



HENRY GRADSTEIN P.S. 166 Q

2009-10 SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN (CEP)

MISSION STATEMENT

“OUR MISSION IS FOR ALL OF OUR STUDENTS, INCLUDING ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS, SPECIAL NEEDS CHILDREN, AND HIGH ACHIEVING STUDENTS, TO BE THE BEST THEY CAN BE. THIS REQUIRES A PARTNERSHIP WITH PARENTS AND A BELIEF THAT TOGETHER WE CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE IN EVERY CHILD’S LIFE. IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE OUR GOAL, WE WILL PROVIDE A QUALITY EDUCATION THAT SUPPORTS A STANDARDS-DRIVEN INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM FOR ALL STUDENTS, FOSTERS A POSITIVE SELF-IMAGE IN A NURTURING ENVIRONMENT, ENCOURAGES CULTURAL AWARENESS, SUPPORTS A VARIETY OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND SERVICES, DEVELOPS AN APPRECIATION FOR THE ARTS, USES A DIAGNOSTIC PRESCRIPTIVE APPROACH TO MEET INDIVIDUAL NEEDS AND PREPARES STUDENTS FOR A TECHNOLOGICAL WORLD.

OUR STUDENTS’ MISSION IS TO COME TO SCHOOL AND WORK HARD EVERY DAY SO THAT THEY CAN BE A SUCCESS

SCHOOL: 30Q166

ADDRESS: 33-09 35TH AVENUE, LONG ISLAND CITY, NY 11106

TELEPHONE: (718)786-6703

FAX: (718) 729-7443

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

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

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: PS 166Q **SCHOOL NAME:** Henry Gradstein

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 33-09 35th Avenue Long Island City, New York 11106

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 718-786-6703 **FAX:** 718-729-7443

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Janet Farrell **EMAIL ADDRESS:** Jfarrel1@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON: Xanthi Spiridakis

PRINCIPAL: Janet Farrell

UFT CHAPTER LEADER: Tiffany Rubin

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT: Raoufa Ali

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE:
(Required for high schools) N/A

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL SUPPORT ORGANIZATION (SSO) INFORMATION

DISTRICT: 30 **SSO NAME:** Integrated Curriculum and Instructional Learning Support Organization/Network #4

SSO NETWORK LEADER: Nancy DiMaggio

SUPERINTENDENT: Philip Composto

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

Directions: Each school is required to form a School Leadership Team (SLT) as per State Education Law Section 2590. SLT membership must include an equal number of parents and staff (students and CBO members are not counted when assessing this balance requirement), and ensure representation of all school constituencies. Chancellor’s Regulation A-655 requires a minimum of ten members on each team. Each SLT members should be listed separately in the left hand column on the chart below. Please specify any position held by a member on the team (e.g., SLT Chairperson, SLT Secretary) and the constituent group represented (e.g., parent, staff, student, or CBO). The signatures of SLT members on this page indicates their participation in the development of the Comprehensive Educational Plan and confirmation that required consultation has occurred in the aligning of funds to support educational programs (Refer to revised Chancellor’s Regulations A-655; available on the NYCDOE website at <http://schools.nyc.gov/Administration/ChancellorsRegulations/default.htm>). *Note: If for any reason an SLT member does not wish to sign this plan, he/she may attach a written explanation in lieu of his/her signature.*

Name	Position and Constituent Group Represented	Signature
Janet Farrell	*Principal or Designee	
Tiffany Rubin	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Raoufa Ali	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
Carina Ponce	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
	Student Representative <i>(optional for elementary and middle schools; a minimum of two members required for high schools)</i>	
	CBO Representative, if applicable	
Xanthi Spiridakis	Member/SLT Chairperson/Reading Teacher	
Jessica Geller	Member/Assistant Principal	
Chene Johnson	Member/Teacher	
Lucila Mejia	Member/Teacher	
Leslie Napolitano	Member/Teacher	
Carmen Urena	Member/Teacher	
Jorge Martinez	Member/Parent	
Marvin Dendy	Member/Parent	
Valerie Lamour	Member/Parent	
Kathryn Janelli Skyles	Member/Parent	
Alma Subisic	Member/Parent	
Migdalia E. Ramos-Diaz	Member/Parent	

(Add rows, as needed, to ensure all SLT members are listed.)* Core (mandatory) SLT members.

Signatures of the member 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.

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

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

P.S. 166Q is a multi-ethnic, urban school located in the Long Island City section of Queens, New York. The immediate community is home to a growing number of businesses and services, private homes, small apartment buildings, a large middle income cooperative development, and light industry surrounds the neighboring area. The Frank Sinatra School of Arts, which is located two blocks south of our school, is scheduled to open in September 2009.

Strengths

P.S. 166Q has achieved accomplishments that are a morale builder which motivates and sustains high level effort and performance. When recognition of work or effort is celebrated, regardless of performance level, students, community, and educational professionals benefit.

- All classrooms are a showcase for all levels of accomplishment.
- Student work is routinely displayed in classrooms and work is updated regularly.
- Bulletin boards amplify and exhibit student growth throughout the year.
- In class, celebrations of work completed include small parties, or fun rewards that are child-friendly, such as book marks, erasers, colorful folders, etc.
- Art projects are exhibited throughout the school in all major corridors.
- Festivals and other cultural, dance, music, and drama events are given wide exposure through the use of the auditorium and specialized classrooms. Parents and key members of the community are invited to attend.
- Our Science Fair extravaganza is so large that it can barely be contained within the gymnasium and may slip out into the hallway onto walls and display tables.
- Teachers are proud to send home personalized notes which recognize effort and accomplishments. They also update parents about students' progress in all curricular areas.
- Awards assemblies and other public relations involving students, their families and staff serve to recognize sustained effort and achievements in our school.

P.S. 166Q takes great pride in the fact that the entire school community is dedicated to furthering our students' futures. Over the last two years, we have received overall Quality Review ratings of "Well Developed." The 2007 Quality Review contained five "Quality Statements." P.S. 166 proudly received well-developed ratings for each of the five Quality Statements.

Attendance is one of P.S. 166Q's accomplishments. It has been maintained at a high level for the last three years and is an aid to the school's continuous improvement.

Parent involvement is an important component of this school's improvement. Parents are offered a multitude of workshops run by the math and literacy coaches, parent coordinator, administrators, teachers and service providers. Topics include parenting skills, helping children with math and literacy skills, and empowering parents by informing them about various programs in the school building, as well as curriculum and testing issues. Parents are also offered ESL classes which help them improve their English skills so that they, in turn, can be more involved in helping their children academically.

SECTION III – Cont'd

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

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

CEP Section III: School Profile

Part B: School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot (Version 2009-1A - March 2009)

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT										
School Name:	P.S. 166 Henry Gradstein									
District:	30	DBN:	30Q166	School BEDS Code:	343000010166					
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:					
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08*	2008-09			
Pre-K	63	70	65		94.9	95.5	96.2			
Kindergarten	189	143	166							
Grade 1	202	205	165	Student Stability - % of Enrollment:						
Grade 2	182	189	189	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09			
Grade 3	183	171	158		95.7	95.4	94.5			
Grade 4	181	171	158							
Grade 5	158	160	161	Poverty Rate - % of Enrollment:						
Grade 6	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09			
Grade 7	0	0	0		75.8	77.4	79.7			
Grade 8	0	0	0							
Grade 9	0	0	0	Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:						
Grade 10	0	0	0	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09			
Grade 11	0	0	0		0	2	40			
Grade 12	0	0	0							
Ungraded	1	7	1	Recent Immigrants - Total Number:						
Total	1159	1100	1071	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09			
					19	22	13			
Special Education Enrollment:				Suspensions (OSYD Reporting) - Total Number:						
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09			
# in Self-Contained Classes	46	41	44	Principal Suspensions	26	17	23			
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	24	27	19	Superintendent Suspensions	11	4	7			
Number all others	51	60	65							
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>				Special High School Programs - Total Number:						
				(As of October 31)	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:						
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09			
# in Transitional Bilingual Classes	0	0	26							
# in Dual Lang. Programs	44	38	26	Number of Teachers	71	76	78			
# receiving ESL services only	340	317	301							

CEP Section III: School Profile

Part B: School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot (Version 2009-1A - March 2009)

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT							
# ELLs with IEPs	20	10	11	Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	11	20	21
These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.				Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	N/A	5	3
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	100.0	98.7	94.9
				% more than 2 years teaching in this school	74.6	76.3	83.3
				% more than 5 years teaching anywhere	69.0	77.6	70.5
Ethnicity and Gender - % of Enrollment:				% Masters Degree or higher	93.0	91.0	95.0
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	% core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	98.5	100.0	95.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.4	0.4	0.5				
Black or African American	4.4	4.6	5.1				
Hispanic or Latino	46.6	45.6	45.2				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	28.4	29.1	29.7				
White	20.2	20.2	19.2				
Male	49.4	49.8	50.0				
Female	50.6	50.2	50.0				
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 ____						

CEP Section III: School Profile

Part B: School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot (Version 2009-1A - March 2009)

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		√SH	√	-			
Limited English Proficient		√	√	√			
Economically Disadvantaged		√	√	√			
Student groups making AYP in each subject		7	7	5	0	0	0

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY							
Progress Report Results – 2008-09				Quality Review Results – 2008-09			
Overall Letter Grade:	A			Overall Evaluation:	NR		
Overall Score:	91			Quality Statement Scores:			
Category Scores:				Quality Statement 1: Gather Data			
School Environment:	11.6			Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals			
<i>(Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)</i>				Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals			
School Performance:	23.1			Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals			
<i>(Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)</i>				Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise			
Student Progress:	48						
<i>(Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)</i>							
Additional Credit:	8.3						

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.

Note: Progress Report grades are not yet available for District 75 schools; NCLB/SED accountability reports are not available for District 75 schools.

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

2009 – 2010 School-wide Priorities for Improvement

1. Improve literacy comprehension through vocabulary building in all content areas as well as listening, speaking, and observing.
2. Continue to focus on improvement of basic mathematics skills for all students.
3. Focus on student writing skills, forms of writing, editing and proofreading skills.
4. Improve Higher Order Thinking Skills in all subject areas by utilizing questioning techniques guided by Bloom's Taxonomy.
5. To increase teaching strategies and tools through professional development of staff.

P.S. 166 takes great pride in the fact that the entire school community is dedicated to furthering the futures of our students. One of our greatest accomplishments is that we have received an overall Quality Review rating of "Well Developed." The 2007 Quality Review contained five "Quality Statements." P.S. 166 proudly received well-developed ratings for each of the five Quality Statements

Contributing factors to our overall rating include the abundance of data that is collected and used to drive instruction. Teachers are made aware of individual student progress using a plethora of methods. Acuity is used to gauge how well the students are achieving based on tests similar to New York State Assessments. We also use Reading Progress Indicators and Reading Achievement Indicators, from Continental Press, in order to focus on specific learning targets.

We are using the data in order to align our instructional strategies to our goals. The school has taken this year to focus heavily on building language skills through vocabulary. Students are engaged in learning in a variety of different ways. We utilize all of the modalities to enhance learning for students on all grade and ability levels. Differentiated instruction allows our students to achieve their greatest potential.

As we continue to strive to improve, we recognize various aids and barriers that exist. We consider the numerous resources, in both people and materials, as an aid to reaching our goals for the year. We take great pride in our small group instruction as a means of meeting the diverse abilities of our students. In addition, we plan to increase technology usage, within the school, in order to teach students using a multi-modality approach.

PS 166 students come to school each day and strive for success. Approximately one-third of these students receive mandated ESL services. Approximately 90% of all students are bi-lingual. Students learning a second language require a minimum of 5 years to develop cognitive academic language proficiency. Because students are often assessed before the 5 year minimum, we have difficulty infusing enough vocabulary into their

repertoires in order for them to achieve success on assessments. This year, we will continue to raise our expectations for our students by developing their expressive, written, and cognitive language skills.

Longitudinal Data Analysis (used to inform the school-wide priorities)

Rationale for Priority Number 1:

An analysis of the scores from the Citywide/Statewide Reading Assessments given over the last three years provides us with a baseline for our school’s priorities for next year. The data indicates that we have had an upward trend amongst students receiving three’s and four’s in the third, fourth, and fifth grades. Third grade students showed a decrease of 16% amongst level 2’s and an increase of 16% amongst level 3’s and 4’s. Fourth grade students increased the number of level 2’s by 6% and maintained the number of students achieving 3s and 4s. Fifth grade students performing at a level 2 decreased from 21% to 15%. Furthermore, the fifth grade showed a 10% increase in levels 3 and 4.

