



**PS/MS 114
THE BELLE HARBOR SCHOOL
2009-2010
SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)**

SCHOOL: 27Q114
**ADDRESS: 400 BEACH 135 STREET
BELLE HARBOR, NY 11694**
TELEPHONE: 718-634-3382
FAX: 718-945-4510

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE	3
SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE.....	4
SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE.....	5
Part A. Narrative Description	5
Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot	Error! Bookmark not defined.
SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT	9
SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS	16
SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN	17
REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2008-2009.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
APPENDIX 2: PROGRAM DELIVERY FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELLs).....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION	Error! Bookmark not defined.
APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS	38
APPENDIX 5: NCLB/SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS IN NEED OF IMPROVEMENT (SINI) AND SCHOOLS REQUIRING ACADEMIC PROGRESS (SRAP).....	42
APPENDIX 6: SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS UNDER REGISTRATION REVIEW (SURR).....	43
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.....	44
APPENDIX 8: CONTRACT FOR EXCELLENCE (C4E) SCHOOL-BASED EXPENDITURES FOR 2009-10..	Error! Bookmark not defined.

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: PS/MS 114 **SCHOOL NAME:** The Belle Harbor School

DISTRICT: 27 **SSO NAME/NETWORK #:** The Knowledge Network

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 400 Beach 135 Street Belle Harbor, NY 11694

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 718-634-3382 **FAX:** 718-945-4510

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Stephen P. Grill **EMAIL ADDRESS:** sgrill2@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON Eileen Bellettiere

PRINCIPAL Stephen P. Grill

UFT CHAPTER LEADER Judith Davidson

**PARENTS' ASSOCIATION
PRESIDENT** Kristine Memoli & Jeannette Calciano
Co-Presidents

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE
(Required for high schools) _____

**COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
SUPERINTENDENT** Michelle Lloyd-Bey

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

Directions: There should be one School Leadership Team (SLT) for each school. As per the *Chancellor’s Regulations for School Leadership Teams*, **SLT membership must include an equal number of parents and staff** (students and CBO representatives are not counted when assessing the balance), and ensure representation of all school constituencies. 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 Chancellor’s Regulations A-655 on SLT’s; 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 an explanation in lieu of his/her signature.*

Name	Position/Constituency Represented	Signature
Stephen P. Grill	*Principal or Designee	
Judith Davidson	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
	Student Representative, if applicable	
Linda Buis	Para Professional	
Janice Daly	Teacher /Renzulli Facilitator	
Laura Ferragamo	Teacher (Middle School) Envision Mathematics Program Facilitator	
Christine Healy	Teacher (Speech Provider)	
Eileen Bellettiere	Parent (SLT Chair)	
Nancy Corrigan	Parent	
Jill McDade	Parent	
Marie Moriarty	Parent	
Aileen-Mullen-Smith	Parent	

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

* Core (mandatory) SLT members.

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

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

PS/MS 114 is located in Belle Harbor, NY, in the western portion of the Rockaway Peninsula. The Belle Harbor School is an elementary-middle school with 811 students from kindergarten through grade 8. The school population comprises 2.84% Black, 5.3% Hispanic, 89.54% White, 2.2% Asian students and 0.12% American Indian or Alaskan native. The student body includes 1.6% English language learners and 17.02% special education students (IEP). Boys account for 53.14% of the students enrolled and girls account for 48.86%.

Our school possesses many distinctive qualities, including, historically above average academic performance and strong parent/community involvement. We are an original Core Knowledge School with school-wide implementation. We house 29 classes (K-8) and a Departmentalized Middle School. There is one self-contained special education bridge class (Grade 3-4) and two CTT classes (Grades 4 and 7). District 75 students from a neighboring school mainstream into our general education classes.

PS/MS 114's facilities consist of a Library integrated with technology. We maintain a dedicated Science Lab for the instruction of our middle school students, as well as, a gymnasium, and auditorium containing a state of the art sound and projection system. There is a Guided Reading bookroom that contains leveled trade books to support our Balanced Literacy Program and a Core Knowledge Resource Room.

Our onsite UFT Teacher Center specialist supports our teachers. The Administration structures an individual professional development plan based on teacher need and self-reflection. Professional development is conducted weekly during a double block period.

Just as professional development is differentiated for teachers, student instruction is differentiated. Classroom teachers plan and provide for each child's individual needs. Our AIS program structure is unique. There are two components. out of classroom providers, as well as, classroom teachers who provide small group AIS instruction to a flexible grouping of students during an embedded AIS period. Assessment data drives student instruction. The diagnostic-prescriptive approach is used to target students' strengths, and weaknesses and to formulate flexible groups. Monthly collaborative articulation meetings are held to facilitate classroom and AIS teacher communication.

Grade level collaborative teams plan instructional activities and create innovative ways of providing rigorous instruction. Collaboration between all instructors (cross grad/cluster) provides a consistent approach to instruction, differentiation, assessment and goal setting.

We maintain an extensive Arts program (visual arts, vocal and instrumental music program). Infusion of the Arts throughout the Core Knowledge Curriculum provides thematic interdisciplinary instruction. Because of this alignment, students participate in trips related to their topics of study. Students

participate in the Music Memory Program, Stage Band, Marching Band, Glee Club and Ball Room Dancing. Our Middle School students perform in an annual talent show, and students K-8 showcase their talents during the Annual Irish Heritage Assembly. .

The Rockaway Artists Alliance (RAA) will initiate an onsite after school enrichment program for our students this year. Additionally, PS/MS 114 has received a \$20,000 CASA grant, which will partner us with the Queens Theatre for their "Theatre in the Park" program.

We provide many student enrichment programs. Students may challenge themselves in Mathematics through the offering of Integrated Algebra ARP (6-8) and Game 24(6-8) and the newly adapted Envision Mathematics Program. In the area of Science, a course in the Living Environment ARP (7-8) is offered. Foreign Language acceleration is offered through Language Proficiency in grades (7-8). The Renzulli School-Wide Enrichment Model has been implemented this year, in an effort to further challenge and enrich all students. There is a technology "Mouse Squad" for our middle schools students, as well as a Science Fair and Robotics program. Foreign language is offered to all students in grades 1-8. In the area of athletics, we offer our students intramural sports, CHAMPS, Morning Yoga and a Cheerleading Squad.

In order to accommodate those students who have attained AYP, as well as our academically at-risk students, the **After School Academy** was created. In order to promote the attendance of our higher functioning students, we have created "Enrichment Clubs", such as Spanish, Glee Club, Yoga, Renzulli Club, and a creative writing enrichment club during the extended day time allotment.

Our active and generous PTA Enrichment Committee provides entertaining learning opportunities through the funding of many enrichment programs as well as the purchase of materials. Through our partnership with the PS/MS 114 parent body, and the establishment of an open, ongoing dialogue, parents, teachers and administrators share thoughts and ideas, solve problems collaboratively, and continually champion for the best interests of our students.

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT									
School Name:		P.S. / M.S. 114 Belle Harbor							
District:		27	DBN:		27Q114	School BEDS Code:		342700010114	
DEMOGRAPHICS									
Grades Served:		Pre-K	√	3	√	7	√	11	
		K	√	4	√	8	√	12	
		1	√	5	√	9		Ungraded	√
		2	√	6	√	10			
Enrollment					Attendance - % of days students attended:				
<i>(As of October 31)</i>		2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	<i>(As of June 30)</i>		2006-07	2007-08*	2008-09
Pre-K		36	36	13			93.5	94.1	94.9
Kindergarten		105	135	142					
Grade 1		109	102	136	Student Stability - % of Enrollment:				
Grade 2		117	113	102	<i>(As of June 30)</i>		2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 3		107	105	118			98.4	97.8	99.5
Grade 4		105	105	118	Poverty Rate - % of Enrollment:				
Grade 5		138	106	102	<i>(As of October 31)</i>		2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 6		26	53	45			17.4	16.5	14.2
Grade 7		28	28	48	Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:				
Grade 8		24	28	28	<i>(As of June 30)</i>		2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 9		0	0	0			0	1	0
Grade 10		0	0	0	Recent Immigrants - Total Number:				
Grade 11		0	0	0	<i>(As of October 31)</i>		2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 12		0	0	0			0	0	0
Ungraded		0	0	2	Special Education Enrollment:				
Total		795	824	840	<i>(As of October 31)</i>		2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
							0	0	0
Special Education Enrollment:					Suspensions (OSYD Reporting) - Total Number:				
<i>(As of October 31)</i>		2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	<i>(As of June 30)</i>		2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
# in Self-Contained Classes		17	7	5	Principal Suspensions		3	6	17
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes		21	18	21	Superintendent Suspensions		0	2	10
Number all others		66	76	80	Special High School Programs - Total Number:				
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>					<i>(As of October 31)</i>		2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
					CTE Program Participants		0	0	0
					Early College HS Program Participants		0	0	0
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment: (BESIS Survey)					Number of Staff - Includes all full-time staff:				
<i>(As of October 31)</i>		2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	<i>(As of October 31)</i>		2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
# in Transitional Bilingual Classes		0	0	0	Number of Teachers		48	54	61
# in Dual Lang. Programs		0	0	0					
# receiving ESL services only		20	23	25					

