling K-5 Literacy Scope and Sequence based on the TCRWP staff development work. This work will provide differentiated support for the school's high need population with an eye towards increasing student performance in ELA for all students.

In 2009, P.S. 79 created an Instructional Cabinet, which consists of school leaders and general education and special education teachers from each grade level. The team meets weekly to develop and align core subject curricular goals and plans. 90% of all teachers are working in collaborative, self-selected inquiry teams focused on developing vertical K-5 core subject curricular maps. Inquiry teams, using 2008 models, are studying target students in an effort to build rigorous, school-wide instructional and organizational coherence.

P.S. 79 has extremely good strategies in place that support the collective vision for the school's future growth based on enabling all students to reach for higher levels of performance. The administration provides teachers with common periods three to four times a week for collaborative planning and staff development. Additionally, monthly faculty conferences, monthly grade level and cluster team conferences, and regularly scheduled individual teacher goals/ assessment conferences provide opportunities for planning, modifications, and reflection. Additionally, in 2009, weekly inquiry team meetings provide teams of teachers with time to create long-term and short-term goals, action plans, as well as rubrics needed to examine student outcomes. These structures offer opportunities for open dialogue and communication about expectations as well as constructive feedback.

Finally, P.S. 79 is meeting the 2009-2010 challenge of integrating and using varied new forms of assessment data into instructional decisions, future planning, and the school's vision for student growth by experimenting with essential questions and backwards design. Through a school-wide teacher action research approach, the principal, assistant principal and faculty collaborate on systemic ways to collect and analyze student data (attendance, summative and formative assessments, anecdotal and student work). Teachers in all core subjects are creating assessment binders with full class data plus a focused component that gathers a more comprehensive set of quantitative and qualitative assessment data for three targeted students.

Some of the student performance trends identified include:

- ❖ The P.S. 79 school community integrates administration, faculty, staff, students, families and the overall community in pursuit of the common goal of maintaining the high level of progress in all core areas and of reaching for new levels of increased student performance.
- ❖ Overall percentages of P.S. 79's students in grades 3 to 5 who are proficient (Levels 3 and 4) in ELA and in math have been consistently high over the last three years. The next step is to look closely at individual student scores for the purpose of examining proficiency ranges on all students, with an eye towards increasing individual proficiencies.
- ❖ P.S. 79 has successfully targeted high need ELL and special education students by ensuring that almost three-quarters of these students made one year's progress on the ELA and math tests in 2009. The next step is the alignment of instructional supports with assessment data in an effort to increase the progress and performance for these two sub-groups.
- ❖ School leadership and faculty have excellent data-informed processes in place to monitor the assessment results in all core subjects.

Some of the accomplishments that have supported this success include:

- ❖ A Collaborative Team Teaching program in every grade that affords the majority of special education students the least restrictive environment and access to instruction based on grade appropriate standards.
- ❖ The provision of at-risk services in guidance, speech and academic subjects to students who fall short of meeting criteria for mandated services.
- ❖ The institution of the Learning Leaders Program, a program that uses trained parent/community volunteers to provide further support to struggling students.
- ❖ The inclusion of science and social studies in the cluster program for grades K-5.
- ❖ The Wilson Program, including Foundations at the kindergarten and grade one levels, is an interactive, multi-sensory program that teaches total word construction providing phonics and letter/sound support for PS 79's high-need students.
- ❖ The provision of additional instruction time before and after school for ELL students and students performing in the lowest third range in reading and math.
- ❖ Systemic staff development structures have been implemented for all classroom teachers through the Teachers College Reading and Writing Project onsite staff development and calendar days.
- ❖ Building on last year's collaboration with the NYC Department of Education's Teaching and Learning Division, staff development and curriculum support will result in the expansion of the third grade pilot program into a K-5 Social Studies Curricular Map.
- ❖ Collaborative structures for common planning time, faculty and grade-level conferences, and individual goals and assessments supports are established practices.
- ❖ Protocols have been implemented for the collection and organization of student performance data using assessment binders. Reflections are shared on ARIS and in TC Assessment Pro.
- ❖ All teachers maintain assessment binders that highlight classroom data from nySTART, Acuity, TC Assessment Pro, and ARIS. Additionally, individual student qualitative data is collected at the end of each unit.

The targeted areas of concern for our school include:

- ❖ Maintaining the overall student progress while increasing the performance and progress (increasing proficiency rates) for Level 3-4 students in all core subjects.
- ❖ Developing the goal setting process in all core subjects areas so that goals are based on evidence of prior learning by engaging students in challenging curricula at all levels including the lowest and highest achieving students, special education students, and English language learners.
- ❖ Expand the use of rubrics across curriculum areas to broaden support for students when setting and monitoring specific goals for reaching their learning targets.

- ❖ Formalize the process of supporting pedagogical growth by regularly evaluating systems that school leadership and teams of teachers use to analyze student assessment data and student work to improve student outcomes.

Some of the barriers the school faces in achieving these goals include:

- ❖ Budget restraints require increasingly creative approaches to developing distributive leadership structures that support teacher input into key decisions that affect student learning.
- ❖ Professional learning opportunities that align curricular goals with data-driven student outcomes require collaboration of teacher teams, using an inquiry approach. Decreased resources limit the kinds of staff development opportunities. The school leadership, in collaboration with faculty, must find new ways to discuss practice with peers, to sharpen content expertise, to visit colleagues' classrooms, and to study teacher and student work with the goal of improving instruction and student outcomes.

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.

P.S. 79's Annual School Goals for 2009-10

1. Develop teachers' expertise in using data to better differentiate literacy instruction for all children as measured by 90% teacher participation in professional development around the use of data to provide differentiated literacy instruction to all children.
2. Improve writing instruction for students in grades K, 1 and 2 with a focus on improving student achievement in writing by one level or more using the TC Narrative Writing Continuum.
3. School leaders and faculty will collaboratively develop and communicate common, rigorous instructional focus and a coherent school culture by instituting an Instructional Cabinet charged with goal-setting and action planning at the school level. School leaders and the Instructional Cabinet effectively involve and communicate with the school community, including teachers, families and students, during the school-level planning processes (needs assessment, goal-setting and action planning) in a way that generates support for the school's direction by developing a coherent, vertically articulated, standards-based K-5 curricula in reading, writing, and at least one additional core subject area.
4. Foster a culture of excellence by increasing the percentage of faculty involved in inquiry teams that use ARIS, TC Pro and other data systems to ensure that curricula challenges and engages individuals and groups of students including the lowest and highest achieving students.
5. Engage in open exchange of information and communicate high expectations with teachers, families and students by developing the PS 79 website to provide up-to-date information and collaborating with PTA Executive Board on community events.