While the scores fluctuated in 2006, for all grades, the overall improvement directs us to our first priority, which is to enhance literacy comprehension through vocabulary building in all content areas as well as listening, speaking, and observing. Data provided by Continental Press Reading Indicators allows us to focus on specific learning targets such as Cause and Effect and Fact and Opinion.

Grade 3 Student Performance on the NYS ELA								
ALL TESTED STUDENTS								
Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	3	1%	23	14%	121	76%	13	8%
2008	5	3%	44	30%	81	56%	18	12%
2007	13	7%	50	28%	109	60%	9	5%
2006	10	7%	25	18%	91	68%	10	7%

Grade 4 Student Performance on the NYS ELA								
ALL TESTED STUDENTS								
Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	4	3%	36	24%	101	66%	12	8%
2008	12	7%	30	18%	115	69%	9	5%
2007	24	14%	48	28%	83	49%	15	9%
2006	3	7%	18	12%	116	80%	8	6%

Grade 5 Student Performance on the NYS ELA								
ALL TESTED STUDENTS								
Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	0	0%	24	15%	119	76%	14	9%
2008	5	3%	32	21%	101	67%	13	9%
2007	3	2%	41.5	27%	102	68%	5	3%
2006	9	6%	28	18%	97	63%	21	14%

Rationale for Priority Number 2:

A longitudinal analysis of the Citywide/Statewide Math Assessments has provided us with information useful for our future action plans. The data indicates that the percentage of students who achieved levels 3 and 4 has increased in grades three, four, and five. Students in the third grade had a 4% increase at the levels of 3 and 4.

An increase of 3% is noted amongst fourth grade students who achieved levels 3 and 4. The most dramatic increase is shown in the performance levels of our fifth grade students. There was a 27% increase in achievement of 3s and 4s on the New York State Math exam.

Data from both Predictive and Diagnostic Assessments, from Acuity, in conjunction with the City/State-wide exams reveals that we still need to work on improving our basic math skills. Individual teachers will use data from Everyday Math in order to further meet the needs of the students in their classes.

Grade 3 Student Performance on the NYS Math Test								
ALL TESTED STUDENTS								
Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	2	1%	4	2%	94	56%	68	40%
2008	3	2%	9	6%	96	63%	45	29%
2007	9	5%	15	8%	110	60%	49	27%
2006	11	6%	16	8.8%	94	51.6%	61	33.5%

Grade 4 Student Performance on the NYS Math Test								
ALL TESTED STUDENTS								
Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	1	1%	10	7%	75	49%	66	43%
2008	5	3%	13	8%	93	55%	57	34%
2007	17	10%	23	13%	85	49%	47	27%
2006	6	3.6%	15	8.9%	99	58.9%	48	28.6%

Grade 5 Student Performance on the NYS Math Test								
ALL TESTED STUDENTS								
Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	0	0%	6	4%	82	52%	69	44%
2008	9	6%	23	15%	68	44%	54	35%
2007	5	3%	22	14%	78	51%	47	31%
2006	9	5.3%	40	23.5%	79	46.5%	42	24.7%

Rationale for Priority Number 3:

Student writing portfolios are kept and assessed on an ongoing basis at PS 166. Teachers use rubrics for grading which allow them to monitor individual student progress. Teachers on all grades follow a writing pacing schedule and allow for students to write on a multitude of topics. At the end of the school year, samples from the student writing portfolios are passed along to the next teacher, so baseline writing skills can be established. Due to the large number of ELL students in our school, we are able to use standardized NYSESLAT scores as indicator for improving writing. One of the four components of that exam is writing. Our students show tendencies of remaining stagnant or declining in the area of writing. As we move forward, we look to use this data to increase the quality of our students' work as well as their standardized test scores.

Rationale for Priority Number 4:

A concern for the level of Higher Order Thinking Skills present in our classrooms lead us to do a study of questioning techniques by all classroom teachers. Using Bloom's Taxonomy, a tally sheet was developed in order to determine the types of questions and responses that were being asked. The results of the study were surprising, yet helpful. In both Kindergarten and First grade, the levels of Bloom's Taxonomy that were being reached were higher, and more frequent, than those in the upper grades. The data also suggests that teachers

need to establish a better scaffold for asking and answering questions. In the future, we would like to turn this data into action and inform the teachers of ways to increase Higher Order Thinking Skills at PS 166.

Rationale for Priority Number 5:

Based on positive feedback, from staff members, of the current professional development, PS 166 will continue to utilize a variety of outside consultants and resources related to our English Language Learner and Special Education populations. In addition, we will continue to address individual student and teacher needs.

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

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

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

1. By June 2010, there will be an increase in reading comprehension as evidenced by a 3% increase in students scoring at level 3 on the NYS ELA exam or show gains based upon Just Right Levels and other school-wide assessments. Due to the prevalence of reading in all content areas, it is necessary for students to become more proficient in their reading skills. We would like students to improve in comprehension, vocabulary, and fluency in order to become more active readers.
2. A 3% improved understanding will be built by June 2010 for students in grades 3, 4, 5 in Everyday Math knowledge and problem solving ability as measured by students' scores on NY State Math exam or show gains based upon other school-wide assessments. Students have exhibited a weakness in prior knowledge necessary to become successful Math thinkers. Therefore, our goal is to immerse students in situations that require a higher degree of mathematical skills.
3. By June 2010, students in grades 1 – 5 will show 2% increased writing skills and organization of various forms of writing, editing, proofreading and publishing as measured by pre and post testing in grammar, editing, and punctuation. As previously stated, we have a significant population of English Language Learners and bi-lingual students. After the collection of monthly writing samples, from all students, it was deemed necessary for us to focus on improving our students expressive and written language skills.
4. By June 2010, teachers in all grades will make a 5% or better improvement in the skill of questioning which is directly reflected in critical thinking and measured by the low inference data collected in September and June. After conducting a cross-sectional study of teachers and their questioning techniques, we determined that there was a decreased presence of words, from the Bloom's Taxonomy hierarchy, as our students got older.
5. By June 2010, teachers' knowledge of effective teaching strategies and classroom management will increase by 5%, or better, through professional development and measured by observations/reports by administration. In order to optimize classroom instruction, it is important to become an efficient classroom manager. Professional development is used as a means for collaboration amongst all staff members thus improving the quality of instruction.

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

Directions: The action plan should be used as a tool to support effective implementation and to evaluate progress toward meeting goals. Use the action plan template provided below to indicate key strategies and activities to be implemented for the 2009-10 school year to support accomplishment of each annual goal identified in Section V. The action plan template should be duplicated as necessary. **Reminder:** Schools designated for 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): ELA

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2010, there will be an increase in reading comprehension as evidenced by a 3% increase in students’ scoring at least a level 3 on the NY State ELA assessment or Just Right Levels.</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>Students will have opportunities to listen to stories read to them, and to utilize class libraries to read independently, as well as in shared and group reading experiences. Students will focus on fiction and non-fiction literature in a variety of genres. Each grade will complete cross-curricular thematic units. Students will keep a reading log and record their responses in journals. Specific comprehension skills will be targeted monthly. Vocabulary development will be encouraged through word walls, dictionary use and words in context. Students will create individual word logs and have weekly vocabulary words and spelling. 9/2009 – 6/2010 daily.</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<p>SWP/Title I: Administration, teachers, parents, students, funded reading teachers</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<p>Reading journals will reflect students’ responses to grade level literature. 2) At least 50% of our students will complete the reading of 25 books or more on or above grade level. 3) Evidence of growth in reading, i.e., fluency, stamina, vocabulary, literal/critical comprehension, variety of genres, quality of reader response, as measured by ongoing teacher assessment and the reading response journal. Also, data will be collected via RPI and RAI. Acuity tests will be given in October, November, March, May and June.</p>

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

Directions: The action plan should be used as a tool to support effective implementation and to evaluate progress toward meeting goals. Use the action plan template provided below to indicate key strategies and activities to be implemented for the 2009-10 school year to support accomplishment of each annual goal identified in Section V. The action plan template should be duplicated as necessary. **Reminder:** Schools designated for 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): Mathematics

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>By June 2010, a 3% improved understanding will be built by for students in grades 3, 4, 5 in everyday math knowledge and problem solving ability as measured by students scores on the NY State Math exam or other school-wide assessments.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>1) Continued use of Everyday Mathematics program of instruction. 2) Acuity and the Grow Report in grades 3, 4 and 5 will be used to differentiate instruction based on strengths and weaknesses. 3) Appropriate use of math manipulatives, working with partners, small groups and the whole class. 4) Use of technology to improve mathematical ability. 5) Focus on problem solving using higher level thinking skills. Students will have homework which involves solving math word problems. 6) Continued use of Every Day Counts in our daily math lessons. 7) Develop an understanding of mathematical operations by modeling and discussing a rich variety of problem situations. 8) Share ideas. 9/2009 – 6/2010</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>SWP/Title I: Administration, teachers, parents, students, funded math teachers</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Evidence of growth in conceptual understanding, problem solving, reasoning, and fluency in basic skills, will be measured by ongoing teacher assessment and by NYS testing during the academic year 2009 – 2010.</p>

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

Directions: The action plan should be used as a tool to support effective implementation and to evaluate progress toward meeting goals. Use the action plan template provided below to indicate key strategies and activities to be implemented for the 2009-2010 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): Writing

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>By June 2010, Students in grades 1 – 5 will show a 2% increase in writing skills and organization of various forms of writing, editing, proofreading and publishing as measured by pre and post testing in grammar, editing, punctuation and capitalization.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>Students will demonstrate improved writing skills through a balanced literacy approach, including: 1) writing daily 2) access to a print rich environment, e.g. experience charts, word walls 3) participating in activities that promote letter-sound correspondence, word recognition, and sentence formation, e.g. manipulatives, chalkboards, letter stamping, tactile letters, experience charts, teacher modeling, story frames 4) participating in shared and individual writing activities 5) producing a narrative account, narrative procedure, response to literature, and a research report 6) writing in journals/logs and maintaining portfolios of completed/published work 7) conferencing about their writing with teachers and peers, as well as individual portfolio reviews 8) practicing letter writing skills (eg. friendly, business) 9) writing centers with a variety of writing tools 10) progressing through the stages of the writing process 11) writing through the content areas 12) using computers and lap tops as a writing vehicle. Students will be taught grammar and practice usage with emphasis on editing and proofreading skills. 9/2009 – 6/2010</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>SWP/Title I: Administration, teachers, parents, students, funded reading teachers</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>2% of student population will improve in writing based on the standards during the school year 2009 – 2010. This will be measured by writing portfolios, response journals, K – 3 ECLAS, CPAA, and an in house pre and post test mentioned in the goal.</p>

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

Directions: The action plan should be used as a tool to support effective implementation and to evaluate progress toward meeting goals. Use the action plan template provided below to indicate key strategies and activities to be implemented for the 2009-10 school year to support accomplishment of each annual goal identified in Section V. The action plan template should be duplicated as necessary. **Reminder:** *Schools designated for 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): Teaching Strategies and Management

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>By June 2010, teachers’ knowledge of effective teaching strategies and classroom management will increase by 5% or better through professional development as measured by observations conducted by administration.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>Professional Development team will create a menu of professional development sessions for staff to attend. Professional development will include outside facilitators, if funding is available, such as C.I.T.E. and Schools Attuned as well as from internal staff and coaches. The professional development will be ongoing from September through June, 2009 – 2010.</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Title IIB/TL FSF/Title I/SWP/TL Children First Funding: Teachers will participate in professional development workshops. Workshops will be focused around differentiating instruction and classroom management. Literacy and Math coaches will assist teachers to implement strategies learned in professional development</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Sign in sheets at professional development sessions. Implementation of strategies in classrooms. Reflective logs. Student achievement on Acuity tests.</p>

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENT FOR ALL TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix 1: Academic Intervention Services (AIS)

Grade	After School (Jacob Riis)	Morning DL/ ELL Program	Saturday Rdg.	Morning/ Afternoon Math	Wilson	Foundations	Rec. Room /AIS	Project Share	After School (Literacy) [Dec. Break]	ELL After School	Saturday	Schools Attuned	Tutoring	37 ½ Minutes
K	12	49	N/A	0	0	170	0	14	0	N/A	N/A	26	16	10
1	45	56	N/A	0	15	151	13	9	0	N/A	N/A	24	15	17
2	43	107	N/A	0	7	0	5	181	0	N/A	N/A	28	14	64
3	21	92	N/A	0	5	0	5	140	32	N/A	N/A	24	10	78
4	1	57	N/A	82	0	0	1	164	167	N/A	N/A	20	12	165
5	5	55	N/A	40	1	0	0	125	135	N/A	N/A	24	11	165
Total	127	416	185	122	28	321	24	633	334	N/A	N/A	146	78	499

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

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

Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	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:	Comprehension skills are addressed through the implementation of small group and individualized instruction. Techniques to work on children's specific needs in order to increase their knowledge base in all subject areas. In addition, we utilize Wilson, Schools Attuned, and the push-in model during the school day.
Mathematics:	Math skills and concepts are reinforced daily through the use of Everyday Math skills. The math push in teacher works with a small group to reinforce skills, strategies, concepts, terminology and problem solving strategies during the school day.
Science:	Students who did not meet the standards on the 4 th grade science test receive AIS from the science teacher on a weekly basis. They read from the Science Daybook and there is small group activity emphasizing Scientific method and content reading during the school day.
Social Studies:	We give AIS services in Social Studies for all who have not met the standards on the 5 th grade NYS Social Studies test. They will read and learn how to respond to document based questions during the school day.
At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:	Students receive counseling through a variety of techniques, in small groups depending on their needs. Sometimes there are whole group discussions. They use appropriate and alternative methods of problem solving and conflict resolution during the school day. Parents are also invited to bring specific issues.
At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	One on one conferencing, appropriate and alternate methods of conflict resolution and how to study are utilized during the school day..
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	Works with the child and family to ease communication among all parties during the school day.
At-risk Health-related Services:	The nurse maintains a list of children with health problems and works with the child, the family, and school personnel to make sure the child is comfortable. It is important that the child feels well in order to be able to succeed academically during the school day.