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT							
# ELLs with IEPs	0	0	0	Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	6	16	17
These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.				Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	N/A	7	8
Overage Students (# entering students overage for grade)				Teacher Qualifications:			
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
(As of October 31)	0	0	0	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	97.9	100.0	100.0
				% more than 2 years teaching in this school	58.3	66.7	70.5
				% more than 5 years teaching anywhere	60.4	63.0	60.7
Ethnicity and Gender - % of Enrollment:							
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	% Masters Degree or higher	98.0	98.0	97.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.1	0.1	0.1	% core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	88.1	79.1	100.0
Black or African American	3.4	3.5	2.6				
Hispanic or Latino	4.9	5.3	5.6				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	2.1	2.2	1.8				
White	89.4	88.8	89.8				
Male	53.0	52.9	52.4				
Female	47.0	47.1	47.6				
2009-10 TITLE I STATUS							
	Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP)						
	Title I Targeted Assistance						
√	Non-Title I						
Years the School Received Title I Part A Funding:	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10			
NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY							
SURR School (Yes/No)	If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:						
Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2008-09) Based on 2007-08 Performance:							
√	In Good Standing (IGS)						
	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1						
	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 2						
	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) – Year 1						
	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) – Year 2/Planning for Restructuring (PFR)						
	NCLB Restructuring – Year ____						
	School Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP) – Year ____						

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT							
Individual Subject/Area Ratings:							
Elementary/Middle Level				Secondary Level			
ELA:	IGS			ELA:			
Math:	IGS			Math:			
Science:	IGS			Graduation Rate:			
This school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for each accountability measure:							
		Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
Student Groups		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		√	√	√			
Other Groups							
Students with Disabilities		√	√	-			
Limited English Proficient		-	-	-			
Economically Disadvantaged		√	√	√			
Student groups making AYP in each subject		4	4	3	0	0	0
CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY							
Progress Report Results – 2008-09				Quality Review Results – 2008-09			
Overall Letter Grade:	A			Overall Evaluation:	√		
Overall Score:	81.5			Quality Statement Scores:			
Category Scores:				Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	√		
School Environment:	8.2			Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	√		
<i>(Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)</i>				Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	√		
School Performance:	19.7			Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	W		
<i>(Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)</i>				Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	√		
Student Progress:	51.3						
<i>(Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)</i>							
Additional Credit:	2.3						
KEY: AYP STATUS				KEY: QUALITY REVIEW SCORE			
√ = Made AYP				Δ = Underdeveloped			
√ ^{SH} = Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target				▶ = Underdeveloped with Proficient Features			
X = Did Not Make AYP				√ = Proficient			
– = Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status				W = Well Developed			
				◊ = Outstanding			
				NR = No Review Required			
* = For Progress Report Attendance Rate(s) - If more than one attendance rate given, it is displayed as K-8/9-12.							
<i>Note: Progress Report grades are not yet available for District 75 schools; NCLB/SED accountability reports are not available for District 75 schools.</i>							

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Directions: Conduct a comprehensive review of your school's educational program informed by the most current quantitative and qualitative data available regarding student performance trends and other indicators of progress. Include in your needs assessment an analysis of information available from New York State Education Department and New York City Department of Education accountability and assessment resources, i.e., School Report Cards, Progress Reports, Quality Review and Quality Review Self-Assessment documents, periodic assessments, ARIS, as well as

results of Inquiry Team action research, surveys, and school-based assessments. (Refer to your school's Demographics and Accountability Snapshot in Part B of Section III.) 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 highlights of your school's strengths, accomplishments, and challenges. Consider the following questions:

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

Performance Trends:

- **English Language Arts:**

Strengths/Implications for Instruction:

In our 2008-2009 CEP and based on the results of that years Quality Review, we initiated efforts to address those areas identified as in need of improvement. Our 2008-2009 Progress Report shows our Students Performance score to be 83.6% for students achieving Level 3-4. Our goal for 2008-2009 school year was to raise this to 90%. Based on the 2008-2009 School Progress report, we exceed our goal with 92.8% of our students achieving a proficiency level of Level 3 and 4. We had hoped to improve our median student proficiency level score from 3.37 to 3.8 and exceeded this as well, with our students scoring 3.90. We hope to continue this trend. Additionally, although we are on par with our peer horizon group, we will strive to increase the percentage of students achieving AYP from 69.4% to 72 %.

In analyzing our ELA assessment data, PS/MS 114 has recognized the challenge of maintaining our Level 4 students, increasing the percentage of students moving from Level 3 students to Level 4 and the augmentation of the number of students who make Annual Yearly Progress. Building upon our success meeting last years' goal of increasing the percentage of students achieving Level 3 and 4, we, as a learning community, recognize that we need to challenge our higher-level students through enriching their learning experiences. As a result of these findings and the recommendation of our 2008-2009 Quality Review, we have built upon last year's improvement efforts by implementing the Renzulli School Wide Enrichment Model, a computer based program that focuses on specific strategies for differentiating instruction via content, process and product using students' top interests, learning styles and expression styles as indentified by the Renzulli Profiler. This research based program is a comprehensive system for infusing "high-end learning" into total school improvement efforts while simultaneously challenging and engaging all students. Additionally, Renzulli provides a unique environment for the entire learning community, which allows parents, teachers and administrators to view data and that encourages an open exchange about students' learning needs.

Weaknesses/Implications for Instruction:

In years past, PS/MS 114 has not employed a uniform phonics program. Results of ECLAS2 data and Guided Reading Benchmarks showed our early childhood students lacking in this area. As a result of these findings we have built upon three literacy programs instituted last year. We have continued the Wilson Reading *Foundations Program* in Grades K-1, continuing it into grade 2. This research based, multi-sensory phonics program will continue to aide our teachers in laying a strong literacy foundation in our youngest students. We have also introduced *RTI* (Response to Intervention) in our first grade. Identified students will receive additional instruction, provided by an AIS teacher, using the Foundations Program (Double Dose). Assessment data will drive instruction, and progress monitoring will ensue so that the program remains flexible, with students entering and leaving the program as necessary (based on goal achievement). In order to further address the learning deficiencies in our earlier grades, our IEP teacher has begun to service regular education second and third grade students, who are academically at risk with the Wilson Reading Program./ These programs, in addition to our Core Knowledge Curriculum, will provide a cyclical learning experience for our students.

In order to enhance our building's capacity in the area of reading instruction, we have sponsored two teachers to become certified Level I Wilson Facilitators. These teachers will eventually support our grade level teachers in the Wilson Foundation Program, alleviating some of the burden of responsibility from our Teacher Center Facilitator. Our partnership with the Wilson Reading/Fundations program has resulted in the designation of an onsite Foundations Professional Developer to our school. This expert works intensely with our grade level teams, to provide support and ensure program fidelity. To further enrich the cohesiveness of this initiative, the Early Child Assistant Principal debriefs regularly with the onsite Professional Developer.

The Earobics Program is a technology based Literacy Program was instituted last year in grades K-1 and will be built upon further this year. It offers support and enrichment to students based on assessment data compiled for each individual student. While Students learn literacy foundations at their own level, the program builds upon their success as it continually monitors students' progress. All data is readily available for teachers to use to drive their instruction. Grades K-1 teachers have created a curriculum map, which aligned the Earobics Program with the Foundation program. This along with the interdisciplinary approach of the Core Knowledge curriculum will provide an even more cohesive instruction as well as, an academic foundation for our youngest learners.

As a result of its utilization by our Data Inquiry Team, the Scantron Progressive assessment has been implemented in Grade 3 to 8 classrooms, in lieu of the ITA interim assessments. The program identifies students' abilities and instruction is adjusted to the individual's need and skill level. Continued Professional Development and implementation support will be offered to instructors. Building upon last year's Data Inquiry Team's findings, we have identified non-fiction as an area of weakness in our students, especially males. We have purchased additional non-fiction reading materials, in addition to the Time for Kids Non-Fiction program. We are also focusing our efforts on improving our students' skills in vocabulary identification and Figurative Language.

Additional professional development will be conducted in Differentiating Instruction in ELA and across the subject areas, through product, process and content. Teachers will be required to tier lessons and utilize Blooms Taxonomy to bring student questioning to a more rigorous level. We continue to employ a UFT Teacher Center Staff developer, an expert in literacy, who will continue to work with teachers in differentiating classroom instruction. We are using more finely grained assessments to identify academic skills and sub skills which are in need of improvement (Acuity; Predictive, Practice State Assessments, Scantron Progressive series, ECLAS2, Earobics (Grades K-1) and Fountas and Pinnell Guided Reading Benchmark Assessments. This data helps to formulate flexible grouping within the classroom, making sure that teachers' planning consistently provides for the different needs of students, by matching activities to students' different ability levels is an area we are focusing on strongly this year.

Writing has also been identified as an area of weakness in our school based on NYS ELA assessments, and second grade EPAL assessments. A significant drop occurred in our Fourth grade, where a significant number of Level 4's fell to Level 3's, due in part to writing component of the ELA assessment. An additional increase in students dropping from a Level 4 to Level 3 was noted in grades 5-8 as well.

To address these deficiencies and improve instruction as well as student achievement, professional learning teams were created on each grade. These grade level teams will create ELA curriculum maps, which will result in a uniform school-wide curriculum map. Goals will continue to be set for each student, based on the *Fountas and Pinnell Continuum of Literacy Learning*. Collaborative Grade Level teams will examine student work in the area of writing using the Tuning Protocol. Best practices will be shared and teachers' toolkits will be further enriched. NY state standards will be examined and collaborative rubrics will be created for each writing genre, thereby fostering a cohesive assessment system.

- **Social Studies:**

Strengths/ Implications for Instruction

PS/MS 114 continues in its fourth year of Core Knowledge Curriculum implementation. We have served as a visitation site, and have been invited to apply for Official Core Knowledge School status. Our students' learning has been enriched and they, as well as, staff and parents hold the program in high regards. We continue to build upon our prior successes by maintaining a Core Knowledge Facilitator and using budgetary funding to provide materials to further support the program. To expand upon the success of History and Geography instruction in our early childhood grades, a grant, *Teaching American History across the Grade*, was applied for and awarded to us for the 2009-2010 school years. This program has partnered us with Bank Street College and The American Historical Society, to enrich the learning experiences of our K-2 students in the content area of American History. Grade level representatives (K-2) attend professional development sessions held at various cultural institutions throughout the school year. Site visits are conducted by Bank Street College.