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): Literacy

<p>Annual Goal #1 Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p><u>GOAL 1:</u> By June 2010, 90% of teachers will participate in professional development around the use of data to provide differentiated instruction to all children as measured by 90% of teachers’ membership in Inquiry Space Teams.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Classroom teachers will gather and analyze reading level data from TC Assessment Pro five times across the year (September, November, January, March and June) to inform reading instruction (whole class, small group, and individual). ▪ Teachers will use and revise the K-5 Reading Curriculum Map developed during 2009 to meet the differentiated needs of students. Teachers will establish monthly curriculum goals for each unit, and develop the goal-setting process so that teachers and students are able to articulate monthly goals based on evidence of prior learning. ▪ School leaders and teachers in all core subjects will collaboratively design a process that enables them to systematically (monthly) reflect on a range of data to analyze learning outcomes. All classroom teachers need to learn how to access and use data from nySTART, NYC Progress Report, TC Assessment Pro and ARIS.
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<p>Resources: classroom teachers; SETTS; AIS;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide time at monthly faculty and monthly grade level meetings to learn how to input and use data to angle instruction to improve reading comprehension. ▪ Build a series of literacy and core subject professional learning communities using ARIS Connect / Inquiry Space as a place collaboration for our inquiry team communications. . ▪ Use Title 1 ARRA SWP budget funds to initiate and sustaining onsite staff development in literacy using TC Reading and Writing Project, in addition to calendar days at Teachers College - \$33,600 plus the cost of substitute coverage for 35 days (\$5390). ▪ Monthly faculty meetings and monthly grade level meetings offer the staff ongoing

	<p>opportunities to collaborate on pacing calendars, unit plans and the alignment between assessment and instruction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff training occurs in monthly TC Calendar Days that provide ongoing support for balanced literacy instruction. ▪ Study groups will be interspersed throughout the year to focus on particular aspects of the work.
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interim progress will be assessed using TC Assessment Pro five times a year (September, November, January, March, and June). ▪ Predictive assessment will be administered twice a year in November and in June. ▪ Ongoing exploration of student data via ARIS, nySTART, and TC Pro provide teachers with tools needed to differentiate learning.

<p>Annual Goal #2 <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p><u>GOAL 2:</u> By June 2010, 90% of Pre-K through 2 students will improve their writing by one level or more from a range of level 1 to 3 to a range of level 2 to 4 as measured by the TC Narrative Writing Continuum.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ School leaders and classroom teachers gather and analyze student writing samples using the TCRWP Narrative Writing Continuum three times across the year (November, March, and June) to inform differentiated writing instruction (whole group, small group and individual). ▪ School leaders and teachers will design and implement the K-5 Writing Curriculum Map to meet the differentiated needs of students. Teachers will establish monthly curriculum goals for each unit, and develop the goal-setting process so that teachers and students are able to articulate goals based on evidence of prior learning. ▪ Classroom teachers in grades will gather and analyze student writing samples using the Narrative Writing Continuum, five times across the year (September, November, January, March and June) to inform differentiated writing instruction focused on increasing the number of K-2 students who move up one level on the continuum. ▪ Provide time at monthly faculty and monthly grade level meetings to learn how to input and use data to angle instruction to improve student writing. ▪ Build a series of literacy and core subject professional learning communities using ARIS Connect as a place for Inquiry Communities. ▪ Use Title 1 ARRA SWP budget funds to initiate and sustaining onsite staff development in literacy using TC Reading and Writing Project.

<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Resources: classroom teachers; SETTS; AIS; ▪ Budget Costs: ▪ Per session costs for 6 teachers in writing inquiry teams for 20 hours each @ \$42. p/hr. = \$5040; ▪ Per session costs for 3 teachers in core subject inquiry teams for 10 hours each @ \$42 p/hr.= \$ 1260; ▪ Source: Inquiry Team After School Academic Per Session ▪ Monthly faculty meetings and monthly grade level meetings offer the staff ongoing opportunities to collaborate on pacing calendars, unit plans and the alignment between assessment and instruction. ▪ Staff training occurs in monthly TC Calendar Days that provide ongoing support for balanced literacy instruction.
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interim progress will be assessed using TC Assessment Pro five times a year (September, November, January, March, and June). ▪ Predictive assessment will be administered twice a year in November and in May. ▪ Ongoing exploration of student data via ARIS, nySTART, and TC Pro provide teachers with tools needed to differentiate learning.

<p>Annual Goal #3 <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>By June 2010, school leaders and faculty collaboratively develop and communicate common, rigorous instructional focus and a coherent school culture as measured by teacher-created, goals-driven K-5 curricula documents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Institute an Instructional Cabinet charged with goal-setting and action planning at the school level. ▪ School leaders and the Instructional Cabinet effectively involve and communicate with the school community, including teachers, families and students, during the school-level planning processes (needs assessment, goal-setting and action planning) in a way that generates support for the school’s direction. ▪ Develop a coherent, vertically articulated, standards-based K-5 curricula in reading, writing, and at least one additional core subject area.
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>Set the measurable target that will define whether you have met your goal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional Cabinet meets weekly to determine school-wide long-term goals and develop action plans about curricula that emphasize rigorous higher order thinking skills and ensure that curricula engages students at the lowest and highest achievement levels. • School leaders and grade team leaders meet bi-monthly to collaboratively design a workable plan to develop unit goals in reading and writing and at least one core subject

	<p>area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers will meet during grade level and common prep times to create monthly instructional plans based analysis on student data and student work products. • School leaders and teachers systematically (twice a month) communicate and reflect on goals, instruction and a range of student data to analyze student outcomes during faculty and grade level / team meetings. • Vertical teams in science and social studies meet several times during the year to design and collaborate on K-5 core subject curricular maps. • Grade level and team meetings are used to support teachers as they learn to access and use data from TC Assessment Pro and ARIS.
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Resources: classroom teachers; SETTS; AIS; ▪ Budget Costs: ▪ Per diem costs for 6 teachers in core subject inquiry teams for 20 hours each @ \$42. p/hr. = \$5040; ▪ Per session costs for 3 teachers in core subject inquiry teams for 10 hours each @ \$42 p/hr.= \$ 1260; ▪ Source: Inquiry Team After School Academic Per Session ▪ Monthly faculty meetings and monthly grade level meetings offer the staff ongoing opportunities to collaborate on pacing calendars, unit plans and the alignment between assessment and instruction.
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weekly Nuts and Bolts and Staff Updates documenting Instructional Cabinet meetings • Monthly faculty conferences and monthly grade team meetings agendas and updates • Teacher-created, goals-driven, standards-based K-5 curricula in at least one core subject area based on student needs