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

NCLB/SED requirement for all schools

Part A: Language Allocation Policy (LAP) – Attach a copy of your school's current year (2009-2010) LAP narrative to this CEP.

Language Allocation Policy 2009-2010

P.S. 166 is a multicultural school located at 33-09 35th Avenue in Long Island City, Queens. **Our total student population is 1,070. 31%** constitute our English Language Learners. The following chart shows the **languages spoken by grade** as well as the **number of ELL students** in our ESL, Dual Language and Freestanding ESL Programs.

TOTAL NUMBER OF ELLS BY GRADE IN EACH LANGUAGE GROUP

Language	K	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Spanish	35	40	54	24	23	21	197
Chinese	2	5	5	4		2	18
Albanian				1		1	2
Bengali	9	12	14	9	7	8	59
Urdu			3	2			5
Arabic	8	4	6	6	1	4	29
Italian						1	1
Filipino (Tagalog)				1			1
Punjabi	1	1		1			3
Portuguese			2	3	1	1	7
Serbo-Croatian	1					1	4
Vietnamese							1
Polish		1	2	1			4
Russian	1						1
Korean						1	1

Nepali	1						1
Japanese	1						1
Romanian		1					1
Total Number of ELLs	59	64	86	52	33	40	334

The goal of our school is to provide standardized and consistent, high-quality instruction not only for monolingual students but also for those participating in the Freestanding English as a Second Language (ESL) and Dual Language (DL) Programs. Currently, our school has 7 freestanding ESL classes in grades K-5 and a total of 8 Dual Language classes. We have 10 Certified ESL teachers, 7 Bilingual Common Branches Spanish. The documentation for all of these teachers is on file. **These programs are designed and implemented in accordance with CR Part 154 Title III guidelines.**

Parental involvement is crucial to ensure the success of all ELLs at PS 166. From the moment parents enter our school, they are made aware of the different programs designed to help the children achieve academic excellence. At the time of registration, Home Language Identification Surveys are carefully reviewed to determine which children are potential ELLs. In September, parents of ELL students attend an orientation session where they are made aware of programs that are available such as ESL, Transitional Bilingual and Dual Language Programs. During this orientation, parents will read literature and view a video in their native language about each program. Parents will then fill out the parent survey and program selection form. Each form will be analyzed to determine students' placement.

After reviewing the "Parent Survey and Program Selection form" for the past few years, the trend in program choice continues to be ESL. Parents of Spanish speaking students in Kindergarten continue to choose Dual Language over bilingual education. After careful evaluation of the "Parent Survey and Program Selection form", students are placed according to the parents' choice.

The programs available at PS 166 are described as follows:

Dual Language Program Description

We currently have implemented a total of 8 Dual Language classrooms with 2 classes in Kindergarten and 1st grade. The 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th grades each have 1 self-contained Dual Language class. There are 176 students in the Dual Language Program. In grades K and 1 this program will follow the Alternating Day Variant of 50:50 Model which involves two teachers, two linguistically integrated classes, and two separate classrooms. In 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th grades each Dual Language classroom will follow the Alternating Day Variant of 50:50 Model. The classroom is divided into two sections, one for English, color-coded in blue and the other in Spanish, color-coded in red. In this program, students will build upon academic skills in their first language and eventually transfer these skills to the second language. Language Arts is taught using NLA, ESL, and ELA. Content area subjects are taught in both English, using second language acquisition strategies, and the target language. The classroom environment is designed to represent the Teacher's College workshop model and balanced literacy in the daily instruction. Teachers use differentiated instruction to meet the needs of the students. All of our beginner and intermediate students receive 360 minutes of ESL per week and all advanced students receive 180 minutes of ESL and 180 minutes of English language arts per week.

English proficient and Spanish native speakers are administered El Sol as well as ECLAS. In grades 3-5, all students participating in the DL Program take EL Examen de Lectura en Español (ELE) to assess reading achievement in Spanish. The data obtained from ECLAS and EL SOL assessments was analyzed and used

to drive instruction. In order to help English proficient students acquire Spanish, they will receive small group instruction by a certified and highly qualified Spanish Bilingual teacher.

In order to continue providing a quality education to all our ELLS we utilize our literacy and math coaches to offer rigorous classroom instruction. We provide common prep time for Dual Language teachers to plan collaboratively. In addition, we have periodic grade meetings and study groups where teachers meet to plan and discuss instruction as well as the latest studies on language acquisition.

Furthermore, professional development continues to be a high priority in order to keep teachers abreast of the latest findings on ESL and Dual Language Programs. If funds are available, all of the out-of-classroom certified bilingual and ESL teachers, math and literacy coaches will offer workshops to all teachers who work with English Language Learners.

- **September 2009: Establishing classroom management and routines in a Dual Language classroom and ESL classroom.** This entails classroom arrangement, scheduling, curriculum planning, organization, distribution and time frame of homework assignments in both languages, preparations of books and materials.
- **November 2009: Align Dual Language and ESL curriculums throughout content areas with New York State standards.** Teachers will work together on different subject areas to develop activities that will go along with the standards.
- **January 2010: Meeting the special challenge of supporting vocabulary and language development.** In preparation for the NYSESLAT, teachers will work on strategies to teach vocabulary and reinforce test-taking skills.
- **June 2010: Assessing and evaluating the Dual Language program to assure successful implementation in the future.** Teachers will discuss and share best practices on Dual Language Programs.

*In addition to these workshops, the Dual Language personnel will be afforded the opportunity to collaborate during the school day by scheduling common preps and lunch periods.

Students enrolled in the Dual Language Program receive individualized instruction by participating in Success Maker, a research and technology based program by Pearson. The program is designed to improve English acquisition for ELLs and improves Spanish literacy for those students whose native language is Spanish. Reports of student data from Success Maker are generated. The reports are analyzed and used to differentiate instruction in all curriculum areas.

Freestanding ESL

P.S. 166 currently services 311 students in Self-Contained English as a Second Language (ESL) programs. We emphasize English language acquisition through the use of ESL strategies, methodologies and techniques such as visuals, repetition, TPR, and graphic organizers. Our goal is to assist students to achieve the state-designated level of English proficiency for their grade and to help ELLs meet or exceed New York State and City standards.

ELL students in our programs are culturally enriched due to the great number of immigrant students enrolled in our school. The diversity of languages allows room for our students to appreciate and be sensitive to other people's cultures.

In addition to having 7 Freestanding ESL classes, we also have 2 CTT and 7 Special Education self-contained classes with ELLs who receive push-in services by certified and highly-qualified teachers. Homeroom and ESL teachers work collaboratively to plan for instruction and thus meet the needs of each student. These lessons provide language acquisition and vocabulary support while retaining content instruction time.

Students in ESL classes receive all instruction in English. As per New York State **CR Part 154** regulations, all ELLs who score at the beginning and intermediate levels on the NYSESLAT receive 360 minutes of ESL weekly. Advanced students receive 180 minutes of ESL and 180 minutes of ELA weekly. All of our students are provided with high-quality instruction using scaffolding strategies in the delivery of the lessons. To achieve this, instruction is differentiated depending on the needs of the students and the data from ECLAS, LAB-R, NYSESLAT, CPAA, ELA, Success Maker, ELL Interim Assessments, and other assessments.

The ESL classrooms provide print-rich environments, which reflect instruction and students' current work as aligned with the ESL Learning Standards. Every classroom is equipped with a leveled library containing culturally diverse books. All of the classrooms have a computer center with a wide range of software. Students who are not in a Self-Contained ESL classroom receive push-in services by certified and highly-qualified ESL teachers who, after careful planning with the classroom teacher, incorporate ESL strategies and methodologies to help students acquire English through the content area. General education teachers and ESL teachers work collaboratively to provide language acquisition and vocabulary support while retaining content instruction time.

English Language Learners who have been in the country for less than 2 years, and are in need of additional support in English, or ELL Students with Interrupted Formal Education (SIFE) are offered the opportunity to attend a morning and/or afternoon program depending on available funding, where highly qualified and certified ESL teachers will provide high-quality instruction in English as a Second Language, English Language Arts, and Math using a variety of methodologies.

Data Analysis and Implications for Instruction

NYSESLAT Results By Levels

<i>Levels</i>	1	2	3	4	5	Total	%
Beginner (B)	28	13	8	4	3	56	21%
Intermediate (I)	25	21	25	9	9	89	32%
Advanced (A)	11	52	19	20	28	128	47%
Total Tested	64	86	52	33	40	275	100%
<i>Total ELLs</i>	64	86	52	33	40	275	100%

<u>Kindergarten LAB-R</u>	
LAB-R Level	# of Students Tested
Below Intermediate (I) level	37

Above Intermediate (A) level	22
Total Tested	59

After examining the results in the four modalities (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) the following data patterns across proficiency levels were observed:

- 21% of students scored at the beginning level
- 32% scored at the intermediate level
- 47% scored at the advanced level

In Kindergarten most students scored at the Intermediate level in the LAB-R. In grade 3 most students scored at the Intermediate level. In first grade most students scored at the Beginner level and in grades 2, 4 and 5, most students progressed to the Advanced level. According to the tables above, there is an upward trend in NYSESLAT scores as students move on to higher grade levels.

NYSESLAT RESULTS BY MODALITIES

<i>Listening/Speaking</i>	<i>K/1</i>	<i>2-4</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Beginner</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Intermediate</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Advanced</i>	<i>96</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Proficient</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>89</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Reading/Writing</i>			
<i>Beginner</i>	<i>30</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Intermediate</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>47</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Advanced</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>64</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Proficient</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>52</i>	<i>5</i>

Patterns revealed across the four modalities in all grades:

- In K/1 most students scored at the Advanced level in Listening /Speaking and at the Proficient level in Reading/Writing.
- In grades 2-4, most students scored at the Proficient level in Listening/Speaking and Advanced in Reading/Writing.
- In grade 5, most students scored at the Advanced level in both Listening/Speaking and in Reading/Writing.

The trend indicates that as students progress into higher grade levels, they also progress in levels of English proficiency.

Instructional Decisions for Reading, Writing, Listening and Speaking Based on Data Analysis

- In Kindergarten, students are receiving small group instruction where a certified Schools Attuned teacher employs mnemonics as a strategy to improve reading and writing.
- In first grade, we will continue to provide students with small group instruction with a focus on Schools Attuned mnemonic devices and strategies.
- Second grade students receive AIS services, small group instruction, and those in the Dual Language program will also participate in 37½ minutes extended day program.
- Fourth and Fifth grade students also participate in the 37½ minutes extended day program, which focuses on enriching and amplifying their vocabulary, and strengthening their reading comprehension. Students who do not increase their score from year-to-year receive AIS and Schools Attuned services where the teacher focuses on students' weaknesses using ESL strategies, methodologies and techniques.
- Students in all grades receive individualized instruction by participating in Success Maker, a research and technology based program by Pearson. The program is designed to improve English acquisition for ELLs and improves Spanish literacy for those students whose native language is Spanish. Reports of student data from Success Maker are generated. The reports are analyzed and used to differentiate instruction in all curriculum areas.
- Special Education students not meeting proficiency levels, in English, continue to be provided with push-in and pull-out ESL services which are provided by certified ESL teachers. Paraprofessionals assigned to students are assigned according to language when available. All special education students that require a bilingual paraprofessional due to their IEP have one.
- ESL students new to the country transition by working with ESL teachers and pairing up with other students from their country that speak their language. ESL teachers work with students to give them basic functional language to negotiate through our school
- In collaboration with our feeder Middle School, parents and students are invited to the Middle School to help with the transition.