The results of the NYS fifth grade Social Studies Assessment shows an increase in the number of students, almost 100%, achieving Level 3 and Level 4. (Only one student scored at Level 2). In viewing the achievement of our fifth grade students between 2006 and 2009, great growth is noted in the percentage of students at Level 3 and 4. This data supports the conclusion that our students' knowledge of history and geography has improved greatly as a result of the implementation of the Core Knowledge Curriculum three years ago.

Weaknesses/Implications for Instruction:

As we have developed and monitored goals in the content areas of ELA and Mathematics, we must continue to develop more rigorous and measurable goals in other content areas, such as Social Studies. Building upon our use of good strategies in goal setting based on student's prior achievement in reading and mathematics, we have focused our efforts now on setting learning targets in these other academic areas. In addressing this Quality Review suggestion, we have created Unit Goals based on Essential Questions for the Core Knowledge Units of Study grades, K-8. Additionally, benchmark assessments have been created for grades 3-8 that will measure progress in content area skills during the course of the academic year. Primary Sources will be implemented in the lower grades thereby enhancing the ability to read such sources prior to the 5th grade state test.

- **Mathematics**

Strengths/Implication for Instruction

PS/MS 114 students have historically achieved highly on NYS assessments. Our goal last year was to raise the percentage of our students achieving level 3 and 4 in math, from 93.3 to 95% on our 2008-2009 Progress Report. We exceeded this goal with 98.2% of our students achieving Level 3 and 4s on the NYS mathematics assessment. Because of the need of further enrichment opportunities in Mathematics a new Mathematics program, en**Vi**sionMath, based on scientific research, as well as, on classroom-based evidence that validates proven reliability has been implemented in grades K-5. In grades 6-7 the new mathematics program implemented this year is the New York Mathematics Courses 1 and 2.

The en**Vi**sionMath program provides a Personalized Curriculum with 20 (16 in Kindergarten) focused topics that are coherent, digestible groups of lessons focusing on one or a few related content areas. The curriculum is designed so that all standards can be taught before the major mathematics testing. en**Vi**sion**M**ATH teaches for deep conceptual understanding using research-based best practices. Essential understandings connected by Big Ideas are explicitly stated in the Teacher's Edition. Daily

Spiral Review and the Problem of the Day focus foundational skills and allow for ongoing practice with a variety of problem types. Daily interactive concept development encourages students to interact with teachers and other students to develop conceptual understanding. Visual Learning allows students to benefit from seeing math ideas portrayed pictorially as well as being able to see connections between ideas. en**Vision**MATH has created a Visual Learning Bridge which is a step-by-step bridge between the interactive learning activity and the lesson exercises to help students focus on one idea at a time and see the connections within the sequence of ideas. The strong sequential visual/verbal connections deepen conceptual understanding for students of all learning modalities and are particularly effective with English language learners and struggling readers.

In regards to differentiated instruction, en**Vision**MATH engages and interests all students with leveled activities for ongoing differentiated instruction. A Teacher-Directed Intervention activity at the end of every lesson provides immediate opportunities to provide differentiated instruction. Additional ready made leveled learning centers for each lesson allow different students to do the same activity at different levels; while at the same time giving the teacher uninterrupted time to focus on re teaching students who require intervention. All centers can be used repeatedly due to the inclusion of a “Try Again” at the end. They can also be used for ongoing review and can be used year after year. Topic-specific considerations for ELL, Special Education, At-Risk, and Advanced students enable teachers to accommodate the diverse learners in the classroom.

Enrichment is provided within the classrooms, using the same prototype of data driven instruction as our ELA efforts. Students’ strengths and struggles are identified after reviewing test data, which drive goal groups and differentiation of instruction. We have employed additional licensed content area teachers in our Middle School, as well as, a en**Vision** Mathematics Program Facilitator/Lead teacher.

Weakness/Implications for Instruction

The area in which we need to improve the most in is giving the students an opportunity to apply their content knowledge in various areas. There needs to be an increase of differentiation instruction across the grades. A vehicle must be established which will enable teachers to communicate strengths and weaknesses with the parents more efficiently. In response to this need, *Success Net* has been implemented for all students. By assigning students benchmarks online, parents can monitor student progress in not only the mathematical content, but the application of it. *Success Net* also provides a step by step tutorial for the student in areas of struggle and offers enrichment when content acquisition has occurred.

- **Technology**

Strengths/Implications for Instruction

PS/MS 114 is considered to be one of the top ten technology schools in New York City due to the amount of technology within our building. Each classroom contains a wireless computer cart and students in grades 3-8 have their own laptop. Our building is wireless, which allows Internet access throughout the school. We are continuing to work on refining our technology curriculum so that a progression of knowledge, skills, and understanding supports learning in all subjects. To this end, we have employed a full time technology staff developer, who works in conjunction with classroom teachers mapping out a plan of technological support for academic areas. Modeling lessons, offering

in class support, and providing Professional development has aided our efforts in this endeavor. Additionally, with the support of our PTA we have purchased *Mimio* machines and projectors, which work along the same lines as a Whiteboard. This will allow teachers to further utilize technology within the classrooms. Because each classroom in our building contains a wireless laptop lab the implication for instruction is great. Students create multimedia projects, undertake web quests, conduct research, utilize the Renzulli Program, take Scantron Assessments, as well as utilize the Earobics program. Through the efforts of our staff developer-technology expert, we look forward to seeing the infusion of technology further developed.

Weaknesses/Implications for Instruction

Along with the large volume of laptops within our building, there comes the overwhelming task of maintaining these machines. As many machine are coming off of warranty, we must become creative in finding the means to maintain and repair our equipment. Because of the many maintenance issues instruction is impacted. A major implication for instruction includes the lack of time in our technology facilitator's program to push into classrooms.

- **Science:**

Strengths/ Implications for Instruction:

To enrich the science instruction of our youngest learners, a K-2 science cluster teacher position was created. This instructor works collaboratively with our grade level teams to implement the new NYC Science initiative/curriculum. We continue the employ of three other science teachers, which includes a certified middle school science instructor. Our state of the art science lab was completed over this summer and offers our middle school students a stimulating environment for their science instruction.

Weaknesses/Implication for Instruction:

Our middle school students have yet to sit for a Regents Examination. It is our intention that our newly hired science instructor will prepare our students and empower them to pass the Living Environment Regents this school year.

- **The Arts:**

Strengths/Implications for Instruction:

Because of the Core Knowledge Curriculum, the Arts play a major role in our interdisciplinary instruction. Classroom teachers and cluster teachers work collaboratively to provide art instruction related to specific Core Knowledge units of study. Core Knowledge itself contains a visual and musical arts component. Our school is a strong supporter of the Arts, continuing to employ a full time Instrumental Music Teacher, Vocal teacher, and a full time Visual Arts instructor. Every student in PS/MS 114 receives direct arts instruction from one of these individuals. This year a Glee club was initiated, as part of our After School Academy. Our students have won many contests in the past year, and our Marching band, in its first year of inception, garnered recognition at the Rockaway Beach St. Patrick's Day Parade. We will continue funding to support the Arts for our student body.

Weaknesses/Implications for Instruction

Due to a decrease in our budget, certain staff members were not asked to return this school year (F status Vocal teacher and Art Therapist). In their absence the school administration was challenged to provide the required arts instruction to our middle school students, as well as our elementary students, with a decrease in instructors. Instruction is impacted because of the necessity of the Middle School and Elementary School having to share cluster teachers.

We recognize research shows the impact of high quality professional development on improving instruction to accelerate student learning. The most effective professional development is based on teachers' content understanding, reflection, and is collaborative and collegial. By June 2010, all staff will set professional goals based on self-evaluation and the professional teaching standards and participate in at least one learning community. This will be measured by stated teacher goals, attendance sheets indicating participation in planning periods, Inquiry Team meetings, conferences and professional development that promotes instructional improvement and student achievement.

- **Partnerships with Outside Organizations:**

In response to a recommendation sited in our Quality Review, PS/MS 114 will be focusing on ensuring that assistance from outside organizations is maintained. Through the generous support of our PTA, our fifth grade students will participate in a Ballroom Dancing residency through the Dance in the Classroom Organization. Additionally, we have facilitated new partnerships with the NYC Ballet, the Rockaway Artists Alliance, Bank Street College, and NYU, which have brought programs into our building.

- **Budgetary Challenges:**

PS/MS 114 is operating at 142% capacity and this has been a major impediment to our educational efforts. With large classroom registers, it is challenging to provide the individualized instruction deserving of all students. We have reached out to the Department of Education officials, as well as local politicians for assistance. We have created 3 additional classrooms. One classroom was provided by our Pre-Kindergarten (which was phased out this year) and two existing kindergarten classrooms were collapsed to create three new classrooms. We do not qualify for Title 1 funding, so our budget is very creative in order to support our school goals.

GOALS

Directions: Based on the findings and implications from the comprehensive needs assessment (Section IV), determine your school's instructional goals for 2008-09 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 NCLB/SED improvement (SURR, SINI, and SRAP) must identify a goal and complete an action plan for each subject/area of identification. (3) When developed, Principal's Performance Review (PPR) goals should presumably be aligned to the school's annual goals described in this section.