<p>Annual Goal #4 <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p><u>GOAL 4:</u> By June, 2010, increase (more than double) the percentage of faculty involved in inquiry teams that use ARIS, TC Pro and other data systems to ensure that curricula challenges and engages individuals and groups of students including the lowest and highest achieving students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Double the percentage of faculty involved in Inquiry teams from 40% (22 out of 55 faculty) to 90% (49 out of 55 faculty) ▪ Self-selected inquiry teams use ARIS, TC Pro and other data systems to ensure that curricula challenges and engages individuals and groups of students including the lowest
---	---

	and highest achieving students
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p><u>Measurable Objectives:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Self-selected inquiry teams make purposeful decisions (long term and short term goals) to emphasize key standards, given the needs of the students, and align curricula to these standards across grades and subject areas. ▪ Self-selected inquiry teams gather and analyze formative assessment data on student subgroups (target populations), providing information to identify trends and track progress allowing them to strategically adjust instruction and practices. ▪ Weekly inquiry team meetings are used to support faculty as they learn to access and use data from TC Assessment Pro and ARIS, among other student data systems. ▪ Per session activities support inquiry team study groups as they design and develop goals-driven, assessment-based core subject curricula based on student outcomes
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Resources: administration; data specialists; classroom teachers; SETTS; cluster teachers; ▪ Source: Tax Levy Data Specialist; TL Children First Inquiry Team; ▪ Monthly faculty meetings and monthly grade level meetings offer the staff ongoing opportunities to collaborate on pacing calendars, unit plans and the alignment between assessment and instruction. Staff training occurs in monthly TC Calendar Days that provide ongoing support for balanced literacy instruction. Study groups
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARIS Connect Discussions • Inquiry Team Goals; Measurable Objectives; Action Plans; and Evidence; • Shared ARIS Inquiry Space data

<p>Annual Goal #5 Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>GOAL 5: By June, 2010, engage in open exchange of information and communicate high expectations with teachers, families and students by designing and developing the PS 79 website to provide up-to-date information and collaborating with PTA Executive Board and SLT on community events.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>Measurable Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use the PS 79 website to consistently communicate information about student achievement and student learning (e.g. progress report; curricular goals and plans; monthly principal updates; etc.) ▪ Collaborate with PTA to promote involvement and leadership of families in important school activities (Learning Leaders; School Initiatives; Arts Programs; etc.) ▪ Engage families and staff in important decision-making through SLT’s CEP planning. ▪ Through PS 79 website, staff communications (nuts and bolts; staff updates; faculty conferences) and parent letters, communicate high expectations (including attendance, behavior, and academic performance and progress). ▪ Parent Coordinator provides ARIS Parent Link support to assist families in learning how to access comprehensive student data on their children. ▪ School leaders, faculty, families and community members will use technology to encourage and provide ongoing opportunities for articulation. ▪ Design and development of new computer lab to support 21st Century teaching and learning. ▪ Increased use of technology including SMART Boards and/or document cameras.
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<p>Resources: cluster teacher; classroom teachers; Computer Software and Hardware: \$8100; Source: Tax Levy NYSTL New state-of-the-art computer lab: \$250,000 Source: Reso A Grant Funding</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PS 79 website • PTA Minutes / Workshops • Comprehensive Educational Plan (CEP) • Staff and Family Communications (agendas; updates; letters)

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	0	0	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0
1	24	17	N/A	N/A	8	0	0	0
2	24	12	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0
3	30	12	N/A	N/A	1	0	1	0
4	24	24	N/A	N/A	0	0	1	0
5	36	29	5	N/A	1	0	5	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

Our basic goal is to support our students that are in need of extra help.

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).
ELA:	AIS is provided by classroom teachers 5X per week, 8:00-8:35 a.m. In addition, small group instruction is provided by AIS teachers throughout the school day: Wilson, Foundations; guided reading, phonics, writing mechanics and content, and spelling patterns and rules. Trace of students are mandated. Attendance voluntary based on teacher recommendation.
Mathematics:	AIS is provided by classroom teachers 5X per week, 8:00-8:35 a.m. In addition, small group instruction is provided by AIS teachers throughout the school day: re-teach of Everyday Math concepts; use of manipulatives and games, drill, problem solving.
Science:	During the AIS period, science content is incorporated into the read-alouds. A CTT Prep Coverage Teacher will push-in to all science cluster classes, and work with children assigned to her.
Social Studies:	Same as in Science. CTT Prep coverage teacher pushes-in to all SS classes and works with assigned students.
At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:	Sessions include: small group, individual counseling sessions, and classroom guidance lessons provided to assist at-risk students.
At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	Verbal and/or play therapy in 1:1 or small group setting during the school day. Also, provide crisis intervention for child, classroom teacher, and/or parent when necessary.
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	Counsels children on individual basis; meets with small groups of children that have family issues; is in contact with parents when appropriate.
At-risk Health-related Services:	Not applicable at this time.

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.

P.S. 79 has one fully certified ESL teacher conducting a freestanding push-in / pull-out model. 74 ELLs out of 830 total students represents 9.12% of the total student population at PS 79 as English Language Learners. These students are initially identified by administering the home Language Identification Survey (HLIS). Also included are the informal oral interview in English and in the native language, and the Language Assessment Battery – LAB-R. The ESL teacher is responsible for conducting the initial screening and administering the HLIS and LAB=R as needed. As required under CR Part 154, beginners and intermediate ELL students receive eight 45 minute periods each week. Advanced ELL students receive four 45-minute periods of ESL per week. ELL students are grouped by grade and English language proficiency. ELL students are annually evaluated using the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT).

There are structures in place at the school to ensure that parents understand the three program choices: transitional bilingual, dual language, and freestanding ESL. The school aims to stay in close contact with ELL parents. The school informs parents of HLIS administration, explains students' eligibility for ELL services, and collects and retains forms that indicate the parents' program choice for students. To encourage informed choice, the school provides parents of newly enrolled ELL's with information on the different ELL programs that are available. Because the state requires that ELL students are placed in the appropriate program within ten days of enrollment, the school provides parents with entitlement letters quickly and efficiently in order to get their timely input. The school makes every effort to ensure that all parent surveys and program selection forms are returned. There are always exceptions to the rule. If a form is not returned, the default program for ELL students is the Transitioned Bilingual Education (TBE) as per CR Part 154. However, since P.S.79 has no TBE program these students are automatically placed in the ELL Program.

Parents of ELL students often speak a language other than English. The school uses the translated materials (brochures, DVD's) and services offered by the Department of Education's Translation and Interpretation Unit, including document translation and onsite interpretation services as needed. Informational question and answer services at the school are provided through group orientations at the beginning of the year. However, the school keeps parents informed throughout the year in a number of ways: one-on-one meetings, phone conversations, regional presentations and informational packets. The parent coordinator works closely with the ELL instructional staff to coordinate school events for ELL parents and delivers translated information to them in a timely manner.