RESULTS FROM STATE TESTS AND IMPLICATIONS

ELA

All students in grades 3-5 who were in the country for more than one year took the ELA test in 2008. The table below indicates the ELA results.

ELA results in 2008 were as follows:

	1	2	3	4
Grades				
3	5	21	17	-
4	11	13	25	-
5	3	9	10	-

ELE

All students participating in the DL Program were administered the ELE test in the spring of 2008. 87 % of the students achieved a performance level of 70 or above.

Science

All ELL students in grade 4 took the New York State Science test in 2008. Of the 33 students tested, one scored 4, 15 scored 3, fourteen scored 2 and three scored 1. In addition, three Special Education students were tested. One obtained a score of 3 and two scored a 1.

Content Performance Area for Grades K-5 and Implications for the School's LAP and Instruction

ELA:

For all ELL newcomers, long-term ELLs and ELL students who did not meet the ELA standards, we are implementing a wide range of programs and activities such as:

Morning School Program:

If funding is available, we will implement a morning program for ELL students in grades 3-5. The purpose of the program will be to increase the proficiency level in English by focusing on the 4 modalities: listening, speaking, reading and writing for the NYSESLAT.

Morning school program for ELL students in grades 3-5 who will be taking New York State ELA test:

If funding is available, this program will focus on the development of necessary skills to meet ELA standards through the use of balanced literacy and Success Maker which is an academic intervention program designed to accelerate learning for students who are experiencing difficulty in reading. Its two major goals are to accelerate students reading abilities and help students learn to apply and use the comprehension and decoding strategies and skills of an effective reader as they read across the curriculum.

Schools Attuned:

This program focuses on weaknesses and builds on strengths through one-on-one tutoring using ESL strategies, methodologies and techniques.

Push-in Reading & ESL:

This service provides small group intervention with a reading or highly qualified ESL teacher using differentiated instruction. Students will read both literature and informational texts to reinforce reading skills.

Academic Intervention Services (AIS):

Small group instruction is provided to help students who scored low on the listening, reading or writing component of the NYSESLAT test. ESL strategies, methodologies and techniques are implemented. Charts, diagrams and graphic organizers are used as well as exposure to literature and informational texts. Students will also be encouraged to write narratives and reports. To help students' listening skills, students will be exposed to one to one interaction, group discussions and oral presentations.

Math Grades 3-5:

ELL students who did not meet the math standards are receiving supplemental support services, which include:

- **Academic Intervention Services (AIS):**

Teacher works with small groups to enhance mathematical concepts and skills, and problem solving. Students are taught to formulate strategies for solving a problem. They will apply strategies to arrive at a logical conclusion. Students express their results orally or written in addition to drawings, symbols, and charts.

- **Push-in Math Coach:**

Work in collaboration with the classroom teacher to reinforce skills, strategies, concepts and terminologies. This enables both teachers to focus on students who require more assistance, while at the same time assessing and conferencing with individual students.

- **Schools Attuned:**

Teachers use differentiated strategies to address students' weaknesses through the use of games, manipulatives, charts, and diagrams.

Science:

Academic Intervention Services (AIS) are being provided to ELL students who did not meet the standards on the 4th grade state science test. The concepts being explored include basic life, earth, and physical science. The materials being presented will focus on the scientific method as a way to solve problems. The use of manipulatives, word walls, charts, graphs, graphic organizers, and Native language /English dictionaries are incorporated into the lesson. Furthermore, students read from Science Day book level 4 and Sciencesaurus. Scientific concepts will be enhanced through the use of technology (audio-visuals and computers). There are periodic assessments, which include teacher observation, as well as teacher-made tests. Teacher will conduct conferencing periodically.

Part B: Title III: Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students – School Year 2009-2010

Form TIII – A (1)(a)

Grade Level(s) K-5 Number of Students to be Served: _____ LEP _____ Non-LEP

Number of Teachers 10 Other Staff (Specify) _____

School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview

Title III, Part A LEP Program

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

Instructional Program

P.S. 166 is multicultural school located at 33-09 35th Ave. in Long Island City Queens. The total student population is 1,070 of which 31% are English language learners. Our school provides standardized and consistent high-quality instruction for those participating in the ESL and Dual Language Programs. Currently our school has 10 free-standing ESL classes in grades K-5 and 7 Dual Language classes in grades K-5. These programs are designed in accordance with CR- Part 154

and the Title III guidelines. The placement of the above students is based on the results of the LAB-R and NYSESLAT scores. ELL students who scored at the beginning or intermediate levels receive 360 minutes of ESL per week. Students who scored at the Advanced level receive 180 minutes of ESL and 180 minutes of ELA weekly. Certified and highly qualified ESL and bilingual teachers service all of our ELL students.

The instructional strategies that are being implemented to help our ELL students meet the City and State standards are as follows:

- ECLAS, El SOL, Success Maker, ELL Interim Assessments, LAB-R, NYSESLAT, ELA, and ELE are all used to identify the needs of individual students.
- Reading and writing workshop models
- 90-minute ESL block concentrating on mastery of the English language through reading, writing, speaking and listening.
- Using ESL methodologies such as TPR, modeling, and visuals, along with technology and exposure to different forms of literature to yield cross-cultural knowledge and understanding.
- AIS services where small group instruction is provided to help students who need additional help.
- Schools Attuned, which will focus on weaknesses and build on strengths through 1-to-1 tutoring.
- Other authorized ESL activities such as trips, multicultural shows, interviews, speeches, international lunches and exposure to literature will be developed to enhance and broaden students' knowledge.
- Success Maker, a technology-based program is used to increase language skills, in both English and Spanish, by providing students with regular individualized instruction in reading and math. Used in conjunction with lessons on the Smart Board, the program reinforces reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. Data reports, from the program, are used as assessments and provide teachers with necessary data for differentiating instruction.

Title III Supplementary Instructional Program

Teachers implement supplemental instructional strategies as outlined by the Empire State NYSESLAT program published by Continental Press. Students have the opportunity to work with materials that are parallel to the NYSESLAT which should lead to increased levels of English Language Proficiency.

- Students in all grades receive individualized instruction by participating in Success Maker, a research and technology based program by Pearson. The program is designed to improve English acquisition for ELLs and improves Spanish literacy for those students whose native language is Spanish. Reports of student data from Success Maker are generated. The reports are analyzed and used to differentiate instruction in all curriculum areas.
- Success Maker, a technology-based program is used to increase language skills, in both English and Spanish, by providing students with supplemental individualized instruction in reading and math. Used in conjunction with lessons on the Smart Board, the program reinforces reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. Data reports, from the program, are used as assessments and provide teachers with necessary data for differentiating instruction

ELL Professional Development Program

Staff Development (2009 – 2010 Activities) :

The following staff development workshops will be planned for the 2009 – 2010 school year for ELL teachers. The proposed schedule for the professional staff development workshops for the 2009 – 2010 school year is as follows:

September 2009: Literacy Coach and ELL Coordinator will provide Smart Board Training for ELL teachers in order to empower them to correctly utilize Smart Boards in conjunction with the Success Maker Program.

October 2009: ELL Coordinator will provide Success Maker Training in inputting the students' names and course assignments in order for students to begin the IPM phase of Success Maker.

November 2009: Pearson will provide detailed professional development on the use of reports. Reports generated utilize student data to plan future instruction.

December 2009: ELL Coordinator and school-based Success Maker Facilitator will provide ELL teachers with the means necessary for using Success Maker to differentiate instruction based upon a skills-based analysis of the data.

January 2010: ELL Coordinator and school-based Success Maker Facilitator will provide ELL teachers with the means necessary for using Success Maker to differentiate instruction based upon a skills-based analysis of the data.

February 2010: Literacy Coach, ELL Coordinator, and school based-Success Maker Facilitator will further develop skills necessary for integrating Smart Board instruction into daily lessons using data from Success Maker and supplementing the existing ELL program.

March 2010: ELL Corrdinator will provide guidance for interpreting past NYSESLAT scores and how to prepare students for the NYSESLAT test utilizing specific skills outlined in the Success Maker program.

April 2010: ELL Corrdinator will provide guidance for interpreting past NYSESLAT scores and how to prepare students for the NYSESLAT test utilizing specific skills outlined in the Success Maker program while working with Smart Boards.

May 2010: ELL Coordinator will provide workshops on assessing and evaluating the supplemental ELL programs to assure successful implementation in the future.

- If funding allows, staff development will also include on-going professional development from Mr. Robert Burke from C.I.T.E. for teachers of ELL students.
- Felicia Bentine and Suzan Goldstein of the Learning Support Organization will provide a series of professional development sessions for classroom teachers of ELL students.

Self-contained ESL classrooms will have Smart Boards and programs in both English and Spanish are used with the classes. Smart Boards provide an opportunity for students to engage in supplemental interactive activities that reinforce language proficiency skills in reading, writing, listening, and speaking.

Freestanding ESL

P.S. 166 currently services 311 students in Self-Contained English as a Second Language (ESL) programs. We emphasize English language acquisition through the use of ESL strategies, methodologies and techniques such as visuals, repetition, TPR, and graphic organizers. Our goal is to assist students to achieve the state-designated level of English proficiency for their grade and to help ELLs meet or exceed New York State and City standards.

ELL students in our programs are culturally enriched due to the great number of immigrant students enrolled in our school. The diversity of languages allows room for our students to appreciate and be sensitive to other people's cultures.

In addition to having 7 Freestanding ESL classes, we also have 2 CTT and 7 Special Education self-contained classes with ELLs who receive push-in services by certified and highly-qualified teachers. Homeroom and ESL teachers work collaboratively to plan for instruction and thus meet the needs of each student. These lessons provide language acquisition and vocabulary support while retaining content instruction time.

Students in ESL classes receive all instruction in English. As per New York State **CR Part 154** regulations, all ELLs who score at the beginning and intermediate levels on the NYSESLAT receive 360 minutes of ESL weekly. Advanced students receive 180 minutes of ESL and 180 minutes of ELA weekly. All of our students are provided with high-quality instruction using scaffolding strategies in the delivery of the lessons. To achieve this, instruction is differentiated depending on the needs of the students and the data from ECLAS, LAB-R, NYSESLAT, CPAA, ELA, Success Maker, ELL Interim Assessments, and other assessments.

Dual Language Program Description

We currently have implemented a total of 8 Dual Language classrooms with 2 classes in Kindergarten and 1st grade. The 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th grades each have 1 self-contained Dual Language class. There are 176 students in the Dual Language Program. In grades K and 1 this program will follow the Alternating Day Variant of 50:50 Model which involves two teachers, two linguistically integrated classes, and two separate classrooms. In 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th grades each Dual Language classroom will follow the Alternating Day Variant of 50:50 Model. The classroom is divided into two sections, one for English, color-coded in blue and the other in Spanish, color-coded in red. In this program, students will build upon academic skills in their first language and eventually transfer these skills to the second language. Language Arts is taught using NLA, ESL, and ELA. Content area subjects are taught in both English, using second language acquisition strategies, and the target language. The classroom environment is designed to represent the Teacher's College workshop model and balanced literacy in the daily instruction. Teachers use differentiated instruction to meet the needs of the students. All of our beginner and intermediate students receive 360 minutes of ESL per week and all advanced students receive 180 minutes of ESL and 180 minutes of English language arts per week.

Push-In Model

Students who are not in self-contained ESL classrooms receive push-in services by a highly qualified and certified teacher who will teach literacy and content areas using ESL methodologies and strategies. Our goals are to assist students to achieve the state designated level of English proficiency for their grade and to help ELLs meet or exceed New York State and city standards.

Parent/Community Involvement

From the moment parents enter our school, they are made aware of the different programs designed to help their children achieve academic excellence. When parents register their children, the ESL Coordinator, Dual Language Coordinator, Parent Coordinator, or trained staff member assists them in the registration process. Translators are available for parents to ensure that information is communicated properly.

Parents are given a choice of enrolling their children in a Transitional Bilingual, ESL, or Dual Language program after the child has been administered the LAB-R and parents have seen the NYCDOE video "Orientation Video for Parents of Newly Enrolled ELL's"

In the Spring, parents of incoming students are invited to attend an open house. At this time, administrators, teachers, parent coordinator, ESL Coordinator, Dual Language Coordinator, Guidance Counselor, and translators greet and speak to the parents about the school. Parents are informed of the different programs, activities, events and special services available to their children such as Speech and Language, Physical Therapy, music and multicultural events. At the end of the orientation, parents are encouraged to ask questions and are finally taken on a tour of the school.