Goal Number 1	To actively engage 90% of educational staff (56 teachers) in the collaborative inquiry process by June 2010 .
Goal Number 2	By June 2010, 50% of Level 2 students (54 students) will progress to Level 3 in the area of writing. 80% of students will achieve yearend Guided Reading benchmark levels. 80% of second grade students will attain an overall score of Level 3 on 2010 EPAL assessment.
Goal Number 3	To build capacity within the school to support early childhood initiatives and the enhancement of teachers' understanding and ability to use data and track student progress, improving reading instruction and improve reading skills in our Early Childhood students (371)
Goal Number 4	To improve teachers' capacity to deliver differentiated ELA instruction to students, thereby moving 88% of students who fell from Level 4 to Level 3, back to level 4 on the Spring 2010 ELA assessment. To provide more enrichment opportunities to all students.
Goal Number 5	30% of eighth grade students will sit for the 2009-2010 Science Regents; thereby further preparing them for acceptance into competitive high schools and providing High School credit.

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 2008-09 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 NCLB/SED improvement (SURR, SINI, and SRAP) must identify a goal and complete an action plan for each subject/area of identification.

Subject/Area (where relevant):

Collaborative Inquiry

<p>Annual Goal #1 Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>To actively engage 90% of educational staff (56 teachers) in the collaborative inquiry process by June 2010.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom and cluster teachers will be responsible for tracking the progress of at least three students by looking at student work /data and the best practices utilized. Criteria for the selection of these Inquiry Group students will be based on student data and decided by the teams. • Grade level teams will meet monthly to discuss student progress by using the Protocol model to view student work and best practices. Content area teachers, AIS/SETTS focus groups will discuss their student progress at monthly PPT and AIS meetings • The school schedule will allow out of class service providers and content area teachers to articulate student progress during a monthly professional development periods. • Classroom teachers will increase their analysis of internal and external data in order to implement small group and differentiated instructional strategies throughout the school day, with emphasis on ELA and Mathematics. • Teachers will work with students regularly to set short and long term goals in Reading, Writing and Mathematics. These goals will be benchmarked and adjusted accordingly through the analysis of periodic and classroom-collected data. • Formative assessment data will be used to plan whole group, small group and individualized instruction. Teachers will re-teach mini lessons as needed to small groups of targeted students using alternate methods of instruction • All classroom teachers will utilize technology such as the overhead projector, Mimio machines, and student laptops to enhance and/or support the delivery of instruction. • Coach will provide professional development in the area of Guided Reading, writing and differentiated instructional practices. Study groups will be formed and teachers will be provided opportunities to read discuss and implement methodologies outlined in selected professional texts.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers will have the opportunities to observe best practices in differentiated instruction through intra and inter visitation opportunities. • On-going assessment and conferencing data will be used to align instructional practices with what students need in order to grow as readers, writers and mathematicians. Teachers will use consistent data collection methods, These will include but are not limited to: running records, conference notes, Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessments, Scantron Assessments, Renzulli Profiles, Acuity, Envision mathematics unit tests, Foundation unit assessments and RTI probes, ECLAS2 assessments, checklists, rubrics, notebooks, and Guided Reading binders • Small group instruction will include test preparation strategy learning. • AIS will be focused and appropriate for identified at-risk learners and for our higher achievers. • The Inquiry Team and Data Specialist will facilitate the inquiry process with grade level teacher inquiry teams. The teachers will select a target population and research and implement effective writing strategies after using a Tuning Protocol to look at student work.
<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"> • Math Facilitator, Teacher Center Specialist Salary • Inquiry Team Per Session Funding • Data Specialist Per Session Funding
<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"> • Teacher participation at team meetings • Regular review of Inquiry Team Meetings, AIS/PPT committee Agendas and minutes, student case studies, Student portfolios / Data Folios, Student Goal Sheets, Academic Intervention plans, Guided Reading Running Records, Teacher Conference Notes • Inquiry Groups document their work, student progress, next steps and reflections on the CFI interface. • Formal and informal observation • Regular review of teacher planning materials • Regular review of teacher assessments

Subject/Area (where relevant):

Literacy

<p>Annual Goal #2 Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2010, 50% of Level 2 students (54 students) will progress to Level 3 in the area of writing. 80% of students will achieve yearend Guided Reading benchmark levels. 80% of second grade students will attain an overall score of Level 3 on 2010 EPAL assessment.</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"> • Creation of professional study groups to develop a year long ELA Curriculum Map for each grade • Weekly Professional Development Grade meetings/study groups utilizing the <u>Continuum of Literacy Learning</u> and Fountas and Pinnell's <u>Guided Reading</u> instruction. • Encourage teachers to continually evaluate and revise their classroom practices to improve student outcome, through teacher conferencing with colleagues, coaches Foundations and Earobics Program and Administration. • Inter-visitations will be conducted among and across the grades • Continued employment of onsite UFT Teacher Center Professional Development Specialist/Core Knowledge Coach/Mentor, will offer support and guidance to classroom teachers • Monitoring of Principal and Teacher Weekly resources for Professional Development offerings, relevant to Literacy Instruction. • Attendance of teachers to these PD sessions offered by the DOE, LSO, UFT Teacher Center and outside vendors • Additional study groups will be offered after school by Teacher Center Specialist • Monthly team inquiry meetings utilizing the Tuning Protocol to analyze student work • Purchase of <u>Teaching the Qualities of Writing</u> by Ralph Fletcher • Purchase of Vocabulary Building Program.
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literacy/Core Knowledge Facilitator Salary • Funding for purchase of professional literature, <u>The Continuum of Literacy Instruction</u> and Fountas and Pinnell's, <u>Guided Reading Instruction</u>. • Funding of Professional Development • Funding for <u>Teaching the Qualities of Writing</u> and Vocabulary program
<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"> • Classroom snapshots and observations, both formal and informal • Professional Development Evaluation Forms • Debriefing sessions follow PD attendance, teachers turnkey information • Regular review of Coach Logs, Administrative Conference Logs • Regular review of Teacher Lesson Plans and Professional Development plans • Sign In Sheets and agendas from PD sessions • Feedback from Cabinet, (AP, Coach, Core Knowledge Facilitator, Chapter Leader) during meetings • Creation of a School Wide ELA Curriculum Map

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of Writing Process in “Polished Pieces” displayed on bulletin boards • Regular review of Student Goal Sheets/ Student portfolios / Data Folios • Regular review of Academic “Hot Lists” • Regular review of Academic Intervention plans • Regular review of Guided Reading Running Records • Regular review of Teacher Conference Notes • Regular review of Teacher Plans, indicate differentiation of instruction, goal setting and attainment of individual student goals • Regular review of Grade Conference sign in sheets and agendas • EPAL assessment results • Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment results • Results of NYS 2010 ELA assessment
--	--

**Early Childhood
Literacy/Data Driven
Instruction**

Subject/Area (where relevant):	
Annual Goal #3 <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i>	To build capacity within the school to support early childhood initiatives and the enhancement of teachers’ understanding and ability to use data and track student progress, improving reading instruction and improve reading skills in our Early Childhood students (371)
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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly collaborative grade team meetings to discuss inquiry work and student progress • Ongoing implementation of the Wilson Response to Intervention program for grades K-2 • Schedule monthly study groups with Foundations Program Site Facilitator; including modeling, walkthroughs and inter-visitations • Provide professional development to Early Childhood AIS instructors to deliver RTI services to identified students • Continued provision of Professional Development in the use of data to drive instruction • Sponsor and support of the IEP teacher and an Early Childhood AIS provider, to participate and complete coursework to become Wilson Level I facilitators. • Teacher Center Specialist will provide professional development in the area of differentiated instructional practices, guided reading and writing. Study groups will be formed and teachers will be provided opportunities to read discuss and implement the methodologies outlined in “The Continuum of Literacy Learning.” • Provide Foundations Professional Development to teachers new to the program • Movement of the first Kindergarten ECLAS 2 administration from January to September. • The continued administration of the ECLAS 2 assessment, resulting in differentiation of instruction, to occur during AIS periods and Guided Reading Blocks • Administer Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessments to students four times per year, recording student progress • Conduct flexible guided reading groups driven by

	<p>running record data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assign reading to students based on Independent reading level and monitor progress through book logs • Enhancement of the implementation of Foundations Phonics program, including “double dosing” of program, to at-risk students, during AIS periods • Wilson Program provided to SETTS students and others deemed in need of remediation • Ongoing utilization of Earobics Phonics program • Identification and remediation of at-risk students during AIS periods and during the Extended Day Program
<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"> • Continuation of funding for the Wilson Foundation Support Package • Continued funding of Wilson Response to Intervention professional development support package • Funding for professional development of two teachers to become Wilson Level 1 certified instructors • Continued Funding of materials to support RTI implementation and extension of the Foundations program • Administrative scheduling of embedded AIS period in teachers’ schedules • Teacher Center Specialist Salary
<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"> • 100% of K-2 classes achieve benchmark of 80% on Foundations Unit Assessments • The movement of 80% of K-2 students three or more Fountas and Pinnell levels from September 2009 to June 2010 • The successful extension of the Foundations Program, to include the Response to Intervention Program (RTI), thereby facilitating a more diagnostic and prescriptive approach to reading instruction, and the identification and tracking of at-risk students in grades K-2 using Foundations Probes • Further engagement of collaborative inquiry groups in the use of data to set goals and monitor student progress as evidenced by meeting agendas, notes and ARIS • The successful training of two teachers as Wilson Level One facilitators • Administration’s quarterly monitoring of <i>Guided Reading Level Benchmarks by Grade Data Sheets</i> • Regular review of Teachers planning materials • Regular review of Guided Reading Binders, running records, Foundation Unit Assessments and Benchmark assessment results • Monthly collaborative meetings with AIS providers • Monitoring of <i>Class at a Glance</i> Data sheets to track student achievement • Formal and Informal Classroom observations • Regular review of Lesson Plans • Report Cards, Interim Reports, Goal Sheets • Regular review of ARIS