After reviewing the Parent Survey and Program Selection 4 forms for the past few years, the trend in program choices requests is as follows:

- The majority of the parents selected the ESL Program as their first choice. Since P.S. 79 offers an ESL Program, this program is aligned with what parents have been requesting.
 - Parents who selected a bilingual program as their first choice generally opted for the ESL Program so that their children could remain in the designated neighborhood school.
-

When planning academic language development, the ESL teachers take the following principles into consideration:

- Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS)
- Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP)
- Stages of reading / writing development as they align with the stages of second language development

The incorporation of content using ESL methodology, i.e. total physical response and scaffolding, is paramount in the planning of our lessons. ESL teachers vary the common functions and structures of language, as well as language patterns and prompts, depending upon the groups and on the different stages of language development.

There is also a systematic plan which guides curricular decisions. There are several determining factors, which guide these decisions. These include: (1) the stage of second language development for each student; (2) NYS ESL Learning Standards; and, (3) P.S. 79's K-5 content area curricula. For example, when implementing reading workshop with students in the pre-production or early production stage of second language development, students learn to understand that print carries a message. Students learn to enjoy listening to stories and to participate in language experience situations.

As revealed by the 2009 data patterns across proficiency levels and grades, the majority of kindergarten students showed higher scores in the listening and speaking modality. Non-English speaking kindergarten students often have pre-reading skills and scores that are higher than their listening and speaking scores. Almost one third of kindergarten students reached proficiency (9 out of 26), and half of our first grade students (4 out of 9) reached proficiency. The majority of first grade ELL students increased proficiency levels, and they continued to show higher scores in listening and speaking. The majority of second grade ELL students achieved higher scores in listening and speaking than in writing and reading. Third and fourth grade ELL students achieved higher scores in listening and speaking than in reading and writing as well.

There are several implications for the school's LAP and instruction based on the data patterns. For ELL students who are determined to be less proficient in the speaking modality, there will be a focus on language patterns and prompts. This will vary according to their stage of language development. For example, a beginner in speaking would be introduced to such language patterns as "yes-no responses" and such conversational prompts as "Where is the cat sitting?" An advanced speaker of English might be introduced to coordinating conjunctions i.e., however, therefore, neither/nor and advanced students will be given language prompts such as, "What is your opinion about ____?" For second grade ELL students who are determined to be deficient in the reading modality, different approaches are applicable. For example, silent stage ELL readers might be read aloud to whereas students in the early production stage might be asked to name characters in the pictures of familiar books. Students in the speech emergence stage might describe characters and setting in independent reading books. ELL students with intermediate fluency might be asked to generate relevant questions after listening to information. Third and fourth graders, who are deficient in writing as well as in reading, might be asked to label pictures with key vocabulary (silent stage) or elaborate a moment in time in a narrative text using age appropriate words (early production stage). For advanced ELL third and fourth graders, who are deficient in the areas of reading and writing, language scaffolds such as a chart of phrases with language models or graphic organizers might be provided when they are working in a nonfiction unit.

There is differentiated instruction for ELL subgroups. Beginning ELL students should be involved in content-based experiential learning activities which facilitates acquisition of academic language proficiency. All children experience the balanced literary approach with an emphasis on using pictures, gestures, voice inflection, dramatization, and nonverbal responses for reading comprehension. These ELL students also benefit from shared reading.

Writing scaffolds for beginning ELL students includes oral discussion, partner stories using pictures and books containing only pictures, pattern poems and creating concept books. Strategies to assist intermediate writers include sentence models and mapping. Modified guided reading, during which the modifications include detailed vocabulary instruction and variables containing second language text structures i.e. syntax.

Since *Students With Interrupted Formal Education* do not have literacy skills in their native language, they do not have literacy skills to transfer to the second language. They need to be led through the initial stages of reading and writing in which awareness of the connection between oral language and print emerges. In the case of SIFE students teaching of reading and writing in the second language (L2) must be based on the same principles that the language approach to teach literacy in L2. The teaching must have these characteristics: (1) build on the child's oral language; (2) be intrinsically meaningful; (3) have communication as their primary purpose; and, (4) be motivating to children. The ESL teacher is taking the above knowledge into consideration when teaching SIFE students by using such techniques as the language experience approach and shared reading with big books.

The services provided to long-term ELL students include group instruction in which learning in the content area is scaffolded. Additionally, targeted interventions, such as AIS extended day instruction and attendance in non-mandated resource room classes, are often used to support ELL students with ELA, math and other content areas.

The instructional materials used to support ELLs include content area as well as language materials. One language material used is *English At Your Command*, published by Hampton-Brown. The introductory level of this series shows second and third grade beginner to intermediate ELLs how to communicate, organize their ideas and write about them. The Encore Edition which is targeted for fourth and fifth grade intermediate to advanced students, is a language arts instructional tool. Several accompanying Big Books contain such items as charts, wipe-off graphic organizers and vocabulary with enlarged visuals. *English to a Beat*, another tool published by Hampton-Brown, develops oral language, literacy, grammar, vocabulary and writing. *Where Is Taro?* by Harcourt Brace and Company, is an ESL novel, and is used with grades two to five beginning to intermediate levels. Patterned Big Books (i.e. *Mrs. Wishy Washy*, published by The Wright Group), are used to model word works, syntax, comprehension, and other reading strategies. *Words Their Way with English Learners*, published by Prentice Hall, offers word study for phonics, vocabulary and spelling instruction.

As previously mentioned, for the instructional materials used to support ELLs include content area as well. *Comprehension Strategies for ELLs* published by Scholastic, is a resource for teaching strategies and scaffolds that help students read, understand and really learn content from their textbooks, and other non-fiction materials. *Everyday Math* is used as a resource for problem-solving skills, crucial math vocabulary for each grade and manipulative activities to enhance ELLs math progress. Third, fourth and fifth grade social studies, science, and math textbooks are used in order to align the ESL and mainstream standards. Finally, National Geographic and Rigby publish content-based fiction and content-based science and social studies trade books, posters, transparencies and charts specifically designed for ELLs.

To promote motivational and lively English Language Learning, other instructional materials are used. Manipulatives (such as Sight Word Cubes) , language games (such as Sight Word Bingo, puppets, language songs) are among the instructional materials used.

Professional Development Program

Staff development will take place on an ongoing basis. Professional Development sessions offered by the district model and explore such ELL-related topics as incorporating language goals into literature, math and other content areas. Articulation involves an exchange of approaches,

curriculum and materials between classroom and ELL teachers so that ELLs can best be served and ELL and mainstream classroom instruction can be aligned with one another. In addition, teachers, special education teachers, and special education paraprofessionals will receive 7.5 hours (or 10 hours for special education teachers and special education paraprofessionals) of training on ESL strategies which serves in part to satisfy Jose P. training. This training will be provided by our network support specialist for ELLs, Giuvella Leisengang, and special education, throughout the school year.