To keep parents abreast of the different programs within our school, P.S. 166 provides parents of ELL students with at least three parent orientation meetings during the year. The Fall orientation is to inform parents of the programs available for ELL's such as Transitional bilingual, Freestanding English as a Second Language, and Dual Language. The Winter and Spring orientations focus on informing parents of the different tests, assessments and their implications. During these orientations translators, of different community languages, are present.

The Parent Coordinator is the link between the parents and the school community. She familiarizes the parents with the immediate community and informs them of resources such as local doctors, health care institutions, legal services, and any other services which may be needed by parents, such as immigration, citizenship, housing, food stamps, etc.

The Parent Coordinator, conducts ESL classes for the parents every week from Tuesday – Thursday. She sometimes incorporates activities such as crocheting or Arts and Crafts so that parents experience a variety of activities and learn language skills needed for completing these activities.

The Parent Coordinator, along with the Math Coach, attends staff development sessions at Hunter College where they are trained to conduct math workshops back at the school building. The Parent Coordinator and Math Coach then conduct monthly math workshops in house for the parents

The Parent Coordinator also assists the Literacy Coach in offering several workshops throughout the year, informing parents of the reading programs in the building and teaching parents how to help their children improve literacy skills at home.

The Parent Coordinator trains the parents to access the DOE website and use the ARIS Parent Link to acquire valuable information regarding their child's education.

Additionally, the Parent Coordinator organizes and provides workshops with the help of outside agencies on topics ranging from nutrition, health, assessments and information on how parents can help their children succeed.

Some of the outside agencies include:

- Health Plus: Informs parents about free or low-cost medical coverage for children and offers enrollment for those parents who have no health coverage.
- Mount Sinai Hospital of Queens: Conducts several workshops at the school during the school year on various topics dealing with children, adolescents, and health. In addition, they send flyers to inform the parents of community workshops that are scheduled at the hospital in their "Community Room." Topics include health, nutrition, aerobics, etc. The hospital also offers free screening for high blood pressure, cancer and diabetes.
- Cornell University: Offers a 6-week nutrition program to the parents to teach them how to budget, shop wisely, and prepare healthy meals for their families. During these sessions, parents participate in hands-on activities where they actually prepare healthy nutritious meals. Upon completion of the six-week program, parents receive a certificate from Cornell which can be used towards employment in the food business.
- EPIC (Every Person Influences Children): Provides workshops based on parents' needs. Members of the organization teach parents how to set goals for themselves and for their children, addressing issues such as adolescence, children with special needs, and sexual abuse. Parents receive a three full-day training session at EPIC's home base, I.S. 204 in Long Island City. Workshops then follow at P.S. 166 to address parents' needs.
- Learning Leaders: Provides workshops for parents on how to help their children with homework and suggests appropriate books for different ages. At the end of the year, there is a party given for the parents as a culminating activity for collaborating with P.S. 166.

- Dial-A-Teacher: Trains parents on how to help their children with homework.
- The UFT: Comes to P.S. 166 to provide parents with a resource package listing cultural institutions and activities as well as free activities available for children.
- TWEED: Offers workshops three to four times a year – sometimes on Saturdays, for ELL parents. These workshops are conducted in a variety of languages and parents are provided with breakfast, lunch and a gift bag. The Parent Coordinator registers the parents for these events and provides them with METRO cards to cover their travel expenses.
- Variety Boys & Girls Club of Queens: Sends representatives to P.S. 166 to speak about the many programs available such as: swimming, drama, art, reading, group/learning centers, and computer classes.

Project Jump Start (Programs and activities to assist newly enrolled LEP students)

PROJECT JUMP START

To assist newly enrolled ELL students, we begin by establishing a good working relationship with the parents, empowering them with as much knowledge as we can about their child's education so that they can take on an active role in their child's learning experiences.

In the Spring, there is an orientation for parents of incoming Kindergarten students. The Dual Language and ESL coordinators explain the HLIS forms, LAB-R and NYSESLAT testing to the parents and inform them of the various programs that are available for all students. ESL, Bilingual, and Dual Language programs are explained so that parents make informed decisions about where they want their child placed. In the Fall, the Dual Language and ESL Coordinators conduct an orientation for parents of newly-admitted students. They explain the programs available in the school for all children. Parents of ELL students are informed and given the opportunity to select an ESL, Bilingual or Dual Language program. They also learn how differentiated instruction and small group instruction are used to meet children's needs, and how support staff such as ESL teachers can support this type of instruction.

Parents of the newly enrolled students are also invited to attend workshops presented by the service providers of P.S. 166. The service providers inform parents of the various services their children are entitled to in order to address any special needs they may have.

The Parent Coordinator assists in the above-mentioned workshops and also coordinates other workshops to inform the parents of services and resources in the community that are available to them and their families.

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

Staff Development (2009 – 2010 Activities) :

If funding is available, the following staff development workshops will be planned for the 2009 – 2010 school year for ESL, Dual Language, monolingual and cluster teachers. The proposed schedule for the professional staff development workshops for the 2009 – 2010 school year is as follows:

- September 2009: Smart Board Training
- October 2009: Success Maker Training – computer program in Spanish and English.
- November 2009: Align Dual Language curriculum throughout the content areas
- December 2009: What does the research tell us about learning in a second language?
- January 2010: Aligning ESL instruction to the reading and writing curriculum.
- February 2010: Tailoring shared reading, read alouds, and word study to support ELL’s
- March 2010: Interpreting past NYSESLAT scores and how to prepare students for the NYSESLAT test.
- April 2010: Current research on the relationship between English oral proficiency and English text-level literacy skills.
- May 2010: Assessing and evaluating the Dual Language program to assure successful implementation in the future.

- If funding allows, staff development will also include on-going professional development from Mr. Robert Burke from C.I.T.E. for teachers of ELL students.
- Felicia Bentine of the Learning Support Organization will provide a series of professional development sessions for classroom teachers of ELL students.
- SMART Technologies will provide professional development on how to incorporate technology into the curriculum. They send trainers to P.S. 166 to provide staff development to teachers on using Smart Boards.

Dual Language and Self-contained ESL classrooms have Smart Boards and programs in both English and Spanish are used with the classes. Smart Boards provide an opportunity for students to engage in interactive activities that reinforce language proficiency skills in reading, writing, listening, and speaking.

In addition to the above-mentioned staff development, the Dual Language personnel are afforded the opportunity to collaborate during the school day by scheduled common preps and common lunch periods. Additionally, every Friday, the Dual Language teachers meet with the Dual Language coordinator to do curriculum planning.

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

School: PS 166Q **BEDS Code:** 343000010166

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

Allocation Amount:		
Budget Category	Budgeted Amount	Explanation of expenditures in this category as it relates to the program narrative for this title.
Professional salaries (schools must account for fringe benefits) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Per session - Per diem 		
Purchased services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High quality staff and curriculum development contracts. 		
Supplies and materials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Must be supplemental. - Additional curricula, instructional materials. - Must be clearly listed. 	\$16599.78	Approximately 4 Smart Boards with projectors to supplement the Success Maker Program Smart Boards provide an opportunity for students to engage in supplemental interactive activities that reinforce language proficiency skills in reading, writing, listening, and speaking.
Educational Software (Object Code 199)	\$32,700.22	Approximately 60 licenses at \$410 each to supplement the current ELL Program. Over 1/3 of the PS 166 student population are documented ELLs. The Success Maker program allows students to use different modalities to address individual learning needs. Approximately \$10,000 for professional support and technological support.
Travel		
Other		
TOTAL	\$49,300	

OFFICE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS
GRADES K-8 LANGUAGE ALLOCATION POLICY WORKSHEET, SCHOOL YEAR 2006-2007

DIRECTIONS: The following worksheet will help you compile and analyze data necessary for your school's language allocation policy (LAP). Your school's LAP should be written in narrative form, and should answer all questions contained in this worksheet. Also, upon completing the worksheet, gather the appropriate signatures on this worksheet and attach it to the LAP narrative that you submit.

I. Language Allocation Policy Team Composition

4	PS 166		
Region	School	LIS	
Janet Farrell	Jessica Geller, Cheryl Hametz, Dov Witkes	Mary Bland	
Principal	Assistant Principal	Parent Coordinator	Parent
Effie Spiratos - Literacy	Helen Blum - Math	Clara Pena - ESL Coordinator	
Coach	Coach	___ESL_____ Teacher Teresa Daleo-Doussi	_____ Teacher
Jessica Geller- Data Specialist	Louis Padula		
_____Computer/Data Specialist____ Teacher	Guidance Counselor	Related Service Provider	Other

II. Teacher Qualifications

English as a Second Language Teachers		Bilingual Teachers	
Number of Certified 11	Number of Uncertified 0	Number of Certified 8	Number of Uncertified

III. ELL Demographics

Total Number of Students in School 1100	Total Number of ELLs 360	Percent of Student Population that is ELL 33 %
--	-----------------------------	---

The number of classes (or *periods) for each ELL program model that your school provides

K	1	2	3	4	5	*6	*7	*8	Total
---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	-------

OFFICE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS
GRADES K-8 LANGUAGE ALLOCATION POLICY WORKSHEET, SCHOOL YEAR 2006-2007

Chinese										
Russian										
Bengali										
Haitian Creole										
Other										
TOTAL										

NUMBER OF ELLS BY GRADE IN EACH LANGUAGE GROUP
FREESTANDING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

Spanish	35	40	54	24	23	21				
Chinese	2	5	5	4	0	2				
Russian	1									
Bengali	9	12	14	9	7	8				
Urdu	0	0	3	2						
Arabic	8	4	6	6	1	4				
Haitian Creole										
French										
Korean						1				
Punjabi	1	1	0	1						
Polish	0	1	2	1						
Albanian				1		1				
Other										
TOTAL	56	63	84	48	31	37				

OFFICE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS
GRADES K-8 LANGUAGE ALLOCATION POLICY WORKSHEET, SCHOOL YEAR 2006-2007

Advanced (A)										
Total Tested										

LISTENING										
B										
I										
A										
SPEAKING										
B										
I										
A										
READING										
B										
I										
A										
WRITING										
B										
I										
A										

FREESTANDING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

Level	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	TOTAL
Beginner (B)		28	13	8	4	3				56
Intermediate (I)		25	21	25	9	9				89
Advanced		11	52	19	20	28				128

OFFICE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS
GRADES K-8 LANGUAGE ALLOCATION POLICY WORKSHEET, SCHOOL YEAR 2006-2007

(A)										
Total Tested		64	86	52	33	40				275
TOTAL ELLS										
LISTENING										
B	1		1	1	1	1				
I	14	14	5	4	4	3				
A	48	48	25	25	25	18				
SPEAKING										
B	1		1	1	1	1				
I	14	14	5	4	4	3				
A	48	48	25	25	25	18				
READING										
B	15	15	5	5	6	4				
I	22	21	15	16	16	5				
A	14	14	21	21	22	13				
WRITING										
B	15	15	5	5	6	4				
I	22	21	15	16	16	5				
A	14	14	21	21	22	13				

Part A Questions: After a review of the data above, answer the following questions in your LAP narrative for each program:

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

Please see attached LAP narrative.

OFFICE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS
GRADES K-8 LANGUAGE ALLOCATION POLICY WORKSHEET, SCHOOL YEAR 2006-2007

ELE	6										
	7										
	8										
Chinese Reading Test	3										
	4										
	5										
	6										
	7										
	8										

Part B Questions: After a review of the data above, answer the following questions in your LAP narrative for each program

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

2. Describe how the school leadership and teachers are using the results of the ELL Interim Assessments. Please see attached LAP narrative.

3. What are the implications for the school's LAP and instruction? How is the Native Language used? Please see attached LAP narrative.

4. How are the English Proficient students (EPs) assessed in the second (target) language? **(For Dual**

OFFICE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS
GRADES K–8 LANGUAGE ALLOCATION POLICY WORKSHEET, SCHOOL YEAR 2006–2007

Language Only) Please see attached LAP narrative.

5. What is the level of language proficiency in the second (target) language for EP students? **(For Dual Language Only)** Please see attached LAP narrative.

6. How are the English Proficient Students faring in State and City Assessments? **(For Dual Language Only)** Please see attached LAP narrative.

VI. Planning for ELLs (Include in LAP narrative): Answer the questions below keeping in mind the following CR Part 154 instructional unit requirements for ELLs, grades K–8

	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced
FOR ALL PROGRAMS			
ESL instruction for <i>all</i> ELLs as required under CR Part 154	360 minutes per week	360 minutes per week	180 minutes per week
ELA instruction for <i>all</i> ELLs as required under CR Part 154			180 minutes per week
FOR TBE /DL PROGRAMS			
Native Language Arts		90 minutes daily	45 minutes daily

Answer all, regardless of whether you have these subgroups in your school currently.