Subject/Area (where relevant):

Differentiation of Instruction/Enrichment

<p>Annual Goal #4 Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>To improve teachers' capacity to deliver differentiated ELA instruction to students, thereby moving 88% of students who fell from Level 4 to Level 3, back to level 4 on the Spring 2010 ELA assessment. To provide more enrichment opportunities to all students.</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>Implementation of the Renzulli Enrichment Program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students will register for Renzulli Learning during school by answering a series of questions about their interests and the ways they like to learn. Using that information, the RLS will provide a written profile that summarizes each student's talents, interests and preferred learning styles. After which, a series of enrichment activities will be specially selected for students to explore based on their individualized profile. Teachers can view each profile allowing for the differentiation of instruction • Appointment of an Renzulli Program facilitator to coordinate the implementation of program and support teachers in this endeavor • Classroom inter visitations within the school • Professional Development Day workshops on Differentiation and the Renzulli Model • Assignment of work in Acuity and Scantron based on individual student assessment data • Professional Development provided at weekly PD meetings by Administration, Math Facilitator, Renzulli Facilitator and UFT Teacher Specialist • Attendance by staff to off site Professional Development sessions • Extended utilization of learning centers to differentiate instruction • Continued use of <i>Shell Education: Applying Differentiation Strategies</i> and <i>Time for Kids Nonfiction Differentiation System</i> • Implementation of enVision mathematics program
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding of Renzulli Enrichment Program and Professional Development package • Funding of Renzulli Facilitator Salary • Funding of Professional Development
<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"> • The successful development of a school wide enrichment model, whereby teachers differentiate and enrich instruction through individualized resources tailored to each student's interests and learning style • Formal/Informal classroom observations and walk throughs reflect differentiation • Regular review of Lesson Plans indicating differentiation • Regular review of Development of Personal Success Plans for all students • Regular review of Tiered Lessons which will produce differentiated student products • Evidence of flexible grouping • Initiation of Renzulli enrichment groups in the Afterschool Academy.

Subject/Area (where relevant):

Science

<p>Annual Goal #5 Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>30% of eighth grade students will sit for the 2009-2010 Science Regents; thereby further preparing them for acceptance into competitive high schools and providing High School credit.</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"> • The building of a new, state of the art science lab in the middle school • The hiring of a new middle school science teacher • Provide science instructor with ongoing professional development provided by the LSO, ISC and outside vendors • Funding for science related materials, supplies, and related events • Provide support and professional development in the use of technology to enrich student learning experiences within the Science Curriculum. • Offer tutorial periods to all students in the Living Environment class.
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding to purchase materials to support science instruction in the Middle School. • Use of tax levy money to sustain highly qualified science teacher • Funding of professional development
<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"> • Exit projects • Science Fair • Agendas from professional development sessions, mentoring plans and notes • Formal and Informal classroom snapshots / observations • Regular review of Lesson plans • Unit Assessments show progress of students in the subject matter • Participation rate of MS 114 students sitting for the Regents examination

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010

Directions: All schools must complete Appendices 1, 2, 3, 7 & 8. All Title I schools must complete Appendix 4. All schools identified under NCLB or SED for School Improvement, including Title I Schools in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1 and Year 2, Title I Corrective Action (CA) Schools, NCLB Planning for Restructuring Schools, NCLB Restructured Schools, and Schools Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP), 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 SINI AND SRAP SCHOOLS

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: CONTRACT FOR EXCELLENCE (CFE) SCHOOL-BASED EXPENDITURES FOR 2009-2010 – NOT REQUIRED FOR 2009-2010 SCHOOL YEAR.

APPENDIX 9: SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS IN TEMPORARY HOUSING (STH)

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

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

Grade	ELA	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	At-risk Services: Guidance Counselor	At-risk Services: School Psychologist	At-risk Services: Social Worker	At-risk Health-related Services
	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS				
K	25	25	N/A	N/A	NA	NA	NA	NA
1	26	20	N/A	N/A				
2	33	15	N/A	N/A				
3	17	15	N/A	N/A				
4	17	19	10	0				
5	24	17	20	0				
6	12	32	25	0				
7	16	5	25	0				
8	6	9	25	25				
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 or low level 3 on New York State English language arts (ELA), mathematics, science, and social studies assessments.***
- Students in Grade 9 who performed at Level 1 or Level 2 on NYS Grade 8 ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies assessments.
- Students in Grades 10 – 12 who scored below the approved passing grade on any Regents examination required for graduation in English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies.

Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	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:	The Wilson Reading Program, Earobics, Foundations RTI, LEAP Frog, Acuity and Scantron Assessments are utilized throughout the school day and during AIS periods by classroom teachers, AIS providers and SETSS teachers. Methods of delivery consist of one-to-one tutoring, small group instruction and a pullout program. Additional tutoring services are provided by classroom teachers to Middle school students during lunch periods and specially designated tutorial periods. Additionally, students who did not achieve AYP in the 2008-2009 school year have been invited to attend our Extended Day Academy.
Mathematics:	enVision mathematics instruction, Acuity, and Scantron Assessments are utilized during the school day and during AIS periods by classroom teachers. SETTS teachers utilize the ret each and remediation portions of the enVision math program. Additional Tutoring Services are provided to Middle School students during their lunch periods and specially designated tutorial periods by classroom teachers. Additionally, students who did not achieve AYP in the 2008-2009 school year have been invited to attend our Extended Day Academy.
Science:	Additional Tutoring Services are provided to Middle school students during their lunch periods by classroom teacher. Teachers also use extended day session to provide individualized tutoring services. Additionally, students who did not achieve AYP in the 2008-2009 school year have been invited to attend our Extended Day Academy.
Social Studies:	Additional Tutoring Services are provided to grade 8 students during their lunch periods and specially designated tutorial periods.
At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:	NA
At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	NA
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	NA
At-risk Health-related Services:	NA

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

NCLB/SED requirement for all schools

Part 1: School ELL Profile

A. Language Allocation Policy Team Composition

SSO/District: 27	School: PS/MS 114
Principal: Stephen Grill	Assistant Principal: Lorraine Engel
Coach: Linda Norwich	Math Facilitator: Laura Ferragamo
Teacher/AIS: Patricia Fleming	Guidance Counselor: Wendy Marciano
Teacher/5th Grade: Mary Wilson	Parent Coordinator: Kathy Meade
Teacher/4th grade: Heather Salzman	Related Service Provider: Eileen Hornung
ESL Teacher: Gina Machado	Parent: Kristine Memoli

B. Teacher Qualifications

Number of Certified ESL Teachers 1	Number of Certified Bilingual Teachers 0	Number of Certified NLA/FL Teachers 0
Number of Content Area Teachers with Bilingual Extensions 0	Number of Special Ed. Teachers with Bilingual Extensions 0	Number of Teachers of ELLs without ESL/Bilingual Certification 0

C. School Demographics

Total Number of Students in School 808	Total Number of ELLs 19	ELLs as Share of Total Student Population 3%
--	---------------------------------------	--

P.S. /M.S. 114 is a Pre K-8 school located in District 27, Queens. The school population is approximately 808 students. The total number of English language learners (ELLs) is 19, which composes roughly 3% of our student population. The main languages spoken by our ELLs are Russian and Arabic.

Part II: ELL Identification Process

1. At PS/MS 114 there are steps followed for the initial identification of ELLs. Parents or guardians of every new student enrolled at the school are given a HLIS to complete. It is at this time that an informal oral interview is conducted with the parent by the parent coordinator, office staff, or the ESL teacher. Each initial interview situation is dealt with on an individual basis. All HLIS are routed to the certified ESL teacher where they are reviewed and it is at this time that an initial screening is completed if necessary. After the initial screening with the student, the determination is made whether or not a student is eligible for the LAB-R. The ESL teacher then administers the LAB-R to all eligible students. At the start of every school year the ESL teacher evaluates the ELL's using the information ascertained from the student's performance on the NYSESLAT. The information is also shared with the ELL's classroom teacher and all other service providers. This way every teacher working with a particular ELL is aware of their strengths and weaknesses and can modify instruction accordingly. The information from the NYSESLAT is used to drive and modify instruction for all of our ELL students.
2. At our school we ensure that parents of ELLs understand and are aware of all three program choices for their children. During the month of September the ESL teacher and parent coordinator invite the parents of ELLs to school for an ESL program overview meeting. It is at this time that the 3 program choices are explained in detail, all of their questions and/or concerns can be addressed, and our program goals for the students are reviewed. After the initial meeting parents are contacted on a regular basis via phone calls, letters, and scheduled conferences to review and discuss their child's progress in the ESL. Our parent coordinator will continue to encourage parents of our ELL's to become active members in our school community.
3. In order to ensure that entitlement letters are distributed and Parent Survey and Program Selection forms are returned we have a meeting for all ELL parents at the start of the school year as described above. At the meeting the parent coordinator and ELL teacher disseminate all forms and have the parent/guardians complete them at the conclusion of the meeting. In the case of a parent that cannot attend the meeting, a phone conference is arranged and the required paperwork is mailed to the home for completion and return to school.
4. At PS/MS 114 the criteria we use when placing our ELLs into an instructional program begins with the parents. Initially we speak with the parents when the HLIS is being completed, and then once again at our ELL parent overview meeting. We are very lucky that all of our ELL students have at least one parent that can speak "some" English. Since speaking the English language does not ensure that they read it as well, the ESL teacher and parent coordinator make sure that all important school documents and paperwork are sent home in the ELL's native language.
5. After reviewing the Parent Survey and Program Selection forms for the last 5 years there is definitely a trend in the program choice that all of our parents have selected. **All** parents in the past 5 years have requested that their children be placed in a Freestanding ESL program. This may be due to the proximity of the school to home, or the number of children in their home.
6. The program model offered at PS/MS 114 is the Freestanding ESL program that aligns 100% with parent request as described above. For the past 5 years all ELL parents have chosen the Freestanding ESL program as the most beneficial program for their children.