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) K - 5 **Number of Students to be Served:** 56 **LEP** **Non-LEP**

Number of Teachers 1 **Other Staff (Specify)** Classroom Teachers; Support Staff

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.

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.

I. Instructional Program

- a. Description of Program – The program builds self-esteem in each target student by facilitating successful second language acquisition (listening, speaking, reading, writing.) Students receive instruction in a holistic, fun and comfortable environment. Oral/aural communication is encouraged through the utilization of the expressive arts (music, dance,

drama) in addition to role-play and total physical response. The involvement of ELLs in content-based experiential learning activities facilitates acquisition of academic language proficiency.

Students are grouped by grade and English language proficiency. The utilized program design is the outer classroom model in which ESL services are provided to target children in a setting outside of the regular classroom.

- b. Number of classes in program – 7
- c. Language of instruction - English
- d. Instructional strategies, activities and programs being implemented to ensure that LEP students meet the standards and pass the required 4th grade State assessments.
- e. The NYS Dept. of Education Actions Steps for ELLs provides for intensive English language instruction (beginning and intermediate ELLs will be serviced for 360 minutes per week.) These Steps support an extended school day and year.
- f. Three study group cycles will be created during the 2009-2010 school year to provide teams of teachers with collaborative ELL staff development. In November 2009, the topic of Who Are The Second Language Learners In My Class? Will be presented to the staff. In February 2009, the topic of How Does a Child Learn a Second Language? will be shared. In April of 2009, the topic of Strategies in Second Language Learning will be shared. Professional texts will be used as the conduit for learning.
- g. In an effort to develop a common instructional focus and a coherent school culture, professional collaborations will be supported through inter-visitations and time to study student and teacher work with the goal of improving instructional and student outcomes.
- h. As per the Chancellor's recommendations for ELLs the program for ELLs will be aligned with the comprehensive core curriculum in mathematics and literacy.

Integrating ESL methodologies into the balanced literacy approach

- 1) ELLs are included in the read aloud, interactive read aloud and shared reading experience by using pictures, gestures and voice inflection to convey meaning, pointing to pictures and words as you read, dramatizing, providing realia and manipulatives, allowing students to respond non-verbally to comprehension questions.
- 2) Some ESL teaching techniques that include ELLs in the guided reading approach are: pre-teaching basic vocabulary, key phrases and concepts from selection by using realia, visuals, gestures and dramatization, "picture walks", "echo reading", finding clues for inferential questions.
- 3) ELLs are included in the independent reading experience by having available leveled library books, i.e., beginning books would include picture and concept books.
- 4) Other balanced literacy approaches include: reading partnership with English speaking and/or bilingual partners and reading conference.

Integrating ESL methodologies into the Writing Process Approach

- 1) Some of the writing scaffolds for beginning ELLs are: oral discussion, partner stories using pictures and wordless books, creating concept books, creating peek-a-boo stories or riddle books, pattern poems, from personal journals to dialogue journals to buddy journals, clustering.
- 2) Strategies to assist intermediate writers include Show and Not Tell, sentence combining or shortening, sentence models, mapping.

Integrating ESL Methodologies into the Math Workshop Model

Use of manipulatives to reinforce learning, problem-solving techniques; working with the math coach.

Integrating ESL Methodologies into the teaching of literacy and writing to lower grade and older non-literate students (SIFE – Students with interrupted formal education)

- 1) Use of Whole Language Approach utilizing Language Experience Approach, Shared Reading with Big Books and Sustained Silent Reading.
- 2) Whole Language methods that promote writing in L2 are dictated stories/creative writing, story completion, and dialogue journal writing.

The NYS Dept. of Education Action Steps for ELLs calls for improving identification and assessment. The LAB-R and NYSESLAT are not only more comprehensive than previous assessment tools, but also assess the language proficiency levels and areas of needed improvement.

- II. Parent/Community involvement- There is an initial parent orientation meeting scheduled in early October, 2009 for newly enrolled “potential ELLs”. For students enrolled during the school year, parent orientation sessions are conducted on an as-needed basis. At each parent orientation session, the following information will be provided to parents in English and, to the extent practicable, their home language: 1) An overview and information about services/program for ELLs; 2) Information about how continuity of participation in a program, be it bilingual or ESL, promotes student performance; 3) Information about the requirement that once selections are made, it is for the duration of the school year or school term; 4) Information that parents have the right to withdraw their child from a bilingual program; 5) an opportunity to ask questions; 6) an opportunity to view the video tape, “The Parent Connection: A Resource for Parents of Newly Enrolled English Language Learners”. 7) A copy of the Parent-Connection-Parent’s Guide; 8) A Parent Survey and Program Selection Form; 9) Information about the requirement that if the Parent Survey and Program Selection Form is not returned, their child will be placed in a bilingual program at the school if there are sufficient numbers to do so, or in an ESL program; 10) As per the Chancellor’s seven recommendations for ELLs, the parent coordinator will be introduced to parents at this meeting in order to improve communication with parents and families of ELLs.

Parents of ELLs are involved in their child’s ESL progress through regularly scheduled parent/teacher conferences. They are updated as to their child’s progress through class report cards as well as ESL progress reports. Parents are encouraged to become active in the PTA, to attend class trips and volunteer for class activities, to attend adult ESL classes and to network among each other.

- III. Project Jump Start – At the time of registration in the spring, prior to the opening of school in September, the Home language Identification Survey is administered to parents of all students new to the NYC public school system. These HLIS forms are reviewed immediately upon return to identify “potential ELLs” (i.e. those students who have a home language other than English and are eligible to be LAB tested).

This process expedites the testing procedures to be followed in the fall of the following school year. At this time, a parent orientation is scheduled for all newly admitted “potential ELLs”. Parents are informed about the ESL program, procedures, and the selection process (in the event that their child becomes eligible for ESL or bilingual services.)

For students enrolled during the school year, parent orientation sessions are conducted on an as needed basis. Identification of ELLs is determined by administering and scoring the LAB-R to determine whether the student is entitled to a bilingual or ESL program. Parents are informed of the child's entitlement to a bilingual or ESL program by sending a copy of the new ELL Entitlement Letter with the Parent Survey and Program Selection Form attached.

The school makes every effort to stay in close contact with ELL parents, from administering the HLIS, to informing them of their child's eligibility for ELL services, to collecting forms that indicate the parent's program choice for their child. All of these forms are translated versions. Parents are informed with information on the different ELL programs that are available through translated brochures and DVD's provided by the Office of ELLs. Because parents often speak a language other than English P.S. 79 uses services offered by the Translation and Interpretation Unit, including document translation, phone conversations and onsite interpretation services, as needed. Translation and interpretation services, usually provided by parent volunteers, are utilized for phone conferences or any communication to parents of ELLs that needs to be sent home. People come in during Parent/Teacher conferences to provide translation through LIS (Language Interpretation Services)

Testing data, that is language proficiency levels based on the LAB-R or NYSESLAT, and which students are eligible for continued ESL services, are reported to all teachers involved in instructing ELLs. However, they are not always provided in a timely manner due to the lack of immediate ATS access to the NYSESLAT scores. In addition, the NYSESLAT data, unlike the ELA data, does not indicate specific areas of weakness. It merely indicates which modalities the student is weaker or stronger in. Therefore, it is not very useful in informing instruction. The school will need additional support from central to address this issue.