OFFICE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS
GRADES K–8 LANGUAGE ALLOCATION POLICY WORKSHEET, SCHOOL YEAR 2006–2007

1. Describe your plan for SIFE students. Please see attached LAP narrative.

2. Describe your plan for ELLs in US schools less than three years (newcomers). Please see attached LAP narrative.

3. Describe your plan for long-term ELLs (in NYC school six years or more). Please see attached LAP narrative.

4. Describe your plan for ELLs identified as having special needs. Please see attached LAP narrative.

5. Describe your plan for continuing transitional support for students reaching proficiency on the NYSESLAT. Please see attached LAP narrative.

6. How does your school assure that the mandated number of instructional minutes is provided according to proficiency levels in each program (as shown above)? Please see attached LAP narrative.

7. How is explicit ESL delivered in each program? Please see attached LAP narrative.

8. To what extent are students served by ESL teachers pushing in or pushing out? Please see attached LAP narrative.

VII. Resources and support (Include in LAP narrative)

1. What instructional materials are used to support the learning of ELLs (include content area as well as language materials)? Please see attached LAP narrative.

2. Describe the professional development plan for all personnel of ELLs at the school. (Please include all teachers.) Please see attached LAP narrative.

OFFICE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS
GRADES K–8 LANGUAGE ALLOCATION POLICY WORKSHEET, SCHOOL YEAR 2006–2007

VIII. Program descriptions (Include in LAP narrative)

Using the information compiled in this form, please see attached LAP narrative. Describe each program model and the language allocation plan for each in narrative form. Attach to this worksheet.

IX. Completing the LAP (Attach narrative to this document and have it reviewed and signed by appropriate regional staff.)

Janet Farrell

January 2010

School Principal

Date

Nancy DiMaggio

January 2010

Regional Instructional Specialist

Date

Dr. Philip Composto

January 2010

Local Instructional Superintendent

Date

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

Requirement under Chancellor's Regulations – for all schools

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

Part A: Needs Assessment Findings

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

Home Language Identification Surveys (HLIS) are completed by the parents in their home language and results are analyzed. In addition to the HLIS, parents are sent home a second language survey from P.S. 166 asking them to indicate their language of preference for any communication between them and the school. This second survey is especially helpful in situations where the parents are of different backgrounds and do not speak the same language. The parent, who is usually responsible for communicating with the school, is the one whose language is most often requested for correspondence. Responses are analyzed. Parents then receive written and oral information from the school in the language they have requested.

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.

After analyzing data from the Home Language Identification Surveys (HLIS) and the P.S. 166 Language Surveys, results indicate that the languages most needed for oral and written communication as requested by parents are English, Spanish, Arabic, Bengali, Chinese, Korean and Urdu.

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.

Both Title I translation service monies, and in-house staff, are used, and will continue to be used, for written translation services. Written correspondence such as newsletters, notifications regarding workshops or informational meetings, and any other letters of importance will continue to be sent to the parents in the language they have requested.

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.

In-house staff, including teachers and paraprofessionals, along with parent volunteers, will work closely together providing oral interpretation services to meet the language needs of the parents at P.S. 166. Because of the excellent working relationship and sense of community that exists in the building,

parents often bring in outside volunteers to assist with interpretation services. We plan to continue providing interpretation services in the same manner during the coming year.

The Parent Association president provides interpretation services in Arabic while the Vice-President provides services in Spanish. These services will continue depending on the languages spoken by the PA officers in 2009 - 2010.

Parents are also provided with oral interpretation services in Bengali, Punjabi, Arabic, Chinese, Urdu, Korean, Italian & Greek. Parents will continue to be provided with services in the languages they need.

In the event that no staff member is available in the building when oral interpretation is needed, we will continue to have ongoing continuous access to the Department of Education's Telephone Interpretation Service Dept. to meet the needs of parents at all times.

We will take the steps required to fulfill Section VII of Chancellor's Regulations A-663 regarding parental notification requirements for translation and interpretation services.

All Parents whose primary language is a covered language and who require language assistance services will be provided with a copy of The Bill of Rights & Responsibilities which includes their rights regarding translation and interpretation services.

Posted in the lobby of the building's primary entrance, there will continue to be signs indicating where parents need to go for translation and interpretation services. These signs are posted in the covered languages.

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>.

It is the school's policy and will continue to be that parents in need of language assistance services are not and will not be prevented from reaching the school's administrative offices solely due language barriers.

Upon entering the school building, there are signs posted in the languages of the school population indicating where to go for translation and interpretation services. Every parent, regardless of the language they speak, will continue to be allowed into the building as long as they show a valid I.D. to the security officer at the door.

Parents will be informed of the Department's website concerning the rights of parents to translation and interpretation services and how to access such services. Parents will be given information regarding the Department's website during the Parent Association's meetings and the Parent Coordinator will give workshops informing parents of the website and showing them how to access the information they need.

We will obtain translation of signs and required forms pursuant to Chancellor's Regulations A-663 for parents whose language (other than English or covered language) is shared by more than 10% of the school's student population. These forms will be posted and provided in accordance with Chancellor's Regulations A-663.

For parents whose language is shared by less than 10% of the school's population, even if the number is as low as 1, we provide in-house translation and interpretation services. We plan to continue servicing the parents' needs in this manner.

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

All Title I schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:

- All Title I schools must address requirements in Part A and Part B of this appendix.
- Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP) schools must complete Part C of this appendix.
- Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) schools must complete Part D of this appendix.

Part A: TITLE I ALLOCATIONS AND SET-ASIDES

	Title I	Title I ARRA	Total
1. Enter the anticipated Title I Allocation for 2009-10:	668,486	47,511	673,237
2. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside for Parent Involvement:	7684		
3. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside to Improve Parent Involvement (ARRA Language):		475	
4. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified:	33424		
5. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect – HQ PD (ARRA Language):		2,374	
6. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Professional Development:	68480.35		
7. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect (Professional Development) (ARRA Language):		4,751	

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

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

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

Part B, 1: School Parental Involvement Policy

School Parent Involvement Policy

- P.S. 166Q will include parents in the development of parent involvement activities as required by 1118 (a)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as determined during the PASS Review. The School Leadership Team surveys the parents to find out what needs they have and then the team plans programs to meet those needs.
- The school will involve parents in a timely and ongoing manner in the planning, implementation, evaluation and continuous improvement of programs funded through Title I. This will be done via the Pass Review, School Leadership Team, School Committees and Evaluation/Survey forms.
- Parents and school will share responsibility for high student performance. There will be parent workshops to discuss the reading and math programs as well as on the agenda of Parent Association meeting. Promotional policy will be distributed early in the year and interpretation made as needed. The rules, rituals and routines will be explained and expectations outlined. Title III workshops for ESL/Bilingual parents will also be included annually.
- Capacity building activities for school staff and parents will support strong parental involvement. Teacher Recognition Day will be sponsored yearly by the Parents Association. More importantly, parents will be involved in the Learning Leaders program and the volunteer program for helping classroom teachers. Parents as partners in their child’s education will be a focus also.
- P.S. 166Q is a high performing school. Parents will be provided with information about how we will help their child/children meet the standards and/or exceed the standards. Each October the school will conduct the required annual review.
- A flexible schedule of regular meetings with parents will be planned each year. This will include meetings of the Parents Association, School Leadership Team and other meetings for parent involvement. The Parent Coordinator will schedule daily workshops also before and during the school day. During the meetings, parents are able to network with other parents, make suggestions and provide input into decisions affecting their child’s education.
- Personnel at P.S. 166Q will respond to written parent comments in a timely manner. The principal is our designated school contact person or whomever she deems should respond.
- Communication with parents will be on a daily basis depending upon the Parent/Student needs. The children will receive an Agenda Book the first week of school. Within the agenda, we will outline student assessment results, proficiency levels and meaningful interpretation. Parents are given assessment result through teacher/student, via the internet, and report cards. Further communication will be disseminated in a monthly calendar and by way of the parent coordinator. In addition, all correspondence from the chancellor and superintendent will be put on hard copy

and distributed as appropriate. All children who meet criteria for after school and summer programs will be informed at Parent meetings and via appropriate fliers. The fliers will be prepared in a multitude of languages. At the beginning of the year, parents will receive the teacher's weekly schedule as to when the teacher is available to share information relating to child's progress. P.S. 166Q has an "Open Door" policy. Administration and classroom teachers will be available as needed to speak to parent concerns.

P.S. 166Q is a multi cultural school. Because of such a diverse population, we will accommodate parents with Spanish translations and when available, we will also translate into Bengali, Urdu, and Punjabi. We will use a blanket attachment to all correspondence that will inform parents to let the school know if they need translation provided in a language other than those now available. Also, report cards will be sent home in the language that the parent requests. When dealing with oral communication, P.S. 166Q is able to provide for Arabic, Bengali, Urdu, Punjabi, Spanish, Italian, and Greek. If we do not have a translator needed, the parent will be encouraged to bring their own interpreter to assist in communication and participation for parents in their native language.

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

Part B, 2: School-Parent Compact

School Parent Compact

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

The School Agrees:	The Parent/Guardian agrees:
<p>To convene an annual meeting for Title I parents to inform them of the Title I program and their right to be involved.</p> <p>To offer a flexible number of meetings at various times, and if necessary, and if funds are available, will provide transportation, child care or home visits for those parents who cannot attend a regular school meeting.</p> <p>To actively involve parents in planning, reviewing and improving the Title I programs and the parental involvement policy.</p> <p>To provide parents with information about all programs.</p> <p>To provide performance profiles and individual student assessment results for each child and other pertinent individual and school district/regional education information.</p> <p>To provide high quality curriculum and instruction.</p> <p>To deal with communication issues between teachers and parents through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ parent-teacher conferences at least annually, ▪ frequent reports to parents on their children's progress, ▪ reasonable access to staff, <p>Opportunities to volunteer and participate in their child's class and observation of classroom activities.</p> <p>To assure that parents may participate in professional development activities if the school determines that it is appropriate, i.e. literacy classes, workshops on reading strategies. To become involved in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the school parent – involvement policy</p>	<p>.</p> <p>To use or ask for technical assistance training that the local education authority or school may offer on child rearing practices and teaching and learning strategies.</p> <p>To work with our child/children on their schoolwork.</p> <p>To read for 15 to 30 minutes per day to K through 1st grade.</p> <p>To listen to grade 2 and 3, and read for 15 to 30 minutes per day.</p> <p>To monitor our child/children's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - attendance at school, - - homework, - - Television watching. <p>To share the responsibility for improved student achievement.</p> <p>To communicate with our child/children's teachers about their educational needs.</p> <p>To ask parents and parent groups to provide information to the school on what type of training or assistance they would like and/or need in the educational process.</p>

SCHOOL PARENT COMPACT SIGNATURE SECTION

We agree to work together, to the best of our abilities, as educators and parents to fulfill our common goal of providing for the successful education of our children.

Principal

(718) 786-6703

2007-2008 School Year

Date

Child's Name and Class

Signature of Parent/Guardian

Print Name

Telephone Number

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.**
 - A school based committee was formed to assess whether student performance is related to the State standards. The committee met four times and the School Leadership Team conducted a P.A.S.S. Review. The committee then met with the School Leadership Team to review material and attain additional input. The CEP was reviewed, along with the data, to determine the effectiveness of and to look for gaps in our written curriculum and the taught curriculum in all subjects, especially for English Language Learners. Materials were also examined as to their relevance, alignment, and language appropriateness. The results of our analysis were shared with our school community including the School Leadership Team, the Parents Association, the staff, our Senior Achievement Facilitator, and our Network Leader

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.**
 - Our committee reviewed and evaluated the taught curriculum for all students with a focus on English Language Learners for alignment with state learning standards. While it is evident through lesson plan evaluations and observations that some of the New York State standards are being addressed, they are not being looked at consistently in all classes, all of the time, to the depth in which they should be taught. Upon reviewing students' writing samples in grades K-5, there was evidence that the students were not meeting the expectations set forth by the comprehension, listening, and speaking standards. Vocabulary expansion was needed in receptive and expressive language development. The findings were especially true for our English Language Learners.

