



P.S. 212

2009-10

SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)

SCHOOL: P.S. 212
ADDRESS: 34-25 82 STREET, QUEENS, NY, 11372
TELEPHONE: 718-898-6973
FAX: 718-898-7068

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE	Error! Bookmark not defined.
SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE	Error! Bookmark not defined.
SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Part A. Narrative Description	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot	Error! Bookmark not defined.
SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT	10
SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS	Error! Bookmark not defined.
SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN	Error! Bookmark not defined.
REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010	Error! Bookmark not defined.
APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM Error!	Bookmark not defined.
APPENDIX 2: PROGRAM DELIVERY FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELLs) ... Error!	Bookmark not defined.
APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION	24
APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL TITLE I SCHOOLS	26
APPENDIX 5: NCLB/SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SINI AND SRAP SCHOOLS	30
APPENDIX 6: SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS UNDER REGISTRATION REVIEW (SURRE)	Error! Bookmark not defined.
APPENDIX 7: SCHOOL-LEVEL REFLECTION AND RESPONSE TO SYSTEMWIDE CURRICULUM AUDIT FINDINGS	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Appendix 8: CONTRACTS FOR EXCELLENCE (C4E) SCHOOL-BASED EXPENDITURES FOR 2009-2010	Error! Bookmark not defined.
APPENDIX 9: TITLE I, PART A – SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS IN TEMPORARY HOUSING (STH)	Error! Bookmark not defined.

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: 30Q212 **SCHOOL NAME:** P.S. 212

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 34-25 82 STREET, QUEENS, NY, 11372

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 718-898-6973 **FAX:** 718-898-7068

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: CARIN ILENE ELLIS **EMAIL ADDRESS:** CELLIS6@SCHOOLS.NYC.GOV

POSITION / TITLE **PRINT/TYPE NAME**
SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON: Linda Lent

PRINCIPAL: CARIN ILENE ELLIS

UFT CHAPTER LEADER: Linda Lent

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT: Jane Marie Buenaventura & Yazmin Suarez

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE:
(Required for high schools) _____

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL SUPPORT ORGANIZATION (SSO) INFORMATION

DISTRICT: 30 **SSO NAME:** Integrated Curriculum and Instruction Learning Support Organization

SSO NETWORK LEADER: DiMaggio, Nancy

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

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

Name	Position and Constituent Group Represented	Signature
CARIN ILENE ELLIS	Principal	
Linda Lent	UFT Chapter Leader	
Caryn Miller	Admin/CSA	
Noreen Treadway	UFT Member	
Deborah Wurgler	UFT Member	
Debra Dagnese	UFT Member	
Jane Marie Buenaventura	PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
Yazmin Suarez	PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
Maria Trujillo	Parent	
Mary Ellen Guerrero	Parent	
Ana Ramirez	Parent (3rd core parent member)	
Victoria Hernandez	Parent	

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

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

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

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

SCHOOL VISION

We envision our school community as a place where all students, staff and parents support and accept each other. Our school community will work together daily to create an atmosphere of learning and creativity. Our students will become life long learners through the collaborative efforts of the entire school community. Our teaching philosophy will lead our students toward inquiry-based discoveries, as they become leaders in the 21st century.

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of P.S. 212 is to provide children with a secure educational foundation in a safe environment.

We believe that all children can develop self-confidence and a love of learning. All children can achieve, and we are dedicated to strengthening the home-school connection.

Contextual Information About the School's Community and its Unique/Important Characteristics

P.S.212 Queens opened on September 7, 2000. The school was built to relieve the overcrowding in the Jackson Heights section of School District 30. Our school is a K-5 school with an average of 5 classes on a grade and an average class size of 27 students.

The school is within the Jackson Heights Historic District and as such was designed to fit in with the existing architecture. The building is four stories above ground and two stories below ground.

Overview of Special Initiatives

There is a 90-minute literacy block for students in all grades. During this time the students are broken into small groups depending on needs. Four AIS push in teachers, two ESL teachers, one IEP teacher, one SETTS teacher and paraprofessionals are employed to guarantee that all children's needs are being met. Based on data small groups are formed. Grades K – 2 use the Teacher's College Reading and Writing workshop model with a strong phonics program. Grades three, four and five are using Reading Street. There are 8 -10 children in each reading group. These groups change according to needs based on the data. Each week we target a skill for grades 3 – 5. This skill is also reinforced during the 371/2 minutes.

We use Acuity and Performance Series tutorials to help reinforce skills for our students.

We have full class instruction and small group instruction for math. Everyday Math is used across all of the grades.

PS 212 has self-contained ESL classes K-3. The program Treasure Chest is being implemented this year for all of our ELL students.

Staff and students are setting short and long term goals to increase their learning and teaching skills. Teachers meet a few times a week to plan and share best practices.

We have three to four workshops a month for parents based on a needs survey taken at the beginning of the school year. The PTA holds monthly meetings and provides fundraisers to support our school's efforts.

Strategic Collaborations and Partnerships

We have had a five year relationship with Kat Alston from the Bronx Guild for the Arts. This year grades 3, 4 and 5 will work with her. Our students perform at the Jackson Heights synagogue under Ms. Alston's tutelage. New York City Center worked with our Kindergarten, first and second graders for 8 weeks each. Children learned different dance techniques. This year all grade two students will participate in a 40 week program with LEAP in conjunction with New York University. This program will integrate all of the art disciplines into a literacy based program. There are 7 professional development days for the teachers and two professional development days for the parents. This year we received a grant from VH1 Save the Music. We will receive 17 keyboards and music for this program. We received a \$33,000 grant from Visual Thinking Strategies. Children in grades K – 5 will learn to observe fine art, speak about it and learn to write using this art form as the subject. Our third graders will partner with Bank Street to learn more about project based learning.

In our community this year we worked with a CBO called HANAC to provide after school activities until 5:45 p.m. One hundred and thirty five students participate in this program. For the last 5 years we have also hosted a Peruvian Folklore Group on Friday afternoons called Pachamama. A basketball team practices here every Thursday evening. On Saturday and Sunday another organization uses our gymnasium for soccer. The organization Jackson Heights Beautification Committee is a local group that pays for plantings in front of our building and gives books about the history of the community to grade 4 children. Boy Scouts meets here every Thursday October through May. Approximately 60 boys participate.

Our fourth and fifth grade basketball team will play against our neighboring elementary school PS 69.

PS 212 is open most evening until 9:00 and every Sunday. We want to provide meaningful activities for our school community.

SECTION III - Cont'd

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT					
School Name:	P.S. 212				
District:	30	DBN #:	30Q212	School BEDS Code #:	30Q212

DEMOGRAPHICS									
Grades Served in 2008-09:	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-K	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> K	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 7
	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	<input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 11	<input type="checkbox"/> 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ungraded			

Enrollment:				Attendance: - % of days students attended			
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Pre-K	0	0	0		94.9	95.1	95.7
Kindergarten	90	102	114				
Grade 1	131	99	104				
Grade 2	104	133	100	Student Stability: - % of Enrollment (As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 3	122	133	154		92.6	97.0	93.19
Grade 4	147	110	134				
Grade 5	113	146	108	Poverty Rate: - % of Enrollment: (As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 6	0	0	0			92.6	97.0
Grade 7	0	0	0				
Grade 8	0	0	0				
Grade 9	0	0	0	Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number: (As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 10	0	0	0		1	3	11
Grade 11	0	0	0				
Grade 12	0	0	0				
Ungraded	4	14	3	Recent Immigrants: - Total Number (As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Total	711	737	717		22.0	21.0	13

Special Education Enrollment:				Suspensions: (OSYD Reporting) - Total Number			
(As October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09

# in Self-Contained Classes	32	32	26				
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	10	10	20	Principal Suspensions	4	0	TBD
Number all others	39	48	48	Superintendent Suspensions	5	2	TBD
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>							
				Special High School Programs: - Total Number:			
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment (BESIS Survey)				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	CTE Program Participants	0	0	0
# in Trans. Bilingual Classes	0	0	0	Early College HS Participants	0	0	0
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0				
# receiving ESL services only	172	172	194	Number of Staff: - Includes all full-time staff:			
# ELLs with IEPs	17	9	6	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
<i>These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.</i>				Number of Teachers	45	47	52
				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	3	16	18
Overage Students: # entering students overage for grade							
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	N/A	6	6
	0	0	0				
				Teacher Qualifications:			
Ethnicity and Gender: % of Enrollment				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100.0	100.0	94.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.0	0.0	0.1	Percent more than two years teaching in this school	80.0	85.1	82.7
Black or African American	1.4	2.3	1.7	Percent more than five years teaching anywhere	71.1	74.5	67.3
Hispanic or Latino	73.3	72.6	72.7				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	15.9	15.2	15.3	Percent Masters Degree or higher	84.0	85.0	85.0
White	9.4	9.9	10.2	Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	88.5	85.0	100.0
Multi-racial							
Male	47.5	46.3	46.4				
Female	52.5	53.7	53.6				