A language instruction education program funded under Title III is in the process of being structured and planned.

Professional Development Program –

The school provides translated informational documents, surveys, and notifications to parents of ELL's during the identification and placement process: The Home Language Identification Survey, The ELL Parent Brochure, Parent Survey and Program Selection Form, Parent Notifications, Entitlement Letter, Non Entitlement Letter, Placement Letter. The school also provides oral interpretations for parent teacher conferences and for meetings with administration and teachers.

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

School: P.S. 79 Francis Lewis BEDS Code: 342500010079

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

Allocation Amount:		
Budget Category	Budgeted Amount	Explanation of expenditures in this category as it relates to the program narrative for this title.
Professional salaries (schools must account for fringe benefits) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Per session - Per diem 	\$9,978 \$1,848 (Total: \$ 11, 826)	200 hours of per session for ESL and General Ed teacher to support ELL students: 200 hours X \$49.89 (current teacher per session rate with fringe) = \$ 9,978.00) 3 days of staff development / curriculum mapping for ESL and general ed teachers to support ELL students: 4 teachers X \$154.00 (current per diem rate for substitute teachers) X 3 days = \$1848.00
Purchased services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High quality staff and curriculum development contracts. 	(0)	ICI Network Support Liasion – Giuvela Leisengang, working with teachers and administrators 1 day a week in cycles on development of curriculum enhancements
Supplies and materials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Must be supplemental. - Additional curricula, instructional materials. - Must be clearly listed. 	\$1200	Books on Tape, Headphones, Book Bins, Leveled Books
Educational Software (Object Code 199)	(0)	Example: 2 Rosetta Stone language development software packages for after school program
Travel		
Other		
TOTAL	\$15.026	

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.
 - Home Language Surveys
 - Feedback from Parent Coordinator
 - Teacher Observations
 - The RBOB Report on ATS
 - Responses from students and parents
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.

There has been an increase of parents not proficient in the English language. Very often, written correspondence to the parents' needs to be written in various languages. In addition, interpreters are needed during parent-teacher conferences, and parent meetings held at the school. The findings were reported to the community during student registration, during PTA meetings, and Open School Week.

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 Translation and Interpretation Unit will translate documents that are distributed to parents who do not speak English. The school will send flyers, permission slips, parent handbooks, memorandums, and other written correspondence. This service is at no cost to the school.

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.

The Translation and Interpretation Unit will offer free over the phone interpretation into over 100 languages to help our school communicate with parents/children with whom communication would be otherwise difficult at best.

LIS-Translations, an on-site interpreting vendor for the NYCDOE will provide the use of interpreters for parent-teacher conferences, PTA meetings, IEP meetings, and workshops. Per hour rates are based on the language selected.

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>

Attachment A in regards to Chancellor's Regulations A-663 will be placed in the main lobby and parent room. This attachment will be translated into Korean, Chinese, Spanish, and Greek, since these languages represent a large number of parents in the school. In addition, the above languages will be represented on forms regarding citywide, regional, or school-wide meetings. Furthermore, The School Safety Plan will specify the procedures to parents ensuring that they can communicate with the school and will not be hindered by language barrier

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:		\$292,549	\$292,549
2. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside for Parent Involvement:			
3. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside to Improve Parent Involvement (ARRA Language):		\$2925	
4. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified:			
5. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect – HQ PD (ARRA Language):		\$14, 627	
6. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Professional Development:			
7. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect (Professional Development) (ARRA Language):		\$33,600	

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.

2. School-wide reform strategies that:
 - a) Provide opportunities for all children to meet the State's proficient and advanced levels of student academic achievement.
 - b) Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically-based research that:
 - Increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as extended school year, before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities.
 - Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.
 - Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.
 - Address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of low academic achieving children and those at risk of not meeting the State academic content standards and are members of the target population of any program that is included in the School-wide 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.
 - Using inquiry teams, identifying and implementing effective strategies in differentiated learning and targeting low performing populations such as ELL, special education, and students in the bottom third.

3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.
100% of staff is highly qualified.

4. High-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals (and, where appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff) to enable all children in the Schoolwide Program to meet the State's student academic standards.
Partnership with Columbia University Teachers College, Intel, Instructional Cabinets, and Inquiry Teams

5. Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.
See Part B 1 and 2.

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

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

8. Measures to include teachers in the decisions regarding the use of academic assessments in order to provide information on, and to improve, the achievement of individual students and the overall instructional program.
Instructional Cabinets, Inquiry Teams, Vertical Planning Sessions, Cross Curriculum Inquiry Teams

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.
Extended day, AIS, Child Study and Special Inquiry Teams, Learning Leaders, CTT Classes, Monthly Pupil Personnel and Evaluation meetings
10. Coordination and integration of Federal, State, and local services and programs, including programs supported under NCLB, i.e., violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, vocational and technical education, and job training.
N/A

Part D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

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

Part A: For All Schools Identified for Improvement

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

Part B: For Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

¹ School Under Registration Review (SURR)

APPENDIX 6: SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS UNDER REGISTRATION REVIEW (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.

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

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Background

From 2006 to 2008, the New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE) and the New York State Education Department (NYSED) commissioned an “audit of the written, tested, and taught curriculum” to fulfill an accountability requirement of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act for districts identified for “corrective action.” The focus of the audit was on the English language arts (ELA) and mathematics curricula for all students, including students with disabilities (SWDs) and English language learners (ELLs). The audit examined the alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment as well as other key areas—such as professional development and school and district supports—through multiple lenses of data collection and analysis. The utilized process was a collaborative one, intended not to find fault but to generate findings in concert with school and district constituency representatives to identify and overcome barriers to student success. As such, the audit findings are not an end in themselves but will facilitate important conversations at (and between) the central, SSO, and school levels in order to identify and address potential gaps in ELA and math curriculum and instructional programs and ensure alignment with the state standards and assessments.

Directions: All schools are expected to reflect on the seven (7) key findings of the “audit of the written, tested, and taught curriculum” outlined below, and respond to the applicable questions that follow each section.

CURRICULUM AUDIT FINDINGS

KEY FINDING 1: CURRICULUM

Overall: There was limited evidence found to indicate that the ELA and mathematics curricula in use are fully aligned to state standards. Although New York City is a standards-based system, teachers do not have the tools they need to provide standards-based instruction to all students at all levels, particularly ELLs. There is a lack of understanding across teachers, schools, and audited districts regarding what students should understand and be able to do at each level in ELA and mathematics.