Part III: ELL Demographics

A. ELL Programs

ELL Program Breakdown

	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Transitional Bilingual Education										
Dual Language										
Freestanding ESL	////	///	///	///	///	///	///	///	///	////////
Self-contained	4	11	4	7		4		6	4	
Push-In										
Total	4	11	4	7		4		6	4	

B. ELL Years of Service and Programs

Number of ELLs by Subgroups

All ELLs	19	Newcomers (ELLs receiving service 0-3years)	13	Special Education	0
SIFE	0	ELLs receiving services 4-6 years	5	Long Term (Completed 6 years)	1

Number of ELLs by Subgroups

	ELLs (0-3 years)	ELLs (4-6 years)	Long Term ELLs (Completed 6 years)	Total
TBE	n/a	n/a	n/a	0
Dual Language	n/a	n/a	n/a	0
ESL	13	4	2	19
Total	13	4	2	19

Number of ELLs in a TBE program who are in alternate placement: 0

**Freestanding English as a Second Language
Number of ELLs by Grade in Each Language Group**

	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Spanish		1		1					1	3
Chinese						1				1
Russian		2	2	1						5
Arabic	1	3	1	1						6
Other	1	2						1		4
Total	2	8	3	3		1		1		19

Programming and Scheduling Information

1. a. At PS/MS 114 the majority of our ELLs are immersed in self-contained classes, however there are a couple of ELL's in (ICT) Integrated Co-Teaching classes. Currently the ELL teacher is utilizing a Pullout program in order to service students fully and effectively. Our program model varies slightly depending on scheduling issues. Most ELL's are placed in age appropriate heterogeneous groups whereby they learn together and from one another.

b. At P.S. /M.S. 114, ELLs receive instruction in a freestanding program. The freestanding ESL program instruction includes small grouping for direct ESL instruction, as well as classroom instruction following the Balanced Literacy model and EnVision Math program. Students interact with their peers and work on content material that is relevant to the academic subject and grade level of study. The Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) integrates academic language development, content area instruction and explicit instruction in learning strategies for both content and language acquisition. In addition, each student's "Basic Interpersonal Communication Skill" (BICS) will be developed and refined through the teaching of colloquialisms, figurative language, and thinking skill strategies.
2. Presently the school meets the requirements for the students being serviced for the mandated 180/360 minutes. The ESL instructor brings direct ESL instruction in English to the students. Our instructor meets the states qualifications for "highly qualified status." She uses materials recommended by the LSO for ESL instruction. It is not specific "program" design, but includes supplementary materials designed to develop language skills.
3. The ESL program model at P.S. /M.S. 114 is a mostly pullout ESL model using ESL teaching methodology. The ESL teacher also utilizes the push in model, as needed for the middle school students. Our program emphasizes a high level of rigor and academic support. The ESL program is child centered; top do-down, (broad to narrow), content based and teaches C.A.L.P. (cognitive academic language proficiency).
4. a. Presently at PS/MS 114 we do not service any SIFE students. However, if we do receive a student with interrupted formal education our plan will begin with evaluating him or her and developing an individualized education plan on a case-by-case basis. We would begin by compiling a detailed and thorough social and educational (or lack there of) history. This will be accomplished

with the assistance of the parent coordinator, guidance counselor, and classroom and ESL teachers. SIFE will be immersed in our language rich classrooms and immediately begin their mandated ESL program.

b. ELLs in US schools less than 3 years will receive small group instruction in our Freestanding ESL program. They will also work with AIS (academic intervention services) providers as needed. All ELLs will be invited to participate in our after school learning academy where they receive individualized instruction and academic support. Most importantly our teachers will utilize differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all students.

c-d. All long term ELL's and those receiving services from 4-6 years will receive academic and social support from all teaching staff. These students will have a Personal Intervention Plan, for their appropriate grade along with the modality in which they are "failing" the NYSESLAT. Instruction will be given during tutorial times, at after school programs, and during extended day activities to attack the lack of performance and close the gap. Parents of these ELLs will be asked to become more actively involved in their child's academic progress, meeting or speaking with teachers regularly in order to make sure that academic strides are being made.

e. ELLs identified, as having special needs will have goals set in ESL and language on their "IEP". Progress reports will be monitored and addressed when failure is persistent.

5. There are several targeted intervention programs for our ELLs in math and ELA, all of which are offered in English. Our ELLs in grades K-1 utilize the Earobics phonics remediation program. ELL's in grades K-3 utilize the Wilson Language Basics program, Leap Frog Literacy based technology, The Write Source Writing Program, and Renzulli Learning Systems that is an online enrichment program in reading and math utilizes from K-8th grade. All of our ELL's receive AIS services as needed and differentiated instruction by their teachers within the classroom. At P.S. /M.S. 114 our ELLs utilize the core knowledge curriculum program in grades k-8. Grades k-5 utilizes the envision Math program, and the middle school works with the Course 1 and 2 mathematics program.
6. Those ELLs who reach proficiency on the NYSESLAT will continue to receive transitional support. Their teachers will be made aware of the ELL's transition into the classroom without the support of the ELL teacher, and their classroom progress will be monitored on a monthly basis. If needed they will be given additional academic support through AIS or the After School Academy.
7. A new program that has been considered and will be implemented for the upcoming school year is "Teaching the Qualities of Writing" for grades 2-8. This program will help students to become better writers in all genres.
8. There are currently no programs/services for ELL's that will be discontinued.
9. ELLs are afforded equal access to all school programs before, after and during school hours. We offer morning and after school tutorials and/or enrichment in math, reading, science and Spanish. Extracurricular activities are open to all ELLs from grades 3-8.

Our programs include chorus, band, cheerleading, basketball, and volleyball. There are also lunch tutorials and academic intervention services via small group instruction.

10. At PS/MS 114 there is a laptop for every student to use. Lower grades ELLs utilize the computers for the Renzulli and Earobics programs. Lower grades have access to Leap Frog Literacy based technology, Wilson Language Basics and The Foundations Literacy program. All of our ELL's have access to leveled libraries and are immersed in our Core Knowledge Curriculum. Grades K-5 utilizes the envision math program, and the middle school works with the Course 1 and 2 mathematics program.
11. At PS/MS 114 we try to offer native language support to both our ELL students and parents. Our parent coordinator ensures that all-important paperwork is sent home in the family's native language. We also offer a small selection of books and materials in languages other than English.
12. At PS/MS 114 all required services and resources correspond to our ELL's age and grade levels.
13. We currently do not have any programs or activities to assist our newly enrolled ELL students prior to the first day of school. Over the past few years at PS/MS 114 our new ELLs come to us in kindergarten. Within the first few weeks of each new school year the ESL teacher in collaboration with the parent coordinator holds a meeting for the new ELLs and their parents to answer any questions or address any concerns that they may have.

Professional Development and Support for School Staff

1. At P.S. /M.S. 114 we will conduct LAP (Language Allocation Policy) meetings on a monthly basis to raise our understanding of the principles of the LAP team. Our members will then turnkey the ideas to the staff during our monthly professional development meetings. The ESL teacher will meet on a monthly basis with classroom teachers of ELLs to evaluate how students are progressing based on the State learning standards as well as to discuss differentiated and academic language development strategies.
2. We provide our staff with support from both the ESL teacher and the guidance counselor to assist ELLs as they transition from elementary to middle school. ELLs have privately scheduled meetings with the both the guidance counselor as well as the ESL teacher to assist with the required paperwork needed to apply for middle school. It is at this time that the ELLs options are explained in full detail and all questions may be answered.
3. The ESL teacher is responsible for providing all teachers and service providers with the 7.5 hours of ELL training. Training is done over the course of the year during staff development days, professional half days, and monthly faculty meetings.

Parental Involvement

1. At PS/MS 114 we have a great deal of parental involvement from many of our parents. Several parents of our ELLs have chosen to become learning leaders and volunteer at the school on a weekly basis to assist in the lunchroom and in the schoolyard. Many parents of our ELLs are members of the school PTA, and attend monthly meetings.
2. There is one Community based organization that our school does partner with to provide workshops to all parents in the school including parents of ELLS. That organization is the **Rockaway Artist Alliance**, which has provided after school art workshops for parents and their children to attend together.
3. We evaluate the needs of our ELL parents at the start of each school year. During the month of September parents of ELLs are invited by the ESL teacher and the parent coordinator to attend a “meet and greet”. It is at this time that we have an opportunity to speak with the parents and ascertain if there is a need for oral interpretation and/or written translation.
4. Our parental involvement activities are geared to address the needs of our parents. Every month parents are invited to attend a workshop that is presented by a member of our school staff on a different subject/content area. For example, our math and core knowledge facilitators provide numerous workshops throughout the school year detailing the math and reading programs that we utilize at our school. During these monthly parent workshops the curriculum and what is expected of the children is explained in detail and any questions or concerns may be addressed.