 - 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.**

- If funding permits we will provide English Language Learners and Dual Language students with a morning program.
 - **Help provide an enriched, amplified, and accelerated curriculum. Infuse more theatre, dance, visual and musical arts into curriculum.**
 - PS 166 has 1 full-time dance teacher who provides students with culturally rich experiences.
 - PS 166 has 2 full-time art teachers who teach visual arts with a component of theater built into the curriculum.
 - PS 166 has 2 full-time music teachers who allow students access to both vocal and instrumental music. We have a full keyboard lab, a guitar lab, a chorus, and classes who play the recorder and learn about the history of music.
 - **Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.**
 - One third of PS 166 students receive mandated ESL services. In order to supplement these services, we have reading and math teachers that push-in to the classrooms to provide more individualized instruction for the students.
 - **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.**
 - PS 166 students receive At-risk/AIS services
 - Some students receive mandated counseling through Guidance counselors
 - A SAPIS worker provides students with relevant and meaningful lessons.
3. **Instruction by highly qualified staff.**
- 98% of all staff members are either highly qualified or are teaching within their certification area.
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.**
- Teachers will receive Schools Attuned professional development (PD).
 - Teachers will receive ongoing PD from a specialist from C.I.T.E.
 - Assistant Principals will attend ELI workshops.
 - Parents will have the opportunity to attend math and literacy workshops as provided by the coaches.
 - Parents will attend language, parenting, and arts seminars as conducted by the parent coordinator.
5. **Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.**
- P.S. 166Q will have a full time Teacher Center specialist to provide staff development
 - P.S. 166Q will have a math coach
 - P.S. 166Q has a comprehensive professional library
 - P.S. 166Q will send teachers to conferences, ask them to turnkey
 - P.S. 166Q has a school climate conducive to life long learning for staff
 - P.S. 166Q has sharing of best practices
 - P.S. 166Q provides teachers with an opportunity to reflect and grow
 - P.S. 166Q fosters schools attuned strategies

6. **Strategies to increase parental involvement through means such as family literacy services.**
 - Classes will continue in ESL computer skills and homework help. P.S. 166Q will continue to train parents as Learning Leaders through the parent coordinator's office and NYC Learning Leaders. Other avenues available to increase parent involvement to include multi-cultural show, career day, and family literacy and math evenings, and family "make and take" workshops.
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.**
 - We will continue with our successful pre-kindergarten program. Currently, we have 4 half-day classes that serve over 80 students.
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.**
 - Intake forms for students overall academic strengths and weaknesses
 - PPT and AIS discussions to formulate AIS student plan
 - Ongoing dialogue with all personnel involved with student
 - Schools Attuned organizers delineating individual student profiles
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.**

Schools Attuned, Wilson Program, and Success Maker are programs used in addition to small group intervention. Interventions last at least 6 weeks in duration and are reviewed weekly at PPT and AIT meetings.

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

P.S. 166Q coordinates and integrates Federal, state, and local services and programs supported under NCLB. In the area of violence prevention, P.S. 166Q has a Project Share, an antiviolence/drug prevention program and a conflict resolution program.

The Parent Coordinator conducts workshops on domestic violence. Jacob Riis settlement house conducts gang violence prevention programs for the parents.

We have a student nutrition program run through the guidance of the Board of Education. Our Parent coordinator conducts a Parent Nutrition workshop series run by the Cornell University nutrition program. Students are provided with job knowledge on Career Day. The Parent Coordinator

refers parent to Adult Horizons Educational program for training in job skills such as nursing, computers, refrigeration technology, and college credit. We offer adult education classes in ESL, computers, mental health, and financial planning. P.S. 166Q also has a Pre-K program.

P.S. 166Q has outside sources to translate parental materials and written communication in Bengali, Spanish, Urdu, Arabic, Chinese, and Korean. P.S. 166Q has inside resources to translate to parents verbally in Punjabi, Bengali, Spanish, and Portuguese.

**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)¹ data also show that the taught curriculum is not aligned to the state standards. For example, in the reviewed high school-level ELA classes, auditors observed a great disparity between what is taught and the depth to which it should be taught. A similar lack of depth can be seen in elementary and middle grades as well (specifically Grades 2, 4, 5, and 6) and Grade 8. As one might look at it, the taught ELA curriculum is quite broad but lacks depth in any one area. Although standards indicate that instruction should be focused on having students create written products and spoken presentations, SEC data show quite the opposite. There is very little emphasis on speaking and listening and only a moderately higher level of emphasis on writing. Critical reading also is supposed to have a much greater depth than is currently occurring in high school English classes.
- **ELA Materials.** In a number of the audited schools, teachers interviewed indicate that they have sufficient amounts of curriculum materials available to them; however, the materials they have are not adequate to meet the needs of all learners, particularly English language learners, students with disabilities, and struggling readers. Further, the materials in use are reportedly often not relevant to the students’ background knowledge, suggesting a need for more age appropriate and culturally relevant books and articles for student use.
- **English Language Learners**

¹ 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.

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

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

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

A school based committee was formed to assess whether Finding IA was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee met four times and the School Leadership Team conducted a P.A.S.S. Review. The Findings committee then met with the School Leadership Team to review material and attain additional input. The CEP was reviewed along with the data to determine the effectiveness of and to look for gaps in our written curriculum and the taught curriculum in ELA, especially for English Language Learners. Materials were also examined as their relevance, alignment, and language appropriateness. The results of our analysis were shared with our school community including the School Leadership Team, the Parents Association, the staff, our Senior Achievement Facilitator, and our Network Leader. It was determined that the curriculum audit findings were relevant to our school's educational progress in the areas of questioning and vocabulary.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

Curriculum Maps: P.S. 166 had an attainable, rigorous, in depth pacing calendar which was followed in a timely manner. It contained some components of curriculum mapping. The curriculum map addressed strategies and components for which we should focus our efforts. In addition, the pacing contains vocabulary, materials, resources, and teaching points which clearly guide instruction, suggested activities, and follow-up activities to maintain continuity. However, the existing pacing did not address measurable outcomes to be attained. During the 2008-09 school year, we revisited and adjusted our curriculum maps and pacing guides.

Taught Curriculum in ELA especially for ELLs:

Our committee reviewed and evaluated the taught curriculum for all students with a focus on English Language Learners for alignment with state learning standards. While it was evident, through lesson plan evaluations and observations, that some of the New York State standards were being addressed, they were not being looked at consistently in all classes, all of the time, to the depth in which they should have been taught.

Upon reviewing students' writing samples in grades K-5, there was evidence that the students were not meeting the expectations set forth by the comprehension, listening, and speaking standards. Vocabulary expansion was needed in receptive and expressive language development. The findings were especially true for our English Language Learners.

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

Although our school did not require additional support from central, our Network Leader, Network Specialists for ELA and ELL, Schools Attuned facilitator, CITE facilitator, and school-based individual experts all enhanced our basic understanding, theology, and practice. Combined with their support, on an ongoing basis, we increased the attainability and measurability of the children's work product. S.M.A.R.T. goals were used in curriculum pacing and incorporated the Bloom's Taxonomy Questioning Techniques as well as expanding the vocabulary banks of both teachers and students. When enhancing our curriculum maps, the taught curriculum for all students, including English Language Learners, focused on aligning our schools' curriculum more closely to the state learning standards. Greater emphasis was placed on the development of questioning and vocabulary including more rigorous writing standards, increased spoken presentations, and increased opportunities for improving speaking and listening skills. The initiative was for all students with a specific focus on meeting the State Learning Standards for the ELL taught curriculum.

1B. Mathematics

Background

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

Specific Math Alignment Issues:

- A review of key district documents for mathematics shows substantial evidence that the primary mathematics instructional materials for Grades K-8 (*Everyday Mathematics* [K-5] and *Impact Mathematics* [6-8]) are aligned with the New York state *content strands* except for some gaps that appear at the middle school level in the areas of measurement and geometry and number sense and operations. The instructional materials that were available at the high school level during the time of the audits (New York City Math A and B [8-12]) were aligned with the 1999 standards but not

with the newer 2005 standards. Furthermore, these documents show that there is a very weak alignment to the New York state *process strands* for mathematics at all grade levels.

- The SEC data for mathematics curriculum alignment (similar to Key Finding 1A for ELA), shows that there is a lack of depth in what is being taught in the mathematics classroom as compared to what is required by the state standards.

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

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

A school-based committee was formed to assess whether Finding 1B was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee met four times and the School Leadership Team conducted a P.A.S.S. Review. The Findings committee then met with the School Leadership Team to review material and attain additional input. The CEP was reviewed along with the data to determine the effectiveness of, and to look for gaps in, the Everyday Math curriculum. We also looked at the effectiveness, especially for English Language Learners, of the math written curriculum, the math taught curriculum, and the math materials. Test results were also examined. An overall analysis was done to assess causation and areas in need of improvement related to curriculum, vocabulary, and questioning techniques. The results of our analysis were shared with our school community including the School Leadership Team, the Parents Association, the staff, our Senior Achievement Facilitator, and our Network Leader. It was determined that the process strands were relevant to our school's educational program.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

Curriculum Maps: P.S. 166 was provided with the city-wide Everyday Math pacing calendar which was aligned with the content strands of number sense and operations, algebra, geometry, measurement, and statistics and probability. However, the calendar was not aligned for the process strands of problem solving, reasoning and proof, communication, connections, and representations.

The Problem-solving strand needed further hands-on support because children were having difficulty solving problems because they could not differentiate between relevant and irrelevant information. Reasoning and Proof needed additional support due to the fact that children did not appropriately recognize the multiple manners in which a problem can be solved. The Communication strand needed additional vocabulary reinforcement because the students had trouble verbalizing an organized thought process. Due to the fact that students lacked prior knowledge and everyday experiences, which are the basis for a strong foundation, they were having difficulty with the Making Connections strand.

Because of the difficulty reading and interpreting charts, graphs, and other mathematical materials, it has been determined that we need to further explore the strand of Representation.

Taught Curriculum in ELA especially for ELLs:

Our committee reviewed and evaluated the taught curriculum for all students with a focus on English Language Learners for alignment with state learning standards. While it was evident through lesson plan evaluations and observations that process strands were being addressed, they were not being looked at consistently in all classes, all of the time, to the depth in which they should be taught.

Upon reviewing students' mathematical work and assessments in grades K-5, there was evidence of students meeting content strands but lacking in content strands. Students faced challenges most often in the areas of vocabulary, comprehension and interpretation of word problems. The use of written and verbal communication was found to be especially difficult amongst our English Language Learners.

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.

Although our school did not require additional support from central, our Network Leader, Network Specialist for ELA and ELL, Schools Attuned facilitator, CITE facilitator, and school-based individual experts enhanced our basic understanding, theology, and practice. Combined with their support on an ongoing basis, we attained measurable improvement in using and understanding the process strands in mathematics. All of our future goals will be set using the S.M.A.R.T. theory.

When dealing with the mathematical process strands, utilized supplemental materials and tools. In addition, better aligned process strands with content strands and the state learning standards. Greater emphasis was placed on the understanding and implementation of the content and process strands.

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.

A school-based committee was formed to assess whether Finding 2A was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee met four times and the School Leadership Team conducted a P.A.S.S. Review. The Findings committee then met with the School Leadership Team to review material and attain additional input. The CEP was reviewed along with the data to determine frequency of direct instruction, individual seatwork, student engagement, the use of appropriate vocabulary, differentiation of instruction, and questioning techniques. Materials and teaching techniques were also examined as to their relevance, rigor and effectiveness. The results of our analysis were shared with our school community including the School Leadership Team, the Parents Association, the staff, our Senior Achievement Facilitator, and our Network Leader. It was determined that the auditors' findings were relevant to our school's educational programs in the areas of increasing student engagement, monitoring best practices, and differentiated instruction.

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?

P.S. 166 conducted walkthroughs and utilized low inference data of teacher observations. The analysis of the data proved that teachers were not asking enough questions that encouraged higher order thinking skills. While teachers were asking questions at an appropriate level of understanding, the vocabulary of both teachers and students was basic and simple. For all students, including English Language Learners, engagement was limited due to language/vocabulary barriers and obstacles.

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.

Although our school did not require additional support from central, our Network Leader, Network Specialist for ELA and ELL, Schools Attuned facilitator, CITE facilitator, and school-based individual experts all enhanced our basic understanding, theology, and practice. Combined with their support on an ongoing basis, enhanced our differentiated instruction, student engagement, and best practices. Data was analyzed regularly. Our school's data included, but was not limited to, conference notes, m-class, DIBELS, Children's Progress, Acuity, teacher-made assessments, and New York State assessments. The data was reviewed and all students were grouped by individual strengths and weaknesses. Lesson plans and implementation were aligned accordingly. Schools Attuned strategies were utilized. Students received individualized attention to improve weaknesses and enrich strengths. This was done during Professional Periods, small-group/push-in/pull-out periods, AIS periods, 37½ minute periods, and throughout the school day when needed.