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

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY							
SURR School: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:					
Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2009-10 Based on 2008-09 Performance):							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In Good Standing (IGS)						
<input type="checkbox"/>	School in Need of Improvement (SINI)Improvement - Year 1						
<input type="checkbox"/>	School in Need of Improvement (SINI)Improvement - Year 2						
<input type="checkbox"/>	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) - Year 1						
<input type="checkbox"/>	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) - Year 2/Planning for Restructuring (PFR)						
<input type="checkbox"/>	NCLB Restructuring - Year ____						
<input type="checkbox"/>	School Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP) - Year ____						
Individual Subject/Area Ratings		Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
	ELA:	IGS			ELA:		
	Math:	IGS			Math:		
	Science:	IGS			Grad. Rate:		
This school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for each accountability measure:							
Student Groups		Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
		ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad. Rate
All Students		√	√	√			
Ethnicity							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Black or African American		-	-	-			
Hispanic or Latino		√	√	√			
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander		√	√	-			
White		-	-	-			
Other Groups							
Students with Disabilities		√	√	-			
Limited English Proficient		X	√	-			
Economically Disadvantaged		√	√	√			
Student groups making AYP in each subject		5	6	3	0	0	0

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results - 2008-09		Quality Review Results - 2008-09	
Overall Letter Grade	A	Overall Evaluation:	
Overall Score	92.0	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	
School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)	12.9	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	
School Performance (Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)	21.8	Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	
Student Progress (Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)	52.0	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	
Additional Credit	5.3	Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	
<i>Note: Progress Report grades are not yet available for District 75 schools.</i>			

Key: AYP Status		Key: Quality Review Score	
√	Made AYP	Δ	Underdeveloped
√ ^{SH}	Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target	▶	Underdeveloped with Proficient Features
X	Did Not Make AYP	√	Proficient
-	Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status	⊍	Well Developed
X*	Did Not Make AYP Due to Participation Rate Only	◇	Outstanding
* = For Progress Report Attendance Rate(s) - If more than one attendance rate given, it is displayed as K-8/9-12.			
<i>Note: NCLB/SED accountability reports are not available for District 75 schools.</i>			

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

English Language Arts **Summary of Needs Assessment Findings** **Early Childhood K-2**

A survey of the K-2 teacher's indicates that the use of Open Court Phonics in grades K and 1 and Words Their Way in grade 2 successfully address the needs of our students. The Teacher's College Reader's and Writer's Workshop has allowed teachers to base their instruction on assessments. Children are given time to practice specific skills and strategies that have been clearly modeled. The workshop model allows teachers the time to assess their students during individual conferences. Writing folders reflect work done in writer's workshop. Leveled libraries allow students to practice reading strategies in books that are "just right" giving them opportunities to grow as readers. Differentiated instruction with leveled books allows teachers to teach one concept or strategy to the whole class and in small groups, while students practice in books at their own pace.

First grade teachers will be participating in the Active Learning Leads to Literacy (ALLL) program. This is a 40-session residency that uses dance, drama, visual arts, music, games, field trips and cooking to teach literacy skills. It provides monthly professional development, and encourages planning among teachers and teaching artists. This program will help to increase the listening, speaking, reading and writing skills of all students. It will provide English language learners with hands on experiences that will increase their language skills and further their language development.

First grade will also be involved with planning and professional development through Bank Street College. Using the theme emersion model, teachers will develop a unit for social studies that is aligned with state standards. This will increase vocabulary development in the content area and provide children with meaningful ways to make connections across curriculum areas.

An analysis of the Kindergarten student achievement data, indicates the following:

That student's academic performance in reading, writing and accountable talk has improved. This is due to the increased use of visual aids such as Reading and Writing Charts, independent book baggies (in class and for home), increased school/home communications (what strategies to work on),

immersion of read alouds to build higher capacity for class conversations. The structured writing curriculum has also increased student language abilities.

An analysis of the first grade and second grade student achievement data, indicates the following:

Through the use of leveled independent book baggies, students were able to increase stamina and fluency in reading. In addition, students' conversations about books are more meaningful and focused through the use of the read aloud with accountable talk and teacher modeled think alouds. The incorporation of strategy lessons and AIS push in for reading, have helped to differentiate instruction and create small groups.

K-2 Performance on the 2008-2009 Teacher's College
Reading and Writing Assessment (TCRWP)

Summary of data analysis/findings of our K-2 students on the TCRWP assessment: Since this was a new assessment, we had to analyze each grade individually based on the movement of their reading levels. The results of our TCRWP assessment indicated that our students in grades K-2. improved from the Fall to the Spring administration. An example of this improvement was seen in Grade 1 where in the Fall 49.5% of the students assessed were approaching grade level. However in the Spring, 41.84% of the students that were assessed in this same area scored in the approaching grade level range. This is a decrease of 7.66%. In grade 2, a similar result was found in the students that were in the need support category where in the Fall, 22.37% of the students scored in this area. However, in the Spring, only 4% of the students were in the needs support category. This showed a decrease of 18.37% in this level. By the Spring, almost 98% of the Kindergarten students were at least meeting grade standards in the area of reading.

In looking at the school as a whole, the amount of students that were assessed in the Fall and those that were assessed in the Spring increased across the various subgroups. As a whole school, in the Fall 38.42% were assessed at a level that was meeting each grade's standards according to New York. In the Spring, this number jumped to 60.99% of students meeting grade K-2 standards. This is an increase of 22.57%. Another increase across the entire school was those students that exceeded grade standards in Reading. In the Fall, the number of students scoring in this level was 2.26% or 4 students. However, in the Spring, 6.74% of students exceeded grade level standards. This was an increase of 4.48% or 15 students. Conversely, we had a decrease school-wide in the number of students that needed support from the Fall administration to the Spring administration. In the Fall, we had 25.42% of the students that scored in the needs support area. However, in the Spring we only had 8.87% of students scoring in this level. This is a decrease of 16.55% of students that moved from this level. Similarly, we had a decrease in the number of students approaching grade standards. In the Fall, we had 33.90% of the students scoring in this area. However, in the Spring, we had 23.40% of students scoring in the approaching standards level. This is a decrease of 10.5%. This decrease can be attributed to students moving up in their reading levels along with the various small group instruction that we began at the start of the year and will continue this school year.

One area where we saw significant growth was in the English Language Learners subgroup. In the Fall administration, 47.62% scored in the needs support level, 28.57% scored in the approaching standards level and only 23.81% scored in the meets standards level. The majority of these students were scoring below grade level. However, in the Spring, only 14.41% were scoring in the needs support level, which was a decrease of 33.21%. There was also a 2.44% decrease in the students scoring at the approaching grade level. There was a major increase in the number of students meeting the standards. In the Spring, 59.46% of the students scored on this level, which was an increase of 35.65%.

Implications for the Instructional Program – English Language Arts
Early Childhood K-2

Based on our analysis of the data and all relevant findings, the following are implications for our Literacy instructional program on the lower grades:

- We will continue to support our students' growth in literacy with Teacher's College Reader's and Writer's Workshop in addition to the Open Court Phonics Program on Grades K and 1. We will use Words Their Way in Grade 2.
- Teachers will focus on small group instruction to provide differentiated instruction to meet individual students needs, through strategy lessons and guided reading groups.
- Computer software programs are used to incorporate reading strategies and decoding to help students become more proficient readers, e.g. Reader Rabbit, Arthur.
- ELL students will use computer software to develop language skills.
- Students will have access to online literacy programs such as Starfall, Pebblego, Raz-kids, and Head Sprouts to strengthen decoding skills, fluency and comprehension.
- ELL students will receive small group instruction using Treasure Chest Reading series.
- Special Education will use computer technology to learn through multi-sensory activities, e.g. Earobics I and II (this program is designed to target the needs of language delayed students and struggling readers).
- We will continue to increase mainstreaming our special education students by creating an additional I.C.T. class in Kindergarten.
- Our special education teachers and support staff will continue to use the Wilson Method and implement the program at least 5 periods a week.