Part 1V: Assessment Analysis

A. Assessment Analysis

Overall NYSESLAT Proficiency Results (Lab-R for New Admits)

	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Beginner (B)		6								6
Intermediate (I)				2				1		3
Advanced (A)	2	2	3	1		1			1	10
Total	2	8	3	3		1		1	1	19

B. After reviewing and analyzing the assessment data, answer the following

1. There are several assessment tools that we use to assess the early literacy skills of our ELLs. All students are evaluated using ECLAS2, Fundation Unit Assessments, EPAL, and Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessments. As part of the Fundations program our ELLs are given end of unit tests to determine if there is a need for review and/or remediation. All information that is gathered from the assessments is used to drive instruction. The data from the assessments indicates that many of our ELLs are on par with their monolingual peers in most areas, but we notice a need for remediation when it comes to writing.

2. If we look at the data patterns across proficiency levels on the Lab-R and NYSESLAT for the breakdown of skill in listening, speaking, reading and writing, we find that the students score considerably better, in both, listening and speaking, with most achieving proficiency.

3. Patterns of student’s progress across the modalities on the NYSESLAT will drive instruction for our ELL students. A large emphasis has been placed on developing our ELLs written language skills, as we have found that modality to be the most difficult one for our ELLs to master. We accomplish this by providing clear and focused ESL instruction to small groups of our ELL learners. ESL instruction at P.S. /M.S. 114 adheres to the eight main LAP principles with our main focus on principle 2: Academic Rigor. Our students are challenged in every content area to stimulate their academic growth within our school. ELLs are provided with challenging content and learning strategies that will prepare them to think critically, solve problems, and communicate in the language of instruction.

4. After examining student’s results we have found that our ESL students in grades 3-6 seem to do better on math assessments versus those that encompass a reading and writing component. Understandably, since the written language component is generally acquired last. The breakdown of levels in the modalities shows that the students in the upper grades are having difficulty obtaining proficiency in writing. These students are proficient in listening, speaking, and often reading as well.

b. The data seems to imply that the instructional program for ELL students is working well. Each year our NYSESLAT scores indicate that our ELLs are improving in all modalities. To continue this success we will keep the class sizes small, continue grouping the ability level of the students homogeneously, and provide instruction that is similar to that of the general population’s focus on literacy and test preparation. In addition, through collaboration the ESL teacher and the classroom teacher will continue to work together to identify each ELLs strengths and weaknesses which will in turn drive instruction.

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

School: _____ **BEDS Code:** _____

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

Allocation Amount:		
Budget Category	Budgeted Amount	Explanation of expenditures in this category as it relates to the program narrative for this title.
Professional salaries (schools must account for fringe benefits) - Per session - Per diem	(e.g., \$9,978)	(Example: 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)

Purchased services - High quality staff and curriculum development contracts.	(e.g., \$5,000)	(Example: Consultant, Dr. John Doe, working with teachers and administrators 2 days a week on development of curriculum enhancements)
Supplies and materials - Must be supplemental. - Additional curricula, instructional materials. - Must be clearly listed.	(e.g., \$500)	(Example: 1 Books on Tape, Cassette Recorders, Headphones, Book Bins, Leveled Books)
Educational Software (Object Code 199)	(e.g., \$2,000)	(Example: 2 Rosetta Stone language development software packages for after school program)
Travel		
Other		
TOTAL		

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.

There are various methods utilized at P.S. /M.S. 114 to assess our schools need for oral and written translation and interpretation. First, parents and/or guardians of all students entering the school must fill out a Home Language Identification Survey. The ESL teacher, who contacts the parents of those families where a language other than English is determined as the primary home language, reviews every HLIS. Based on meeting with and/or speaking with the parents, the determination is made for the need of translation services. Then, all of the Home Language Survey information of both students and parents is entered into the school ATS for easy reference. Next, at the start of the school year every classroom teacher invites all of the parents for a "meet and greet" the teacher. It is at this time that the teachers get an opportunity to speak with each parent and ascertain if there will be a need for oral interpretation and/or written translation. Finally, the ESL teacher in collaboration with the parent coordinator conduct a meeting for the parents of the English Language Learners each September to further determine if there are any non-English speaking 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.

At PS/MS 114 less than 3% of our school population are ELL's, therefore we have very few if any parents that are non-English speaking. The breakdown of languages spoken at home is as follows in order from greatest to least predominance: Arabic, Polish, Russian, Spanish, Chinese, Romanian, and Pilipino. Our major findings are that even in those families where English was not the native language, in every case one if not both of the parents spoke English, and at least one parent was able to read English as well. In all cases the parent who was dominant in the written and spoken word acted as the others translator.

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.

At P.S. /M.S. 114 written translation services will be provided to those parents determined to be in need of language assistance services by school staff and parent volunteers. The Parent Coordinator maintains a compiled list of languages other than English, which are spoken and written by school staff and parent volunteers. As documents are sent home that need to be translated, the parent coordinator will find one of the volunteers to translate the document so that it can be sent out in a timely manner. Also, the Parent Coordinator has access to download many school signs, documents, and forms in a variety of languages.

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.

At PS/MS 114 oral interpretation school staff and/or parent volunteers when deemed necessary will provide services. We will follow the same routines as for written translation services.

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>.

At P.S/M.S. 114 we will fulfill Section VII of Chancellor's Regulations A-663 by sending out a parent language survey at the start of the school year to determine if there are any parents who require translation and interpretation services. After the parent or guardian of every student in the school has been accounted for, we will determine if any of the parents' primary language is a covered language and require such services. Thereafter, all school memos, letters, notices, documents, and academic progress reports pertaining to their child's education will be sent home in their primary language

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

Directions:

- All Title I schools must address requirements in Part A and Part B of this appendix.
- Title I School wide 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

1. Enter the anticipated Title I allocation for the school for 2008-2009_____
2. Enter the anticipated 1% allocation for Title I Parent Involvement Program_____
3. Enter the anticipated 5% Title I set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified_____
4. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2007-2008 school year_____
5. If the percentage of high quality teachers during 2007-2008 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 at <http://schools.nyc.gov/Parents/NewsInformation/TitleIPIG.htm>. 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 at the NYCDOE website link provided above.

2. School-Parent Compact - Attach a copy of the school's Parent Involvement Policy.

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 at <http://schools.nyc.gov/Parents/NewsInformation/TitleIPIG.htm> 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 at the NYCDOE website link provided above.

Part C: TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM SCHOOLS

Directions: Describe how the school will implement the following components of a School wide 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.

3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.
4. High-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals (and, where appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff) to enable all children in the School wide Program to meet the State's student academic standards.
5. Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.
6. Strategies to increase parental involvement through means such as family literacy services.
7. Plans for assisting preschool children in the transition from early childhood programs, such as Head Start, Even Start, Early Reading First, or a State-run preschool program, to local elementary school programs.
8. Measures to include teachers in the decisions regarding the use of academic assessments in order to provide information on, and to improve, the achievement of individual students and the overall instructional program.
9. Activities to ensure that students who experience difficulty mastering the proficient or advanced levels of the academic achievement standards are provided with effective, timely additional assistance. The additional assistance must include measures to ensure that students' difficulties are identified on a timely basis and to provide sufficient information on which to base effective assistance.
10. Coordination and integration of Federal, State, and local services and programs, including programs supported under NCLB, i.e., violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, vocational and technical education, and job training.

Part D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS

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

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

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 IN NEED OF IMPROVEMENT (SINI) AND SCHOOLS REQUIRING ACADEMIC PROGRESS (SRAP)

This appendix must be completed by all Title I Schools in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1 and Year 2, Title I Corrective Action (CA) Schools, NCLB Planning for Restructuring Schools (PFR), NCLB Restructured, Schools, Schools Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP), and SURR schools that have also been identified as SINI or SRAP.

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

Part A: For All School Improvement Schools (SINI and SRAP)

1. For each area of school improvement identification (indicated on your pre-populated School Data Profile, downloadable from the NYCDOE website at <http://www.schools.nyc.gov>), 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 that Have Been Identified for School Improvement (SINI)

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.
 - (a) Provide the following information: 2008-09 anticipated Title I allocation = \$_____ ; 10% of Title I allocation = \$_____.
 - (b) Describe how the 10 percent of the Title I funds for professional development 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 the students’ background knowledge, suggesting a need for more age appropriate and culturally relevant books and articles for student use.

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.

– **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 has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school’s educational program.

The Administrative cabinet (administration and coaches), AIS team and classroom teachers have reflected on this statement and its relation to the instruction being provided in our school in the area of ELA. After professional conversations and the review of various sources of data, we came to our determination regarding key finding 1A English Language Arts

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

Applicable (to some findings) Not Applicable

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

In evaluating our ELA curriculum, we determined that the state’s findings are applicable to us in some, but not all areas, as described below.

ELA Alignment Issues:

Our school uses Balanced Literacy for our ELA instruction. This coupled with the fact that we have implemented the Core Knowledge Curriculum program in grades K-8, means that interdisciplinary instruction is the foundation of our students’ learning. In order to facilitate interdisciplinary instruction, and due to time constraints resulting from a 7 period day, the Core Knowledge topics are taught through the Shared Reading portion of the literacy block. We do not have a “reading program” aligned with NYS standards. Teachers are creating lessons based on the Core Knowledge themes, and are teaching skills based on a pacing schedule .

Our teachers plan together and therefore there is alignment across the grades as to what topics are taught.

Gaps in Written Curriculum

The data compiled by the state regarding the written ELA curriculum not being aligned with the state standards in terms of the range of topics covered and the depth of understanding required, applies to our school. Additionally, the SEC² found taught curriculum is not aligned to the state standards. Our school curriculum is aligned with state standards in all content areas. Extensive curriculum mapping was undertaken with the inception of the Core Knowledge program. We also follow the NYC Department of Education pacing calendars in other content areas such as math, science, art and languages.