The administration focused on walkthroughs with an emphasis on Bloom's Taxonomy. The administration and instructional administrative team read [A Taxonomy For Learning, Teaching and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives](#) by Lorin W. Anderson and David R. Krathwohl and [The New Taxonomy of Educational Objectives](#) by Robert J. Marzano and John S. Kendall. Based upon discussions of the two books we, as an instructional team, incorporated and conveyed to the staff, through staff development, a better understanding for increasing critical thinking and questioning techniques.

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* (SOM²) 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.

A school-based committee was formed to assess whether Finding 2B was relevant to our school’s educational program. The committee met four times and the School Leadership Team conducted a P.A.S.S. Review. The Findings committee then met with the School Leadership Team to review material and attain additional input. The CEP was reviewed along with the data to determine possible gaps in Mathematical instruction. The results of our analysis were shared with our school community including the School Leadership Team, the Parents Association, the staff, our Senior Achievement Facilitator, and our Network Leader. It was determined that this area is not applicable to our school.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

The class time at PS 166 has a high academic focus. Students were engaged in hands-on mathematical activities using manipulatives. We have an abundance of math manipulatives which enabled all of our students to utilize multiple modalities and become actively engaged in their own learning. All classrooms have at least two computers which students used to enhance and remediate their mathematic abilities. In addition, all classes had access to our three computer labs to enhance math skills and strategies. We received an additional computer lab this year in order to increase time-on-task in the area of mathematics. Smart Boards were also used in over 15 classrooms. Therefore, it was our belief that this evidence dispels the relevance of this finding as it related to our school’s educational program.

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

² 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.

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 administration reviewed all relevant documentation to the issue of teacher turnover rate. We looked at the Progress Report, the BEDS Survey, School Report Cards, and New York State AYP documentation. We found that we have a low teacher turnover rate.

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?

The evidence that we have looked at dispels the relevance of this finding to our school's educational program. The School Report Card stated that the turnover rate was 12% in 2006-07. Since then, two teachers have retired and no teachers have left.

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.

A school-based committee was formed to assess whether Finding 4 was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee met four times and the School Leadership Team conducted a P.A.S.S. Review. The Findings committee then met with the School Leadership Team to review

material and attain additional input. The CEP was reviewed along with the CR Part 154, the Language Allocation Policy, the Title III plan, and the Dual Language Plans. Materials were also examined as to their relevance, alignment, and language appropriateness. The results of our analysis were shared with our school community including the School Leadership Team, the Parents Association, the staff, our Senior Achievement Facilitator, and our Network Leader. It was determined that the Professional Development for English Language Learners Findings were relevant to our school's educational program.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

The evidence that supports the relevance of this Finding is aligned with the standards for ESL instruction.

Based on the data from the NYSESLAT, it was determined that students need to focus more on listening and speaking. Refer to ESL Standard 1.

ESL Standard 1: *Students will listen, speak, read, and write in English for information and understanding.*

- Students learning English as a second language will use English to acquire, interpret, apply, and transmit information for content area learning and personal use.
- They will develop and use skills and strategies appropriate to their level of English proficiency to collect data, facts, and ideas; discover relationships, concepts and generalizations; and use knowledge generated from oral, written, and electronically produced texts.

Our students were able to decode but they are weak in vocabulary and comprehension therefore, they were unable to express appropriately. Our students have a limited knowledge base due to cultural experiences, or lack thereof. Refer to ESL Standard 2.

ESL Standard 2: *Students will listen, speak and read, and write in English for literary response, enjoyment, and expression.*

- Students learning English as a second language will use English for self-expression, artistic creation, and participation in popular culture.
- They will develop and use skills and strategies appropriate to their level of English proficiency to listen to, read, and respond to oral, written and electronically produced texts and performances.
- They will relate texts and performances to their own lives and other works, and develop an understanding of the diverse social, historical, and cultural dimensions the texts and performances represent.

In order for students to be able to properly articulate thoughts, they needed to enhance their vocabulary. These critical thinking skills are a derivative of Bloom's Taxonomy and questioning techniques. Refer to ESL Standard 3.

ESL Standard 3: *Students will listen, speak, read, and write in English for critical analysis and evaluation.*

- Students learning English as a second language will use English to express their opinions and judgments on experiences, messages, ideas, information, and issues from a variety of perspectives.
- They will develop and use skills and strategies appropriate to their level of English proficiency to reflect on and analyze experiences, messages, ideas, information, and issues presented by others using a variety of established criteria.

Our students worked well together. Many of our students have been Beginner ELLs thus having compassion for their peers. Students often work together to achieve common goals. However, limited vocabulary hinders the ability for students to accurately transfer their thoughts to written or expressive language. Refer to ESL Standard 4.

ESL Standard 4: *Students will listen, speak, read and write in English for classroom and social interaction.*

- Students learning English as a second language will use English to interact with others in social and classroom situations.
- They will develop and use skills and strategies appropriate to their level of English proficiency to communicate effectively with regard to audience, purpose, and setting.

Our school is a diverse school where students' cultures are celebrated throughout the year. Refer to ESL Standard 5.

ESL Standard 5: *Students will demonstrate cross-cultural knowledge and understanding.*

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.

Although our school did not require additional support from central, our Network Leader, Network Specialist for ELA and ELL, Schools Attuned facilitator, CITE facilitator, and school-based individual experts enhanced our basic understanding, theology, and practice. Combined with their support on an ongoing basis, we enhanced our understanding, theology, and utilization of techniques and strategies that helped facilitate the learning of our ELLs. ELL professional development was also made available to appropriate staff. Our school focused on the ESL standards to meet the needs of our English Language Learners.

ESL Standard 1: *Students will listen, speak, read, and write in English for information and understanding.*

- Students learning English as a second language will use English to acquire, interpret, apply, and transmit information for content area learning and personal use.
- They will develop and use skills and strategies appropriate to their level of English proficiency to collect data, facts, and ideas; discover relationships, concepts and generalizations; and use knowledge generated from oral, written, and electronically produced texts.

Information pertaining to Standard 1:

- We aligned this standard with our curriculum
- We used data to group and guide instruction within a specific subgroup of students.
- We used Bloom's Taxonomy questions, on all levels, and increased vocabulary foundation and usage.

ESL Standard 2: *Students will listen, speak and read, and write in English for literary response, enjoyment, and expression.*

- Students learning English as a second language will use English for self-expression, artistic creation, and participation in popular culture.
- They will develop and use skills and strategies appropriate to their level of English proficiency to listen to, read, and respond to oral, written and electronically produced texts and performances.
- They will relate texts and performances to their own lives and other works, and develop an understanding of the diverse social, historical, and cultural dimensions the texts and performances represent.

Information pertaining to Standard 2:

- We used listening centers and Success Maker to increase self-expression and incorporate technology.
- We purchased and used current materials.
- We continued to enhance and share individual cultural experiences.

ESL Standard 3: Students will listen, speak, read, and write in English for critical analysis and evaluation.

- Students learning English as a second language will use English to express their opinions and judgments on experiences, messages, ideas, information, and issues from a variety of perspectives.
- They will develop and use skills and strategies appropriate to their level of English proficiency to reflect on and analyze experiences, messages, ideas, information, and issues presented by others using a variety of established criteria.

Information pertaining to Standard 3:

- We increased student vocabulary and prior knowledge
- We modeled Bloom's Taxonomy questioning techniques and had students do the same.
- We used current, age appropriate materials in order to increase critical analysis.

ESL Standard 4: Students will listen, speak, read and write in English for classroom and social interaction.

- Students learning English as a second language will use English to interact with others in social and classroom situations.
- They will develop and use skills and strategies appropriate to their level of English proficiency to communicate effectively with regard to audience, purpose, and setting

Information pertaining to Standard 4:

- Students expressed themselves through the Arts.

ESL Standard 5: Students will demonstrate cross-cultural knowledge and understanding.

Information pertaining to Standard 5:

- Students continued to participate in the sharing of cultural experiences.
-

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.

A school-based committee was formed to assess whether Finding 5 was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee met four times and the School Leadership Team conducted a P.A.S.S. Review. The Findings committee then met with the School Leadership Team to review material and attain additional input. The CEP was reviewed along with information collected by the school to look for gaps in data use and the monitoring of ELL instruction. The results of our analysis were shared with our school community including the School Leadership Team, the Parents Association, the staff, our Senior Achievement Facilitator, and our Network Leader. It was determined that the Finding was not applicable to our school's educational program.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

PS 166 analyzed all data, including information pertaining to English Language Learners. Each child has a binder. The outside of the binder indicated, for the teacher, the NYSESLAT proficiency level (B, I, A, or P), and the year that level was achieved for each student. All classroom teachers have a complete history of each student from the time they entered the New York City school system. The data became even more detailed when the students enrolled at PS 166. The information that can be found in a student's binder included: yearly writing on demand samples, E-CLAS/m-class results, E-PAL 2 results, E-PAL 3 results, Just Right Levels, Success Maker output, comprehension skills data, Schools Attuned data, as well as a complete New York State test history report including Item Strands Analysis. This evidence dispelled the relevance of this finding to our school's educational program.

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

KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SPECIAL EDUCATION

While the DOE and individual schools have made a substantial investment in professional development for special and general education teachers, classroom observations, IEP reviews, and interviews indicate that many general education teachers, special education teachers, and school administrators do not yet have sufficient understanding of or capacity to fully implement the range and types of instructional approaches that will help to increase access

to the general education curriculum and improve student performance. Further, many general education teachers remain unfamiliar with the content of the IEPs of their students with disabilities, have a lack of familiarity with accommodations and modifications that would help support the students with disabilities in their classrooms, and are not knowledgeable regarding behavioral support plans for these students.

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

6.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.

The administrative team assessed whether Finding 6 was relevant to our school's educational program. We met weekly and met with the School Leadership Team on a monthly basis. Staff development was also evaluated as well as classroom teacher observations. The CEP was reviewed along with all of the City, State, and Federal regulations. The results of our analysis were shared with our school community including the School Leadership Team, the Parents Association, the staff, our Senior Achievement Facilitator, and our Network Leader. Although our Professional development as it relates to Special Education is ongoing, It was determined that this Finding was not applicable to our school's educational program.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

PS 166 analyzed all of the regulations and staff development areas pertaining to Special Education strategies, learning styles, techniques, materials, tools, etc. We provided staff development training for paraprofessionals, classroom teachers, cluster teachers, push-in/pull-out teachers, ESL teachers, reading teachers, math teachers, and AIS teachers. The PD focused on range and type of instruction, data analysis and utilization, application of teaching and learning practices, behavior modification, writing and interpreting IEPs, and accommodations and interventions.

We are a Schools Attuned school with 98% of our teachers completing certification. The Schools Attuned practice allowed teachers to work with and focus on individual students. They created management plans which focused on strengths and strategies for improving upon weaknesses. Teachers implemented this philosophy when creating and conducting lessons. Students' affinities were used, along with their strengths, based on a variety of constructs in order to differentiate instruction. Based on this evidence, we dispelled the relevance of this Finding to our school's educational program.

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

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

7.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.

A school-based committee was formed to assess whether Finding 7 was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee, which consisted of members from PPT, AIS, SBST, Mainstreaming, IEP Team, etc., met on an ongoing basis. In discussions during such meetings, student IEPs were reviewed and it was determined that this Finding is relevant to our school's educational program.

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?

Our committee met and reviewed students' IEPs with a specific lens focusing on accommodations and modifications for the classroom environment, behavioral plans, and alignment between goals, objectives, and modified promotion criteria. Upon reviewing these IEPs, committee members then conducted walkthroughs and observations to determine whether or not these criteria were being met within the classrooms. The committee then shared their findings and determined that, although accommodations and modifications were in place, teachers and service providers would benefit from a review of their intended purpose. Additionally, behavior plans, which were often attached to the IEPs, were not being included in the actual IEP as outlined by goals and objectives. Finally, there did not appear to be an alignment between the goals, objectives, and modified promotion criteria.

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

Although our school did not require additional support from central, we sought out support from our Network Specialists and the Integrated Services Center (specifically the Special Education Team) to ensure that the relevant issues were addressed. Additionally, upon meeting as a committee and reviewing the aforementioned items, it was determined that Special Education Teachers, and service providers would benefit from a review of practices related to Key Finding 7. The committee decided that these teachers and service providers would participate in professional development to encourage the use of accommodations and modifications for testing purposes and classroom environment. Moreover, the issue of behavior plans was addressed through meetings and professional development as provided by members of the School Based Support Team.

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

This appendix will not be required for 2009-10.

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

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

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:

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

Supporting Students in Temporary Housing (STH)

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

Part A: FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

1. Please identify the number of Students in Temporary Housing who are currently attending your school. (Please note that your current STH population may not be the same as officially reported in DOE systems and may change over the course of the year.)
None
2. Please describe the services you are planning to provide to the STH population.
Not Applicable

Part B: FOR NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

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