The good results of the ECLAS-2 assessment indicate that the programs we use in our lower grades are effective and we will continue to use them and refine the strategies within each program further. We will continue to use our excellent Open Court Phonics Program on Kindergarten and Grade 1. All Grade 2 teachers will be provided training in the use of Words Their Way and implement into the weekly routine. We will continue to use the Teacher's College reading and writing workshop on a daily basis with a stronger focus on developing conversations of story elements through partners and groups. The literacy components that support the reading and writing workshops will be particularly focused upon. The read aloud with accountable talk, shared reading and writing, interactive writing and word study will be areas that will be done on a daily basis. Books will be ordered that lend themselves well to these particular components to make instruction more effective. Our teachers will work closely together to plan units of study in literacy throughout the year with the support of our literacy coach.

Grade		3				NYS				ELA	
Year	# Tested	Lvl 1	Lvl 1%	Lvl 2	Lvl 2%	Lvl 3	Lvl 3%	Lvl 4	Lvl 4%		
2009	124	0	0.0%	10	8.0%	102	82.0%	12	10.0%		
2008	111	0	0.0%	28	25.2%	72	64.9%	11	9.9%		
2007	101	6	5.9%	27	26.7%	61	60.4%	7	6.9%		

An analysis of the Grade 3 ELA Assessment results, over a three-year period from 2007 to 2009, indicates the following:

Results for General Education students indicate the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 decreased 5.9%. We had a 18.7% decrease in the number of students performing at Level 2. The percentage of students scoring at Level 3 over the past three years increased from 60.4% to 82.0% which is a 21.6% increase. The percentage of students scoring at Level 4 increased from 6.9% to 10.0% an increase of 3.1%. An analysis of this three-year trend in ELA General Education student performance indicates that the percentage of students scoring at a level 2 decreased while the percentage of students scoring at a level 3 increased. This negative trend in student achievement is being addressed by small group instruction, differentiation of instruction, targeting specific areas of

need as indicated by Acuity, unit tests and informal assessments.

Grade 4 NYS ELA

Year	# Tested	Lvl 1	Lvl 1%	Lvl 2	Lvl 2%	Lvl 3	Lvl 3%	Lvl 4	Lvl 4%
2009	114	1	1.0%	18	16.0%	87	76.0%	8	7.0%
2008	97	4	4.1%	28	28.9%	57	58.8%	8	8.3%
2007	126	4	3.2%	27	21.4%	85	67.5%	10	7.9%

An analysis of the Grade 4 ELA Assessment results, from 2007 to 2009, indicates the following:

Results for General Education students indicate the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 decreased from 3.2% to 1.0%, a decrease of 2.2%. The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 decreased from 21.4% to 16.0%, a decrease of 5.4%. The percentage of students scoring at Level 3 increased from 67.5% to 76.0%, an increase of 8.5%. The percentage of students scoring at Level 4 decreased from 7.9% to 7.0%, a decrease of 0.9%. An analysis of this three-year trend in ELA General Education student performance indicates that the percentage of students scoring at a level 2 decreased while the percentage of students scoring a level 4 decreased. The percentage of students scoring at a level 3 increased. This negative trend in student achievement is being addressed by small group instruction, differentiation of instruction, targeting specific areas of need as indicated by Acuity, unit tests and informal assessments.

Grade	5 NYS ELA									
Year	# Tested	Lvl 1	Lvl 1%	Lvl 2	Lvl 2%	Lvl 3	Lvl 3%	Lvl 4	Lvl 4%	
2009	93	0	0.0%	16	17.0%	60	65.0%	17	18.0%	
2008	124	0	0.0%	20	16.1%	99	79.8%	5	4.0%	
2007	95	2	2.1%	28	29.5%	59	62.1%	6	6.3%	

An analysis of the Grade 5 ELA Assessment results, from 2007 to 2009, indicates the following:

Results for General Education students indicate the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 decreased from 2.1% to 0 a decrease of 2.1%. Level 2 decreased from 29.5% to 17.0% a decrease of 2.1%. The percentage of students scoring at Level 3 increased from 68.2% to 79.8% an increase of 12.5%. The percentage of students at Level 4 increased from 6.3% to 18.0%, a increase of 11.7%. An analysis of this three-year trend in ELA General Education student performance indicates that the percentage of students scoring at levels 1 and 2 decreased and the percentage of students scoring at a level 3 increased thus indicating noteworthy gains. This positive trend in student achievement will be maintained by continuing activities and programs that strengthen the skills of students scoring on Level 3. The percentage of students scoring a level 4 also increased over the three years. This negative trend in student achievement is being addressed by small group instruction, differentiation of instruction, targeting specific areas of need as indicated by Acuity, unit tests and informal assessments.

2007-2009 Student Subgroups for English Language Arts

Analysis of student achievement in English Language Arts by subgroup from 2007 to 2009, indicates the following:

Grade	3 NYS ELA Special Education									
Year	# Tested	Lvl 1	Lvl 1%	Lvl 2	Lvl 2%	Lvl 3	Lvl 3%	Lvl 4	Lvl 4%	%
2009	29	5	17.0%	11	38.0%	13	45.0%	0	0.0%	
2008	14	4	28.6%	6	42.9%	4	28.6%	0	0.0%	

2007	11	1	9.1%	5	45.5%	5	45.5%	0	0.0%
------	----	---	------	---	-------	---	-------	---	------

Results for special education students indicate an increase of 7.9% of the students scored at Level 1. The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 decreased from 45.5% to 38.0%, a decrease of 7.5%. At Level 3 the percentage of students decreased from 45.5% to 45.0% a decrease of 0.5%. We have worked and will continue to work on creating small group and differentiated instruction even within this small population.

Grade	4	NYS		ELA		Special		Education	
Year	# Tested	Lvl 1	Lvl 1%	Lvl 2	Lvl 2%	Lvl 3	Lvl 3%	Lvl 4	Lvl 4%
2009	15	5	33.0%	5	33.0%	5	33.0%	0	0.0%
2008	11	2	18.2%	6	54.6%	3	27.3%	0	0.0%
2007	12	5	41.7%	5	41.7%	2	16.7%	0	0.0%

Results for special education students indicate that the percentage of students scoring at a Level 1 decreased from 41.7% to 33.0%, a decrease of 8.7%. The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 students decreased from 41.7% to 33.0%, a decrease of 8.7%. Level 3 students increased from 16.7% to 33.0 %, an increase of 16.3%. We strive to provide additional support to these students.

Grade	5	NYS		ELA		Special		Education	
Year	# Tested	Lvl 1	Lvl 1%	Lvl 2	Lvl 2%	Lvl 3	Lvl 3%	Lvl 4	Lvl 4%
2009	14	0	0.0%	6	43.0%	8	57.0%	0	0.0%
2008	15	3	20.0%	7	46.7%	5	33.3%	0	0.0%
2007	13	1	7.7%	9	69.2%	3	23.1%	0	0.0%

Results for special education students indicate the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 decreased from 20.7% to 0%, a decrease of 20.7%. The percentage of students achieving Level 2 decreased from 69.2% to 43.0% a decrease of 26.2%. However students achieving Level 3 increased from 23.1% to 57.0%, an increase of 33.9%. We will strive to provide additional support to these students.

Grade 3 NYS ELA ELL 2007-2009

Year	# Tested	Lvl 1	Lvl 1%	Lvl 2	Lvl 2%	Lvl 3	Lvl 3%	Lvl 4	Lvl 4%
2009	30	4	13.0%	8	27.0%	18	60.0%	0	0.0%
2008	26	4	15.4%	17	65.4%	5	19.2%	0	0.0%
2007	20	7	35.0%	11	55.0%	2	10.0%	0	0.0%

Results for English Language Learners indicate the percentage of students scoring at a Level 1 decreased from 35% to 13.0%, a decrease of 22.0%. The percent of students scoring at a Level 2 decreased from 55% to 27.0% a decrease of 28.0%. The percentage of students scoring at a Level 3 increased from 10% to 60.0%, an increase of 50.0%. An analysis of this three-year trend in ELA English Language Learners student performance indicates that the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 and Level 2 decreased and the percentage of students scoring at a level 3 increased thus indicating noteworthy gains. This positive trend in student achievement will be maintained by continuing activities and programs that strengthen the skills of students scoring on Level 3.