Curriculum Maps:

Our teachers meet weekly during an additional “PD” period to plan instruction together. Curriculum maps were created and are utilized in the area of Core Knowledge. In past years PS/MS 114 did not have stand alone ELA curriculum maps. During the 2009-2010 school year ELA curriculum maps will be created by grade level teams.

ELL Instruction:

Our very small ELL population, are the recipients of a rigorous educational program (as reflected in testing data). Our ELL teacher attends professional development, which allows her to continue to use ESL standards to drive instruction while additionally supporting the content area learning standards and classroom teachers’ instruction. Additionally, pedagogy benefits from exposure to cutting edge, evolving best practices, research and information, which in turn is then, shared with the general education teachers.

ELA Materials:

PS/MS 114 follows the Balanced Literacy Model, and teachers have access to many leveled books for Guided Reading instruction. These are not only housed in classroom libraries, but are maintained in the school’s Literacy Resource/Guided Reading Room. It is here teachers can access books on various reading levels on grade level content specific topics. Students are the recipients of differentiated instruction because they are able to access subject information at their determined reading level.

Additional programs, *Time For Kids Non-Fiction Differentiation of Instruction Program- Applying Differentiation Strategies*), tiered reading materials, leveled libraries, the implementation of a differentiated trade book based Social Studies Curriculum program in Grades 4 and 8, and the implementation of the Foundations Phonics program and Earobics Phonics program, have provided ample opportunities for students’ needs to be met at their individual level.

Taught Curriculum:

In light of the fact that we do not follow a scripted, standards based, literacy program, teachers must be aware of the standards and use them as the basis of all lessons within the Balanced Literacy model. Although learning is project based in all the subject areas, again facilitated by the Core Knowledge Curriculum, there needs to be a higher emphasis on writing and spoken presentations.

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.

In reflecting on these issues, we have determined the need to create a written standards based, ELA curriculum/pacing calendar. We have purchased the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment program which will be implemented in grades K-8. This will provide the framework for reading lessons. Study groups will be conducted utilizing the book *The Continuum of Literacy Learning*, by Fountas and Panel. Our instructional focus next year will be on creating standards based lessons. Teachers will receive clear expectations of what is expected to be exhibited by students, through academic rigor and measurable student outcomes.

We are implementing the Qualities of Teaching Writing program.

We will encourage the expanded use of technology to foster oral communication and listening skills (ex. power point presentations, movies, pod casts). Since many ELA materials exist in our building, we will focus on training teachers on the effective use of these materials.

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 has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.

The Administrative Cabinet (administration and coaches), AIS team and classroom teachers have reflected on this statement and its relation to the instruction being provided in our school in the area of Mathematics. After professional conversations and the review of various sources of data, we came to our determination regarding key finding 1B Mathematics Instruction.

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?

PS/MS 114 has implemented the Envision Math program in grades K-5 and Course 1 and 2 in grades 6-8. These programs are aligned with the NYS standards. Additionally, all grade level teachers meet weekly to plan out cohesive mathematics instruction and assessments. A Mathematics Coach ensures that the NYC Comprehensive Approach to Balanced Mathematics is followed and that pacing is kept on target.

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 has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school’s educational program.

The Administrative cabinet (administration and coaches), have reflected on this statement and its relation to the instruction being provided in our school in the area of ELA. Based on observations, snapshots, student products, the review of formal lesson plans, professional conversations and the review of various sources of data, we came to our determination regarding key finding 2A.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

Once again, in relation to Key finding 2A, we find that it is applicable to our school in some areas, but not in others. Our Quality Review results, ELA scores (lack of AYP in Levels 3 and 4), and teachers’ needs assessment results, (based on Professional Development survey results), show that there is a need for more differentiation of instruction. Teachers have received Professional Development, programs have been purchased, but more work needs to be undertaken in improving this area. Teachers have begun to employ differentiation of instruction techniques in the subject areas (ex. Tiering of lessons) as evidenced by formal observations, walk throughs, and student products.

Since we employ the workshop model in our school, most lessons involve group work, with student grouping differentiated by level or goals. Additionally, the use of learning centers facilitates independent work, as well as project work. Because of our use of the workshop model, teacher directed lessons are minimal at best.

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.

We will continue to provide professional development in differentiation of instruction and ensure continued fidelity to the workshop model of instruction.

2B – Mathematics Instruction

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

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

2B.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school’s educational program.

The Administrative cabinet (administration/coaches) and classroom teachers have reflected on this statement and its relation to the instruction being provided in our school in the area of Mathematics. After professional conversations and the review of various sources of data (portfolios items, projects and observation of students playing math games), we came to our determination regarding key finding 2B.

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?

In relation to Key Finding 2B, we find that it is applicable to our school in some areas, but not in others. Our Quality Review results, and Math scores (lack of AYP in Levels 3 and 4), teachers’ needs assessment results (based on Professional Development survey results), show that there is a need for more differentiation of instruction. Teachers have received Professional Development, and programs and materials have been purchased, but more work needs to be undertaken in improving this area. Teachers have begun to employ differentiation of instruction techniques in the content areas (ex. Tiering of

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.

lessons) as evidenced by formal observations, walk throughs, and student products. Teachers have attended Professional Development on differentiation of mathematics instruction and have worked with the math facilitator. Acuity and Scantron Progressive Assessments, Earobics and the Foundations program, allows for targeted instruction in performance areas specific to an individual child's needs.

Since we employ the workshop model in our school, most lessons involve group work, with student grouping differentiated by level or goals. Additionally, the use of learning centers facilitates independent work, as well as math projects.

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 has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. **The Administrative Cabinet (administration and coaches) have reflected on this statement and its relation to the instruction being provided in our school in the area of teacher experience and stability. After professional conversations and the review of various sources of data, we came to our determination regarding key finding 3.**

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?

PS/MS 114 School report card data and mentoring logs indicate that our school has a low teacher turnover rate. Additionally, the School Excessing and Seniority list indicates 5 teachers with less than 4 years of experience. The addition of new teachers to our school has been done so to accommodate our expanding Middle School, and teachers who are on childcare leave.

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 has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. **The Administrative cabinet (administration and coaches), and ELL Teacher have reflected on this statement and its relation to the instruction being provided in our school in the area of Professional Development – English Language Learners. After professional conversations and the review of various sources of data, we came to our determination regarding key finding 4.**

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?

The low numbers of ELL students in our school are serviced by one ELL Teacher. This teacher attends LSO, and DOE professional development sessions. The strategies and any other ELL information is communicated through the ELL provider to the classroom teachers of the ELL students. During AIS committee meetings and PPT meetings, news regarding ELL instruction is communicated so that all service providers receive the same information, thereby fostering a cohesive educational team.

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 has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. **The Administrative cabinet (administration and coaches) and ELL instructor have reflected on this statement and its relation to the instruction being provided in our school in the area of data use and monitoring in ELL instruction. After professional conversations and the review of various sources of data, we came to our determination regarding key finding 5.**

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?

NYSESLAT testing data is provided and explained to the classroom teacher by the ELL provider. As testing data is disaggregated, the ELL subgroup is monitored and results are in turn shared with the ELL teacher. With the advent of the ARIS system, student data and progress will be monitored more consistently and progress will be transparent to all parties involved (ELL instructor, classroom teacher, Administration and other related service providers)

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 has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. **The Administrative Cabinet, PPT committee, AIS committee and Data Inquiry Group have reflected on this statement and its relation to the instruction being provided in our school in the area of Professional Development and Special Education. After professional conversations and the review of various sources of data, we came to our determination regarding Key Finding 6.**

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?

In reviewing individual teacher professional development plans, evidence exists to support attendance to outside, as well as, in-house professional development attendance in the area of Special Education. Our SETTS teachers have participated in the year long SETTS Academy, CTT teachers have attended relevant professional development, AIS teachers have attended Professional Development based on their individual needs, and classroom teachers have attend UFT Teacher Center sponsored professional development sessions on Special Needs student strategies.

SETTs providers have delivered Professional Development on instructional strategies to classroom teachers. Monthly, each grade meets with the related service providers of their students. Best practices are shared and teachers plan collaboratively for the success of the students.

To build upon our success in sharing best practices, we are looking to institute a monthly teacher survey, related to particular situations occurring in their classrooms and their need for strategies to address these specific student learning difficulties. The AIS team will then brainstorm possible solutions (strategies) and present these in the form of a monthly newsletter.

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 has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. **The Administrative Cabinet, IEP teachers, and SETTS teachers have reflected on this statement and its relation to the instruction being provided in our school in the area of Individual Education Programs. After professional conversations and the review of various sources of data, we came to our determination regarding Key Finding 7.**

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?

Although our IEP students' needs are basically academic and not behavioral, we have recognized that we need to further facilitate communication between classroom teachers and SETTS/IEP instructors. The institution of monthly meetings between classroom teachers and related service providers has facilitated communication of IEP goals, which have found need to be built upon. We are looking ahead to scheduling a meeting at the beginning of the year, so that special education teachers can go through each individual IEP with the classroom teacher, thereby facilitating a more collaborative professional relationship.

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

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

This appendix will not be required for 2009-10.

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

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

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:

- A// Title I schools must complete Part A of this appendix.
- A// 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.)
2. Please describe the services you are planning to provide to the STH population.

Part B: FOR NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

1. Please identify the number of Students in Temporary Housing who are currently attending your school (please note that your STH population may change over the course of the year). **There are no students fitting this category presently enrolled in our building.**
2. Please describe the services you are planning to provide to the STH population with the Title I set-aside funds.
Not Applicable
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.
Not Applicable