1A. English Language Arts

Background

A curriculum that is in alignment will present the content to be taught (as outlined by the state standards), with links to the following: an array of resources from which teachers may choose in teaching this content; a pacing calendar and/or suggested timeframe for covering the curriculum material; a description of expectations for both the teacher’s role and the student level of cognitive demand to be exhibited; and a defined set of student outcomes—that is, what the student should know and be able to do as a result of having mastered this curriculum. The New York State ELA Standards identify seven different areas of reading (decoding, word recognition, print awareness, fluency, background knowledge and vocabulary, comprehension, and motivation to read) and five different areas of writing (spelling, handwriting, text production, composition, motivation to write) that are addressed to different degrees across grade levels. Although

listening and speaking are addressed within the New York State ELA Standards, they are not further subdivided into topic areas. A written curriculum missing literacy competencies or performance indicators at any grade level will impact the alignment of the curriculum to state standards. A written curriculum that does not address the areas in reading identified by the state standards will also impact vertical and horizontal alignment within and between schools by creating gaps in the Grades K–12 curriculum. *Vertical alignment* is defined as the literacy knowledge addressed at a grade level that builds upon and extends learning from the previous grade level, whereas *horizontal alignment* refers to agreement between what is taught by teachers addressing a common subject across a single grade level.

ELA Alignment Issues:

- **Gaps in the Written Curriculum.** Data show that the written curriculum in use by many schools is not aligned with the state standards in terms of the range of topics covered and the depth of understanding required. All reviewed curricula had gaps relative to the New York State ELA standards. The fewest gaps were found at Grade 2, but the gaps increased as the grade levels increased. Interviewed staff in a number of the schools that were audited reported less consistent and effective curriculum and instruction at the secondary level. These data further indicated that curricula were not adequately articulated—less articulated in secondary than elementary schools.
- **Curriculum Maps.** The curriculum alignment analyses noted that although a number of curriculum maps had been developed, the mapping has been done at a topical level only and does not drill down to an expected level of cognitive demand that will indicate to teachers what students should know and be able to do at each grade level. These curriculum maps addressed only content topics—not skills to be mastered, strategies to be utilized, or student outcomes to be attained.
- **Taught Curriculum.** The *Surveys of Enacted Curriculum (SEC)*² data also show that the taught curriculum is not aligned to the state standards. For example, in the reviewed high school-level ELA classes, auditors observed a great disparity between what is taught and the depth to which it should be taught. A similar lack of depth can be seen in elementary and middle grades as well (specifically Grades 2, 4, 5, and 6) and Grade 8. As one might look at it, the taught ELA curriculum is quite broad but lacks depth in any one area. Although standards indicate that instruction should be focused on having students create written products and spoken presentations, SEC data show quite the opposite. There is very little emphasis on speaking and listening and only a moderately higher level of emphasis on writing. Critical reading also is supposed to have a much greater depth than is currently occurring in high school English classes.
- **ELA Materials.** In a number of the audited schools, teachers interviewed indicate that they have sufficient amounts of curriculum materials available to them; however, the materials they have are not adequate to meet the needs of all learners, particularly English language learners, students with disabilities, and struggling readers. Further, the materials in use are reportedly often not relevant to

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

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

– **English Language Learners**

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

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

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

School members (administrators and faculty) met monthly, or at the end of each unit of study, to analyze a wide range of formative and summative data- School's Progress Report, TcPro Assessment for concepts of print, letter & letter-sound identification, decoding, fluent word identification, fluency and comprehension, NYStart for ELA and NYSESLAT results, feedback from grade conference meetings, teachers' conference notes, student work, classroom assessments and teachers' action research.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

Gaps in Written Curriculum: N/A

Curriculum Maps: N/A

Taught Curriculum: N/A

ELA Materials: Applicable

English Language Learners: 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?

Gaps in Written Curriculum: PS 79 uses the Teachers College Reading and Writing Project Curricular Plan and Calendar Day supports to teach ELA. Administrators and teachers meet monthly, or at the end of units, to review and reflect upon written ELA curriculum units. Teachers meet up to 3 times weekly in common prep periods to write, review, revise and reflect upon ELA lesson plans.

Curriculum Maps: Each grade has developed and follows appropriate reading/writing curriculum maps that include goals, teaching points and assessments for each ELA unit. Grades work collaboratively up to 3 times weekly to reflect on the progress of curriculum. Grade level teachers meet with administrators monthly to review progress and reflect upon their work.

Taught Curriculum: PS 79 utilizes the Teachers College Reading and Writing Project - a balanced literacy approach which emphasizes reading, writing, listening and speaking components

ELA Materials: Feedback from grade conferences indicate that teachers feel that the ELA materials provided are not sufficient to support classroom instruction and the learning needs of English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities and struggling readers. Additional leveled reading texts in both fiction and nonfiction are needed.

English Language Learners: NYSESLAT & ELA results, teacher feedback at grade conferences, action research, and student work indicate that ELL instruction are starting to become aligned with classroom instruction. Additional supports for both classroom and ELL teachers would be beneficial.

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.

ELA Materials

- School members (administrators, classroom teachers, ELL teachers, Special Education teachers and core subject cluster teachers) should work collaboratively to examine materials currently used and to discuss materials needed to support ELA instruction for English Language Learners, Students with Disabilities and struggling readers.
- School could use additional financial support from Central to address this issue.

English Language Learners:

- School members (administrators, classroom teachers, ELL teachers and core subject cluster teachers) should meet monthly, or at the end of ELA units, to analyze formative and summative data and to reflect on instruction and student learning and progress.

- Provide professional development for ELL teachers in ELA standards and reading and writing instruction.
- Provide professional development for faculty in New York State Learning Standards for ESL.
- School could use additional staff development support from Central to address this issue.

1B. Mathematics

Background

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

Specific Math Alignment Issues:

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

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

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

School members (administrators and faculty that include SETTS and ELL teachers) created and integrated a process that systematically collected a range of relevant mathematical data on a monthly basis or at the completion of each instructional unit. Data was analyzed that included but was not limited to: the New York Predictive Math Assessments, classroom assessments and projects, and feedback from grade conferences.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

According to the NYCDOE 2007-2008 Quality Review, "The school aligns its academic work, strategic decisions and resources, and effectively engages students around its plans and goals for accelerating student learning." In addition, data based on the New York State Math Assessment shows that 96% of our student population achieved "on or above grade" (3 or 4) for the year 2008.