Grade 4 NYS ELA ELL 2007-2009

Year	# Tested	Lvl 1	Lvl 1%	Lvl 2	Lvl 2%	Lvl 3	Lvl 3%	Lvl 4	Lvl 4%
2009	27	6	22.0%	15	56.0%	6	22.0%	0	0.0%
2008	17	5	29.4%	10	58.8%	2	11.8%	0	0.0%

2007 25 7 28.0% 13 52.0% 5 20.0% 0 0.0%

Results for English Language Learners indicate the percentage of students scoring at a Level 1 decreased from 28% to 22%, a decrease of 6.0%. The percent of students scoring at a Level 2 increased from 52% to 56.0% an increase of 4.0%. The percentage of students scoring at a Level 3 increased from 20% to 22.0%, an increase of 2.0%. An analysis of this three year trend in ELA English Language Learners student performance indicates that the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 decreased and the percentage of students scoring at a level 2 and 3 increased thus indicating a positive trend. We have addressed the lack of level 4's in this population by small group instruction, differentiation of instruction, targeting specific areas of need as indicated by Acuity, unit tests and informal assessments.

Grade		5				NYS		ELA		ELL	
Year	# Tested	Lvl 1	Lvl 1%	Lvl 2	Lvl 2%	Lvl 3	Lvl 3%	Lvl 4	Lvl 4%		
2009	15	0	0.0%	10	67.0%	5	33.0%	0	0.0%		
2008	14	3	21.4%	9	64.3%	2	14.3%	0	0.0%		
2007	9	2	22.2%	5	55.6%	2	22.2%	0	0.0%		

Results for English Language Learners indicate the percentage of students scoring at a Level 1 decrease from 22.2% to 0%, a decrease of 22.2%. The percent of students scoring at a Level 2 increased from 55.6% to 67.0% an increase of 11.4%. The percentage of students scoring at a Level 3 increased from 22.2% to 33.0%, an increase of 10.8%. An analysis of this three-year trend in ELA English Language Learners student performance indicates that the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 decreased and the percentage of students scoring at a level 2 and 3 increased thus indicating noteworthy gains. This positive trend in student achievement will be maintained by continuing activities and programs that strengthen the skills of students scoring on Level 3.

Student Progress for English Language Arts indicates the following:

- *1 year Progress: 71.1% of our students made at least 1 year of progress, which is 30.9% from the lowest (40.2%) to the highest (73.4%) score relative to our Peer Horizon and 23.8% of the way relative to our City Horizon.*
- *Average Change in Proficiency for Level 1 and Level 2 Students: 0.44 was our average change in student proficiency for levels 1 and 2, which is 90.3% relative to our Peer Horizon and 82.4% of the way relative to our City Horizon.*
- *Average Change Lowest 1/3 Students: 83.8% of our students in the lowest 1/3 made at least 1 year progress which is 66.6% compared to our Peer Horizon and 67.4% to our City Horizon.*

Our school received extra credit for closing the achievement gap for English Language Learners. 36.1% of our English Language Learners have exemplary proficiency gains in E.L.A. We also received extra credit for closing the achievement gap with our Hispanic students in the lowest 1/3 citywide. The data also reflects a growth in students making at least 1 year's worth of progress, especially in our lowest 1/3 in English Language Arts.

Grade 3 New York State ELA Test

Based on our analysis of the data and all relevant findings, the following are implications for our Literacy instructional program for Grade 3 students:

- Continuation of instructional strategies that have contributed to overall improved student achievement, including the implementation of a 90-minute literacy block and the Reading Street reading program. During this literacy block, students will be broken into small groups based on ability

- across the grade. Classroom teacher, AIS teachers, SETTS teacher, and ESL teachers will each have a small group and develop lessons that meet the needs of their small group.
- The implementation of a school-wide balanced literacy program with parallel instruction in all classes including a I.C.T. special education class, and a self contained ESL class.
 - Continued support to all students who are not meeting State standards through Title 1, Academic Intervention Services, After School Programs and SETSS.
 - Increased opportunities for the mainstreaming of special education students in general education classes through project based learning.
 - All teachers will become familiar with and use the reading strategies that are based on scientifically based research in the six dimensions of reading: 1) understanding how phonemes are connected to print-phonemic awareness; 2) being able to decode unfamiliar words; 3) being able to read fluently; 4) attaining background knowledge and vocabulary to foster reading comprehension; 5) developing appropriate active strategies to construct meaning from print-comprehension; and 6) developing and maintaining motivation to read.
 - Classroom libraries will continue to be established in every classroom. A variety of class sets of books, additional leveled books, genre and theme related material will be supplied. Professional Development will include the framework of teacher knowledge, teacher skills and professional development experiences in all the components of the six dimensions of reading, balanced literacy and workshop model.
 - Students are encouraged to use technology, e.g. Promethean Boards, computer software, Acuity tutorials and internet research.
 - Mobile labs are used to work on ongoing class projects as a full class and group activities.
 - ELL's and Special Education students will use computer software to help strengthen their language skills, through modeling and imitation. Books on tape provide a rewarding reading experience.
 - ELL students will receive small group instruction using the Reading Street series to help foster language acquisition, vocabulary development and reading skills.
 - Writing rubrics have been developed and used with students to assess their own writing at various points in the writing process; opportunities will be provided for teachers to plan collaboratively, align instructional assessments and examine and assess student work to focus instruction directly on students needs to meet the standards.
 - Teachers will use data from formal and informal assessments to provide differentiated instruction: i.e. Acuity, Performance Series, conference notes, Reading and Writing Unit checklists.
 - Teachers will reinforce literacy strategies during content area instruction.
 - Teachers will continue incorporate the Theme Immersion approach into their content area instruction in cooperation with Bank Street.
 - Investigation of best practices for sustaining and accelerating the achievement of English language learners will be incorporated.

Grade 4 New York State ELA Test

Based on our analysis of the data and all relevant findings, the following are implications for our Literacy instructional program for Grade 4 students:

- Continuation of instructional strategies that have contributed to overall improved student achievement, including the implementation of a 90-minute literacy block using the Reading Street Series and Writing Program. Students will work in a small group setting to help strengthen various reading strategies during part of the 90-minute literacy block. This grouping will include all classroom teachers on the grade, AIS teachers, SETTS teacher, and ESL teacher.
- The implementation of a school-wide balanced literacy program with parallel instruction in all classes including a I.C.T. special education class, and a self-contained special education class.
- Continued support to all students who are not meeting State standards through Title I, Academic Intervention Services, After School Programs and SETSS.
- Increased opportunities for the mainstreaming of special education students in general education

classes.

- All teachers will become familiar with and use the reading strategies that are based on scientifically based research in the six dimensions of reading: 1) understanding how phonemes are connected to print-phonemic awareness; 2) being able to decode unfamiliar words; 3) being able to read fluently; 4) attaining background knowledge and vocabulary to foster reading comprehension; 5) developing appropriate active strategies to construct meaning from print-comprehension; and 6) developing and maintaining motivation to read.
- Classroom libraries will continue to be established in every classroom. A variety of class sets of books, additional leveled books, and a variety of theme and genre related books will be supplied. Professional Development will include the framework of teacher knowledge, teacher skills and professional development experiences in all the components of the six dimensions of reading, balanced literacy and workshop model.
- Writing rubrics have been developed and used with students to assess their own writing at various points in the writing process; opportunities will be provided for teachers to plan collaboratively, align instructional assessments and examine and assess student work to focus instruction directly on students needs to meet the standards.
- Teachers will use data from ARIS, Acuity and Performance Series and informal assessments (conference notes, Unit checklists) to provide differentiated instruction.
- Teachers will reinforce literacy strategies during content area instruction.
- Investigation of best practices for sustaining and accelerating the achievement of English language learners will be incorporated.
- Computer software is used to help students publish their stories (Writer's Workshop) and research topics.
- The use of the Promethean Boards will be used to increase student knowledge and understanding across the curriculum.
- ELL students will use computer software to help strengthen their language development, type their work, research topics and listen to books on tape.
- Special Education will use computer software to create an interactive learning environment for learning, e.g. living books, phonics, etc. Books on tape give children an opportunity to successfully read a book.

Grade 5 New York State ELA Test

Based on our analysis of the data and all relevant findings, the following are implications for our Literacy instructional program for Grade 5 students:

- Continuation of instructional strategies that have contributed to overall improved student achievement, including the implementation of a 90-minute literacy block using the Reading Street Series and the Teacher's College Writing Program. Students will work in a small group setting to help strengthen various reading strategies during part of the 90-minute literacy block. This grouping will include all classroom teachers on the grade, AIS teachers, SETTS teacher, and ESL teacher.
- The implementation of a school-wide balanced literacy program with parallel instruction in all classes including self-contained special education class.
- Continued support to all students who are not meeting State standards through Title 1, Academic Intervention Services, After School Programs and SETSS.
- Intensive instruction funded through the Title III grant targeted towards parents, students and teachers. Topics included: literacy instruction, technology, math, and science.
- Increased opportunities for the mainstreaming of special education students in general education classes.
- All teachers will become familiar with and use the reading strategies that are based on scientifically based research in the six dimensions of reading: 1) understanding how phonemes are connected to print-phonemic awareness; 2) being able to decode unfamiliar words; 3) being able to read fluently; 4) attaining background knowledge and vocabulary to foster reading comprehension; 5) developing appropriate active strategies to construct meaning from print-comprehension; and 6) developing and

- maintaining motivation to read.
- Classroom libraries will continue to be established in every classroom. A variety of class sets of books, additional leveled books and a variety of theme and genre related material will be supplied. The Literacy Coach will provide professional development. Professional Development will include the framework of teacher knowledge, teacher skills and professional development experiences in all the components of the six dimensions of reading, balanced literacy, and workshop model.
 - Writing rubrics have been developed and used with students to assess their own writing at various points in the writing process; opportunities will be provided for teachers to plan collaboratively, align instructional assessments and examine and assess student work to focus instruction directly on students needs to meet the standards.
 - Teachers will use data from the ARIS, Acuity and Performance Series, formal and informal assessments (Unit checklists, running records and conference notes) to provide differentiated instruction.
 - Teachers will reinforce literacy strategies during content area instruction.
 - Investigation of best practices for sustaining and accelerating the achievement of English language learners.
 - Use of computer software is done for students to publish their stories (Writer's Workshop) and research information. The use of the Promethean Board will be used to increase student knowledge base and understanding across the curriculum.
 - ELL students will use computer software to help strengthen their language skills, type their work (Writer's Workshop), do research and listen to books on tape.
 - Special Education will use computer software to create an interactive learning environment for learning, e.g. living book, phonics, etc. The use of books on tape, give children an opportunity to successfully read a book.

Implications for 2009 Student Subgroups for English Language Arts

Analysis of the data indicates the extra support for ELL and AIS students has been successful. We will continue to use differentiated instruction and a variety of push-in/pull-out program models to aide these students and help them to reach proficiency. We hope to continue to offer after-school classes to support our ELL and AIS students. In addition we will offer intensive professional development in ESL and AIS strategies and the implementation of ESL and ELA standards. Where numbers allow, self-contained classes will be formed. We will use funding from the Title III Grant to provide After School classes and Professional Development for teachers, parents and students. This will promote best practices and reinforce the use of ESL methodologies and AIS modification of instruction in the classroom and enable parents to better help their children at home. We will implement the strategies and practices described in our newly created Language Allocation Policy for our ELL population.

We will continue to support our ELL students as well as our special education students with all their reading and writing comprehension skills through our intense Reading Street programs, through all the literacy components such as the read aloud with accountable talk, shared reading, word study and phonics, shared writing, guided reading and writing and book clubs. Students will be instructed through small groups using differentiated instruction and intense ESL strategies. Using leveled classroom libraries with strong multicultural themes, strong student-friendly charts with visual prompts and strong vocabulary reinforcement will provide the scaffolding supports needed by our students. The use of the Promethean Boards on a daily basis will also meet the various learning modalities of the students. Small strategy group work along with guided reading and writing group work will focus on specific learning needs which will be provided by the teacher, paraprofessional or push-in AIS or ESL providers.

We will continue to strengthen all the skills relating to the different components of the NYSESLAT for our ELL students across all the grades and all the proficiency levels. Our researched-based Open Court Phonics Program will continue to develop and reinforce the listening/speaking skills for our ELL students as well as our Special Needs students. Through our AIS services we will also continue to

use the Wilson Reading Program, Headsprouts and Raz-Kids as supplementary programs for extra support. The Read Aloud with Accountable Talk, shared reading, shared writing and interactive writing will be best practices that all our ELL students will be exposed to on a daily basis. All of these literacy components along with the reading and writing workshop which our ELL students will participate daily will help to improve their performance in reading and writing as well. We will work to differentiate instruction in all of these areas through small group instruction and through intense ESL strategies. Some of these will be using Sheltered English, the Total Physical Response (TPR), reader's theater, repeated readings, choral/echo reading, songs, chants and nursery rhymes. Our ELL students will get additional support through our day PCEN/ESL program as well as through our after school Title III ESL program. Our Language Allocation policy and our CR-Part 154 policy describe and support all the afore-mentioned strategies and interventions.

Analysis of Student Performance on the NYSESLAT from 2007-2009
Reading and Writing Results for Grades K-5

R and W All students

	# Tested	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Proficient
2009	205	6%	20%	38%	36%
2008	177	1	30%	42%	18%

K-01 R and W

	# Tested	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Proficient
2009	86	6.0%	20.0%	38.0%	36.0%
2008	80	8.0%	30.0%	36.0%	26.0%
2007	82	4.0%	15.0%	34.0%	48.0%

2-4 R and W

	# Tested	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Proficient
2009	99	6.0%	27.0%	47.0%	19.0%
2008	77	8.0%	32.0%	49.0%	10.0%
2007	78	10.0%	24.0%	27.0%	38.0%

05-06 R and W

	# Tested	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Proficient
2009	20	5.0%	30.0%	45.0%	20.0%
2008	20	25.0%	20.0%	40.0%	15.0%
2007	15	13.0%	40.0%	27.0%	20.0%

Listening and Speaking Results for Grades K-5

Lands All Students

	# Tested	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Proficient
2009	205	1%	7%	24%	68%
2008	177	3%	6%	44%	47%

K-01 L and S

	# Tested	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Proficient
2009	86	0.0%	2.0%	14.0%	84.0%
2008	80	1.0%	8.0%	51.0%	40.0%
2007	82	0.0%	7.0%	37.0%	56.0%

2-4 L and S

	#	Tested	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Proficient
2009	99	1.0%		9.0%	29.0%	61.0%
2008	77	3.0%	3.0%	38.0%		57.0%
2007	78		3.0%	5.0%	45.0%	47.0%

05-06 L and S

	#	Tested	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Proficient
2009	20		5.0%	20.0%	40.0%	35.0%
2008	20		10.0%	10.0%	40.0%	40.0%
2007	15		0.0%	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%

Summary of Data Analysis/Findings for ELL Student Performance on the NYSESLAT: Analysis of ELL student achievement of the 2009 NYSESLAT shows that overall our students are progressing in an upward fashion. On the R/W portion of the exam, our percentage of students achieving Proficient doubled to 36% in one year. All the other levels decreased a total of 18%. On the L/S portion of the exam, again our students showed great gains. There was a 21% increase in the amount of students achieving the Proficient level on the NYSESLAT. Again we see a positive decrease in the amount of students on the B, I, and A levels totaling 21%.

Our K-1 students showed a considerable increase in their performance on the 2009 NYSESLAT in all areas tested. The most significant being the Listening/Speaking (L/S) portion of the test. Students increased by 44% to the Proficient level and a decrease in all the other levels for L/S. On the Reading/Writing (R/W) portion of the test, there was a 12% decrease in the Beginner and Intermediate levels, while there was a 12% increase on the Advanced and Proficient levels. Hence, our students' performance levels are showing a steady improvement over the past 3 years. The data reveals that our students performed better on the 2009 NYSESLAT L/S portion and our percentages surpass those of the 2007 NYSESLAT.

Our 2-4 students showed a small increase in their performance on the 2009 NYSESLAT results. Both R/W and L/S portions of the test show an increase on the Proficient Levels. Surprisingly, on the R/W portion of the test, there was a combined decreased of 9% in the B, I, and A levels, while there was a 9% increased in the Proficient levels. We can safely say that our students are showing steady improvement in R/W. On the L/S portion of the test, there were mixed results. While the Proficient levels did increase slightly 4%, our Intermediate group also increased by 6%. Our Advanced and Beginning groups decreased by a total of 11%, telling us that additional support must be given to those groups of students.

Our grade 5 students showed a steady progress. In the R/W portion of the test, they showed some gains in the Intermediate, Advanced and Proficient levels. Although, they did show a significant decrease in the Beginning level of 20%. Hence, telling us that they have moved in an upward fashion. On the other hand our students did not show improvement on the L/S portion of the test. Although our Beginning levels decreased by 5% our Intermediate levels increased by 10% and our Proficient students decreased by 5%, telling us that we need to give additional support to our students on the L/S portion of the test.