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

KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION

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

2A – ELA Instruction

Classroom observations in audited schools show that direct instruction was the dominant instructional orientation for ELA instruction in almost 62 percent of K–8 classrooms. (In direct instruction, the teacher may use lecture- or questioning-type format. It includes instances when the teacher explains a concept, reads to students, or guides students in practicing a concept.) Direct instruction also was observed

either frequently or extensively in approximately 54 percent of the high school ELA classrooms visited. On a positive note, high academically focused class time (an estimate of the time spent engaged in educationally relevant activities) was observed frequently or extensively in more than 85 percent of K–8 classrooms visited, though this number fell slightly to just over 75 percent of classrooms at the high school level. Student engagement in ELA classes also was observed to be high – observed frequently or extensively 71 percent of the time in Grades K–8, but this percentage shrank to 49 percent at the high school level. Finally, independent seatwork (students working on self-paced worksheets or individual assignments) was observed frequently or extensively in approximately 32 percent of the K–8 ELA classrooms visited and just over 34 percent of classrooms in high school.

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

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

School members (administrators and faculty) met monthly, or at the end of each unit of study, to analyze a wide range of formative and summative data- School's Progress Report, TCPro Assessment for concepts of print, letter & letter-sound identification, decoding, fluent word identification, fluency and comprehension, nyStart for ELA and NYSESLAT results, feedback from grade conference meetings, teachers' conference notes, student work, classroom assessments and teachers' action research.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

During the 2008-2009 school year, the process that our school engaged in was a workshop model. The model included direct instruction, student independent work and teacher input. Therefore, the finding that the students are frequently and extensively focused on reading and writing was evident at PS79.

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?

According to the NYCDOE 2007-2008 Quality Review:

"Quality Statement 3 – Align Instructional Strategy to Goals: The school aligns its academic work, strategic decisions and resources, and effectively engages students around its plans and goals for accelerating student learning.

This area of the school's work is outstanding.

The school has extremely good procedures for ensuring that teaching and planning decisions reflect its development priorities and learning goals. Teachers base their instruction on curriculum plans that provide frequent opportunities to assess student progress in order to

modify teaching strategies. Teaching is very effective and lessons are well organized to include differentiated work matched to students' needs. The curriculum is broad and balanced, with all students having the opportunity to study art and music as well as the other core subjects. The school also provides a range of optional after-school activities that give further opportunities to experience the arts. Planned future activities include drama and puppetry. All students have the opportunity to use computers in the laboratory but they are not used enough to enhance classroom learning, although some teachers are more skilled than others in this respect. Teachers plan their work carefully to make lessons interesting and enjoyable. The principal encourages teachers to use a wide range of strategies such as, for example, problem-solving work in math. This allows the students to have some responsibility for their learning and to think for themselves. Personal responsibility and respect are encouraged and evident throughout the school. Students enjoy being at school and their attendance is above average. Strategic planning decisions, such as budgeting and staffing, are aimed at meeting the school's learning goals. This was illustrated in the school's decision to eliminate the math and literacy coach positions due to budgetary constraints. The principal plans to use the savings to provide high-quality professional development and to reduce class sizes, which would have been impossible if the coaches had been retained. The principal and assistant principal are specialists in math and literacy, respectively, and they will provide support for these subjects. Monitoring of the delivery of math and literacy to ensure that these new strategies for support are effective in maintaining standards have not yet been established. The quality of teaching, strategic planning and the curriculum contribute greatly to the school's success."

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

2B – Mathematics Instruction

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

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

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

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

School members (administrators and faculty that include SETTS and ELL teachers) created and integrated a process that systematically collected a range of relevant mathematical data on a monthly basis or at the completion of each instructional unit. Data was analyzed that included but was not limited to: the New York Predictive Math Assessments, classroom assessments and projects, and feedback from grade conferences.

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?

Direct, individual, group and differentiated instruction are reflective of the school's priorities and goals. Teaching is effective as evidenced by the successful achievements of the students on the 2008 State Math Assessment. Instruction is based on a well planned and orchestrated math curriculum calendar. The school provides optional after-school math activities as well as one-to-one volunteer parent tutoring. Teachers have the opportunity to engage in meaningful professional development learning new strategies and methods of problem solving to utilize in the classroom. The principal and assistant principal encourage and support new and often "untested" ideas if they will have a positive impact on instruction. Planning, teaching, monitoring and revisiting goals contribute to a successful academic program.

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

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.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

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.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

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

KEY FINDING 5: DATA USE AND MONITORING—ELL INSTRUCTION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

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

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

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.

The school has reviewed the IEPs of students, conferred with general and special education teachers through grade and school wide conferences, and instituted a policy that complies with 408 regulations regarding IEP access. The result has been to determine that this finding does not apply.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

Both general and special education teachers participate fully in instructional staff development. Current staff development includes techniques for differentiated instruction and working with the reluctant reader. All but 12 special education students are in regular or CTT classroom settings with full access to the general education curriculum. All teaching staff is provided complete copies of student IEPs and have trained staff available for assistance implementing those plans. The school uses the Balanced Literacy approach and emphasizes differentiated instruction.

Sp. Ed. Teachers participate equally with Gen. Ed teachers in attending T.C. training sessions. Gen. Ed. Teachers are quite familiar with the students who have IEPs and the nature of their individual needs. The special education supervisor regularly reviews test modifications and appropriate implementation of them with classroom teachers. Classroom teachers have been given copies of all IEPs and receive annual/triennial updates. Other school personnel that work with students also have copies of IEPs. Several teachers have been trained to utilize the Wilson Program in our CTT classes and in Grades K and 1, teachers were trained in Foundations, an off-shoot of the Wilson Program and implement it in their classrooms daily. School has a full time IEP teacher who acts as liaison between Sp. Ed service providers and Gen. Ed teachers to answer questions and share strategies on implementing plans for achieving individual academic/behavioral goals.

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.

The school has reviewed students' IEPs, conferred with special education teachers, School Based Support Team personnel, and Pupil Personnel Committee members to review these findings and determined some elements apply.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

A review of IEPs has shown that while some state modifications for classroom instruction, others do not. Some lack the desired level of specificity. Behavioral plans and interventions are consistent and adequate. Instructional goals are aligned with promotional criteria.

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.

The Pupil Personnel committee assists special education teachers to determine a range of appropriate classroom modifications to use when preparing IEPs. The School Based Support Team monitors their inclusion through the Annual Review Process.

School will provide staff development for Sp. Ed. Teachers and related services providers on writing IEPs. A review of selected IEPs indicates that some students have specific interventions listed. However, there is some evidence that instructional modifications are not consistently noted.

The alignment of goals, objectives, and modified promotional criteria with state testing is not an issue. Academic goals both long-term and short-term are based on the state standards. The modifications to Promotional Criteria for those applicable students do not exclude participation in standard state testing but allow a greater weight for classroom performance and alternative teacher assessment to determine promotion.

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.)

At the present time, there are no students in temporary housing.

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

These plans are not currently needed.

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.