Mathematics
Summary of Needs Assessment Findings
Grades K-2

An analysis of the Grades K-2 Mathematics Performance from 2007 to 2009 indicates the following:

We assessed our students K-2 through formal and informal evaluations and observations e.g. morning routines, calendar math, and math message. Teacher made assessments and student's conferences are used to evaluate student's performance. Speaking with the staff indicates that

students K-2 consistently perform at or above grade level in Math. By using the Everyday Math Program children quickly grasp concepts due to the use of manipulatives, skill building activities and playing games. Tests are given after each unit to assess student's mastery of math concepts and skills and allow for re-teaching of concepts when necessary. In addition, the progress check aligned with text made it easier to plan for differentiated instruction.

In grade K:
Teacher created homework assignments coordinate with the EDM program, increased use of EDM games, teacher adaptation of EDM lessons to differentiate for population of students and supplementing lessons with cooperative problem solving activities are all taking place.

In grade 1:
Through increased student usage of math tools kits, we noticed that students were better able to solve mathematical problems on their own. In addition, students exhibited increased motivation to learn new mathematical concepts when the lesson started with the math message.

In grade 2:
Increased experiences with the Everyday Math Program and morning routines have contributed to student success, as well as the use of student math reference books.

General		Education								
Grade 3		NYS				Mathematics				Test
Year	# Tested	Lvl 1	Lvl 1%	Lvl 2	Lvl 2%	Lvl 3	Lvl 3%	Lvl 4	Lvl 4%	
2009	128	0	0.0%	1	1.0%	96	75.0%	31	24.0%	
2008	117	0	0.0%	4	3.4%	72	61.5%	41	35.0%	
2007	100	1	1.0%	5	5.0%	49	49.0%	45	45.0%	

An analysis of the Grade 3 NYS-Mathematics Assessment results, from 2007 to 2009, indicates the following:

Results for General Education students indicate that there were no general education students scoring at Level 1 in 2008 or 2009 a decrease of 1.0% from 2008. Level 2 decreased from 5.0% to 1.0%, a decrease of 4%. Level 3 students increased from 49% to 75% an increase 26%. The percentage of students scoring at Level 4 decreased from 35% to 24%, from 2008-2009 a decrease of 11%. An analysis of this three-year trend in Math General Education students' performance indicates that the percentage of students scoring at levels 1 and 2 decreased and the percentage of students scoring at a level 3 increased thus indicating noteworthy gains. This positive trend in student achievement will be maintained by continuing activities and programs that strengthen the skills of students scoring on Level 3. The percentage of students scoring a level 4 decreased. This negative trend in student achievement is being addressed by small group instruction, differentiation of instruction, targeting specific areas of need as indicated by acuity, unit tests and informal assessments. We will also continue to provide support to level 4 students to maintain high achievement.

In addition to test preparation, teachers feel that increased student experiences with computer math games and hands on activities (manipulatives) have also contributed to increased student achievement.

Grade 4		NYS				Mathematics				Assessment
Year	# Tested	Lvl 1	Lvl 1%	Lvl 2	Lvl 2%	Lvl 3	Lvl 3%	Lvl 4	Lvl 4%	
2009	116	0	0.0%	3	3.0%	62	53.0%	51	44.0%	
2008	99	1	1.0%	16	16.2%	51	51.5%	31	31.3%	

2007 133 2 1.5% 6 4.5% 82 61.7% 43 32.3%

An analysis of the Grade 4 NYS Mathematics Assessment results, from 2007 to 2009, indicates the following:

Results for General Education students indicate the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 decreased from 1.5% to 0%. Students scoring at Level 2 decreased from 4.5% to 3.0%, a decrease of 1.5%. The percentage of students scoring at Level 3 increased from 51.5% to 53.0%, an increase of 1.5%. Level 4 students increased from 31.3% to 44% an increase of 12.7%. An analysis of this three-year trend in General Education students' performance indicates that the percentage of students scoring at levels 1 and 2 decreased and the percentage of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 increased thus indicating noteworthy gains. This positive trend in student achievement will be maintained by continuing activities and programs that strengthen the skills of students.

In addition to test preparation, teachers feel that increased planning time and development of their own monthly calendar, increased use of manipulatives, group work, math games, and supplemental materials have also contributed to increased student achievement.

Grade		5 NYS-Mathematics Test							
Year	# Tested	Lvl 1	Lvl 1%	Lvl 2	Lvl 2%	Lvl 3	Lvl 3%	Lvl 4	Lvl 4%
2009	96	1	1.0%	10	10.0%	44	46.0%	41	43.0%
2008	131	2	1.5%	7	5.3%	86	65.7%	36	27.5%
2007	96	0	0.0%	14	14.3%	45	45.9%	39	39.8%

An analysis of the Grade 5 NYS-Mathematics Assessment results, from 2007 to 2009, indicates the following:

Results for General Education students indicate the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 decreased from 1.5%, a decrease of 1.0%. The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 decreased from 14.3.0% to 10.0%, a decrease of 4.3%. Students scoring at Level 3 increased from 45.9% to 46.0%, a minimal increase. The percentage of students scoring at Level 4 increased from 39.8% to 43.0%, an increase of 3.2%. An analysis of this three-year trend in General Education students' performance indicates that the percentage of students scoring at levels 1 and 2 decreased and the percentage of students scoring at a levels 3 and 4increased thus indicating noteworthy gains. This positive trend in student achievement will be maintained by continuing activities and programs that strengthen the skills of the students.

2007-2009		Student Subgroups Mathematics							
Grade 3		NYS		Math		Special		Education	
Year	# Tested	Lvl 1	Lvl 1%	Lvl 2	Lvl 2%	Lvl 3	Lvl 3%	Lvl 4	Lvl 4%
2009	30	1	3.0%	6	20.0%	22	73.0%	1	3.0%
2008	14	2	14.3%	3	21.4%	9	64.3%	0	0.0%
2007	10	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	8	80.0%	1	10.0%

Results for special education students indicate that the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 in 2007 was 10.0% and decreased to 3.0 % in 2009, a 7.0% decrease. Level 2 decreased from 21.4% in 2008 to 20.0%, a decrease of 1.4 %. The percentage of special education students scoring at Level 3 increased from 64.3% to 73.0% an increase of 5.7% from 2008-2009. The percentage of students at Level 4 increased from 0% to 3.0% an increase of 3.0% from 2008-2009. An analysis of this three-year trend in Math Special Education students' performance indicates that the percentage of students scoring at levels 1 and 2 decreased and the percentage of students scoring at a level 3 and 4

increased, thus indicating noteworthy gains for all levels. This positive trend in student achievement will be maintained by continuing activities and programs that strengthen the skills of students. Small group instruction, differentiation of instruction, targeting specific areas of need as indicated by acuity, unit tests and informal assessments will continue.

Grade	4	NYS		Math		Special		Education	
Year	# Tested	Lvl 1	Lvl 1%	Lvl 2	Lvl 2%	Lvl 3	Lvl 3%	Lvl 4	Lvl 4%
2009	15	3	20.0%	4	27.0%	8	53.0%	0	0.0%
2008	11	2	18.2%	2	18.2%	7	63.6%	0	0.0%
2007	12	4	33.3%	3	25.0%	5	41.7%	0	0.0%

Results for special education students indicate that Level 1 students decreased from 33.3% to 20.0%, a decrease of 13.3%. Level 2 students increased from 25.0% to 27.0%, an increase of 2.0%. The number of students achieving Level 3 increased from 41.7% to 53.0%, an increase of 11.3%. The Level 4 remained constant at 0. An analysis of this three-year trend in Special Education students' performance indicates that the percentage of students scoring at levels 2 and 3 increased and the percentage of students scoring at a level 1 decreased thus indicating a positive trend. We will continue to support these students with small group instruction, differentiation of instruction, targeting specific areas of need as indicated by acuity, unit tests and informal assessments.

Additional support will be provided to move our Level 1 students to Level 2 and to maintain our Level 3 students.

Grade	5	NYS		Math		Special		Education	
Year	# Tested	Lvl 1	Lvl 1%	Lvl 2	Lvl 2%	Lvl 3	Lvl 3%	Lvl 4	Lvl 4%
2009	14	0	0.0%	3	21.0%	11	79.0%	0	0.0%
2008	15	6	40.0%	3	20.0%	6	40.0%	0	0.0%
2007	13	1	7.7%	1	7.7%	10	76.9%	1	7.7%

The results for special education students indicates that Level 1 students decreased from 7.7% to 0.0%. Level 2 students increased from 7.7% to 21% a 13.3%. Level 3 increased from 76.9% to 79.0%, an increase of 2.1%. An analysis of this three-year trend in Special Education students' performance indicates that there was a decrease of level 1 students and an increase of students scoring at a level 2 and 3, thus indicating noteworthy gains for all levels. This positive trend in student achievement will be maintained by continuing activities and programs that strengthen the skills of students. Small group instruction, differentiation of instruction, targeting specific areas of need as indicated by acuity, unit tests and informal assessments will continue.

Grade	3	NYS		Math		English		Language		Learners	
Year	# Tested	Lvl 1	Lvl 1%	Lvl 2	Lvl 2%	Lvl 3	Lvl 3%	Lvl 4	Lvl 4%		
2009	25	1	3.0%	4	17.0%	18	71.0%	2	9.0%		
2008	30	2	6.7%	6	20.0%	19	63.3%	3	10.0%		
2007	18	2	11.1%	4	22.2%	11	61.1%	1	5.6%		

Results for English Language Learners taking the 3rd grade NYS math test indicate the percentage of students scoring at a Level 1 decreased from 11.1 to 3.0%, a decrease of 8.1%. The percent of students scoring at a Level 2 decreased from 22.2% to 17.0% a decrease of 5.2%. The percentage of students scoring at a Level 3 increased from 61.1% to 71.0%, an increase of 9.9%. The percentage of students scoring at a Level 4 increased from 5.6% to 9.0%, an increase of 3.4%. An analysis of this three-year trend in Math English Language Learners student performance indicates that the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 and 2 decreased and the percentage of students scoring at

a level 3 and 4 increased thus indicating noteworthy gains. This positive trend in student achievement will be maintained by continuing activities and programs that strengthen the skills of students scoring on Levels 3 and 4, and supporting the needs of students scoring Levels 1 and 2.

Grade	4	NYS		Math		English		Language		Learners
Year	# Tested	Lvl 1	Lvl 1%	Lvl 2	Lvl 2%	Lvl 3	Lvl 3%	Lvl 4	Lvl 4%	
2009	30	3	10.0%	7	23.0%	17	57.0%	3	10.0%	
2008	19	3	15.8%	11	57.9%	5	26.3%	0	0.0%	
2007	32		4 12.5%	4	12.5%	20	62.5%	4	12.5%	

Results for English Language Learners taking the 4th grade NYS math test indicate the percentage of students scoring at a Level 1 decreased from 12.5% to 10.0%, a decrease of 2.5%. The percent of students scoring at a Level 2 increased from 12.5% to 23.0% an increase of 10.5%. The percentage of students scoring at a Level 3 decreased from 62.5% to 57.0%, a decrease of 5.5%. From 2008-2009 the percentage increased from 26.3% to 57%, an increase of 30.7%. The percentage of students scoring at a Level 4 decreased from 12.5% to 10.0%, a decrease of 2.5%. From 2008 -2009 there was an increase of level 4 students from 0% in 2008 to 10% in 2009. An analysis of this three-year trend in Math English Language Learners student performance indicates that the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 decreased. The percentage of students scoring at level 2 increased and the percentage of students scoring at a level 3 and 4 decreased thus indicating a negative trend. Although from 2008-2009 the percentage of students scoring a level 3 and 4 increased. This negative trend in student achievement is being addressed by giving these students extra support with small group instruction, differentiation of instruction, targeting specific areas of need as indicated by acuity, unit tests and informal assessments. The positive trend in student achievement will be maintained by continuing activities and programs that strengthen the skills of students scoring on Levels 3 and 4, and by supporting the needs of students scoring Levels 1 and 2.

Grade	5	NYS		Math		English		Language		Learners
Year	# Tested	Lvl 1	Lvl 1%	Lvl 2	Lvl 2%	Lvl 3	Lvl 3%	Lvl 4	Lvl 4%	
2009	17	0	0.0%	8	47.0%	8	47.0%	1	6.0%	
2008	20	5	25.0%	4	20.0%	8	40.0%	3	15.0%	
2007	13	1	7.7%	7	53.8%	4	30.8%	1	7.7%	

Results for English Language Learners taking the 5th grade NYS math test indicate the percentage of students scoring at a Level 1 decreased from 7.7% to 0.0%, a decrease of 7.7%. The percentage of students scoring at a Level 2 decreased from 53.8% to 47.0% a decrease of 6.8%. The percentage of students scoring at a Level 3 increased from 30.8% to 47.0%, an increase of 16.2%. The percentage of students scoring at a Level 4 decreased from 7.7% to 6.0%, a decrease of 1.7%. An analysis of this three-year trend in Math English Language Learners student performance indicates that the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 and 2 decreased and the percentage of students scoring at a level 3 increased. The percentage of students scoring at level 4 decreased. A positive trend in student achievement shown by levels 1, 2 and 3 will be maintained by continuing activities and programs that strengthen the skills of students. The decrease in level 4 students will be addressed by supporting the needs of these students. We will support these students with small group instruction, differentiation of instruction, targeting specific areas of need as indicated by acuity, unit tests and informal assessments.

Progress Report Analysis
 Student Progress for Mathematics indicates the following:

- 1 year Progress: 76.5% of our students made at least 1 year of progress, which is 36.1% from the

lowest (40.4%) and is 21.3% to the highest (93.1%) score relative to our Peer Horizon and 67.4% of the way relative to our City Horizon.

- Average Change in Proficiency for Level 1 and Level 2 Students: 0.43 was our average change in student proficiency for levels 1 and 2, which is 73.6% of the way from the lowest (0.04) to the highest (0.57) score relative to our Peer Horizon and 69.8% of the way relative to our City Horizon.
- Average Change Lowest 1/3 Students: 78.6% of our students in the lowest 1/3 made at least 1 year progress which is 74.6% of the way from the lowest (41.6%) to the highest (91.2%) to our Peer Horizon and 75.3% of the way to our City Horizon.

Unlike E.L.A., our school did received extra credit in 3 areas for closing the achievement gap in the various subgroups. We received 1.5 points extra credit for both English Language Learners and Special Education students. We also received 0.75 points for our Hispanic Students in the Lowest Third Citywide. This data reflects our efforts to support these subgroups in Mathematics. We will continue these efforts in the hopes of having the same success this year.

Science

Summary of Needs Assessment Findings

The analysis of the data indicates that there was a 3% increase of the percentage of students scoring at Level 1. The percentage of students scoring at a Level 2 decreased from 8.0% to 6.0% a decrease of 2%. The percentage of students scoring at Level 3 decreased from 40.0% to 20.0% a decrease of 20.0%. The percentage of students scoring at a Level 4 increased from 51.0% to 69.0%, an increase of 18.0%. Further, we have assessed students in grades K-5 formally and informally through teacher made tests and observations as well as chapter tests at the end of each unit. Speaking with classroom teachers and the Science Cluster teacher indicates that our students are consistently performing at grade level in K-5. The percentage of students scoring at Levels 2 and 3 decreased while the percentage of students scoring at level 1 and level 4 increased. This negative trend in student achievement is being addressed by small group instruction, differentiation of instruction, targeting specific areas of need as indicated by unit tests and informal assessments. This positive trend in student achievement will be maintained by continuing activities and programs that strengthen the skills of students scoring on Level 4.

Grade	4	NYS		Science		Assessment		-	All	Students
Year	# Tested	Lvl 1	Lvl 1%	Lvl 2	Lvl 2%	Lvl 3	Lvl 3%	Lvl 4	Lvl 4%	
2009	131	6	5.0%	8	6.0%	26	20.0%	91	69.0%	
2008	106	2	2.0%	8	8.0%	42	40.0%	54	51.0%	
2007	146	6	5.0%	6	4.0%	56	39.0%	78	53.0%	

Special Education Student Performance on the New York State Science Assessment

Year	# Tested	Lvl 1	Lvl 1%	Lvl 2	Lvl 2%	Lvl 3	Lvl 3%	Lvl 4	Lvl 4%	
2009	15	3	20.0%	4	27.0%	0	0.0%	8	53.0%	
2008	9	1	11.0%	1	11.0%	6	67.0%	1	11.0%	
2007	9	7	78.0%	1	11.0%	1	11.0%	0	0.0%	

The percentage of Special Education students scoring at a Level 1 increased from 11% to 20.0%, an increase of 9%. The percentage of Level 2 students increased from 11.0% to 27.0%, an increase of 16.0%. The percentage of Level 3 students decreased 67.0% from 67.0% the previous year, meaning no student scored at a Level 3. Conversely, the percentage of Special Education students receiving a Level 4 increased 42.0% from 11.0% to 53.0%. The negative trend in student achievement is being addressed by small group instruction, differentiation of instruction, targeting specific areas of need as indicated by unit tests and informal assessments. The percentage of students scoring at Level 4

increased. This positive trend in student achievement will be maintained by continuing activities and programs that strengthen the skills of students scoring on Level 4.

ELL Student Performance on the New York State Science Assessment

Year	# Tested	Lvl 1	Lvl 1%	Lvl 2	Lvl 2%	Lvl 3	Lvl 3%	Lvl 4	Lvl 4%
2009	29	5	17.0%	8	28.0%	10	34.0%	6	21.0%
2008	17	2	12.0%	5	29.0%	8	47.0%	2	12.0%
2007	25	2	8.0%	5	20.0%	12	48.0%	6	24.0%

The percentage of English Language Learner students scoring at a Level 1 increased from 12% to 17.0%, an increase of 5%. The percentage of Level 2 students decreased from 29.0% to 28.0%, a decrease of 1.0%. The percentage of Level 3 students decreased from 47.0% to 34.0%, a decrease of 13.0%. The percentage students receiving a Level 4 increased 9.0% from 12.0% to 21.0%. The percentage of students scoring at Levels 2, and 3 decreased while the percentage of Level 1 and Level 4 students increased. This negative trend in student achievement is being addressed by small group instruction, differentiation of instruction, targeting specific areas of need as indicated by unit tests and informal assessments. The positive trend in student achievement will be maintained by continuing activities and programs that strengthen the skills of students on Level 4.

Implications for the Instructional Program - Science

Based on our analysis of the data and all relevant findings, the following are implications for our science program:

Overall, we have an effective science program, as evidenced by the 69% increase in Level 4 scores. Yet, remediation is needed to reverse a negative trend in certain areas. In particular, we have observed an increase in Level 1, and a decrease in Level 2 and Level 3 scores. Therefore, our target groups for 2009-2010 will focus on all students who typically fall within these low to mid-range scores, as all of our students have contributed to this negative trend regardless of cohort group. We will continue to enrich and enhance our science program from grades K through 5, so that as many students as possible will perform at or above the State Designated Level. We have enhanced our science program with the addition of a K-2 science cluster. Both cluster teachers are using an inquiry-based curriculum that is aligned to the New York State Science Standards and Core Curriculum. Working alongside the classroom teachers, the upper grade science cluster will assist classroom teachers in various enrichment projects based on student interest in the top 3rd, 4th and 5th grade classes.

We will continue to support our ELL and Special Education students in this content area for the upcoming year. Students will develop their skills and concepts in Science through the use of our Harcourt Science textbook series, science classroom libraries, and through inquiry-based science activities and experiments. Our upper grade cluster teacher will provide science lessons twice a week to our fourth grade students so that all units of study are covered thoroughly and effectively. Science vocabulary will be developed through word walls and flash cards. Students will participate in the annual Science fair in which they will have the opportunity to use the scientific method and create meaningful projects based on their units of study. Our Teacher's College program in grades K-2 and Reading Street series in grades 3-5, supports this area with the majority of the units focusing in content area reading and writing activities. All of these activities and materials will facilitate continuity to help our students to grow in this content area.

Our Special Education students will receive classroom instruction in science as well as weekly instruction by both Science Clusters. These students will use hands on experimentation, observation, and videos to reinforce scientific concepts.

Questions, reading about Social Studies topics in the Reading program, the study of various cultures, use of Brain Pop website, and increased map and globe skills. We assessed our students K-5 through formal and informal evaluations and observations. Teacher made assessments, student research reports and projects are used to evaluate student performance. Speaking with the teachers indicates that students K-5 are performing at or above grade level in Social Studies.

Implications for the Instructional Program – Social Studies

Based on our analysis of the data and all relevant findings, the following are implications for our social studies program:

The school will continue to provide an enriching Social Studies curriculum for all students and continue to provide real life experiences through Career Day, class trips and participation in the multicultural festival. In addition, a social studies cluster will work with grades K-5. Social studies concepts covered will include family, community, world communities, map and globe skills, New York State, Latin America, and Government. We will continue the use of newspaper and magazine subscriptions, such as Time for Kids and National Geographic, to encourage student awareness of current events.

Students who need extra help in the area of social studies will be given intervention by the classroom teacher who will use individual and small group instruction to help students who need extra help. In addition, classroom teachers will supplement the social studies curriculum through non-fiction/content area reading units in Kindergarten to Grade 2, and embedded into the Reading Street program for grades 3-5. In collaboration with Bank Street College, our Grade 1 and 3 teachers are involved with planning and executing a Social Studies Theme Immersion Program.

We have purchased a curriculum for grades 3-5. In addition, the school purchased new maps for all classrooms grades K-5. The upper grades have world maps, state maps and also maps of North America. Our students' performance in social studies will improve through the implementation of new world and state maps, textbooks and real-world events.

We will continue to support our ELL and Special Education students in the area of Social Studies using our Harcourt Social Studies series, social studies classroom libraries, theme-based projects relating to their units of study, real-life experiences such as Career Day, trips to museums and historical places and doing reports using the internet. Our focus in this area is to develop their high order thinking skills and vocabulary as well as providing them with the skills and strategies they need to answer document-based questions relating to primary sources. In Kindergarten to second grade, social studies is incorporated into our Teacher's College Reading and Writing program. It also supports our students in this area with several of their units during the year focusing on content area reading and writing. In addition,

Technology will be used to support social studies instruction through the use of internet research, video conferencing, and theme based projects by implementing strategies learned from Bank Street. Students will also be exposed to various time periods by examining closely and discussing art using the V.T.S. We have an increase in technology via Promethean Boards. This allows teachers instant access to a wealth of lessons, virtual field trips, and interactive differentiated assessment.

Library and Media services will support social studies instruction through the use of trade books, videos, listening centers and slide presentations.

Professional development will be provided for the staff in the area of social studies addressing the New York State Pacing Calendar, Curriculum Charting, backwards planning across grades and the use of DBQ's for instruction in all grade based on the developmental level of the children.

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

Directions: Based on the findings and implications from the comprehensive needs assessment (Section IV), determine your school's instructional goals for 2009-10 and list them in this section along with a few phrases of description. The resulting list should include a limited number of goals (5 is a good guideline), and the list as a whole should be a clear reflection of your priorities for the year. Good goals should be SMART - Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound. **Notes:** (1) In Section VI of this template, you will need to complete an "action plan" for each annual goal listed in this section. (2) Schools designated for improvement (SINI/SRAP/SURR or schools that received a C for two consecutive years, D, or F on the Progress Report) must identify a goal and complete an action plan related to improving student outcomes in the area(s) of improvement identification. (3) When developed, Principal's Performance Review (PPR) goals should presumably be aligned to the school's annual goals described in this section.

Annual Goal	Short Description
1. By June 2010, the communication between home and school will increase as evidenced by an improvement of scores on the communication portion of the learning environment survey.	After reviewing and evaluating the 2008-2009 Learning Environment Survey, the SLT determined the home/school connection was not sufficient. Therefore, a more comprehensive parent letter is sent home in both English and Spanish.
2. By June 2010, we will create and implement an in house data collection system as measured by an increased identification of children that need additional help as well as improved differentiated instruction.	After reviewing and evaluating the existing data collection system, the instructional cabinet and inquiry team determined that there was a need to improve methods of gathering and analyzing student data. Therefore, in collaboration with Promethean, a new technology based system is being developed to assist in the gathering and the breakdown of scores according to AYP categories.
3. By June 2010, there will be an increase in the number of staff involved in Inquiry work as evidenced by staff participation at Inquiry Team meetings.	After reviewing and evaluating student predictive and ITA scores, the 2008-2009 Inquiry Team determined that more staff involvement was necessary in order to increase the amount of differentiated instruction throughout the building.
4. By June 2010, there will be a grade wide implementation of the Reading Street program for grade 3 as measured by increased participation in professional development and increased grade3 NYS ELA scores.	After reviewing and evaluating the, our instructional cabinet and inquiry team determined that the Teacher's College model of reading workshop was not meeting the needs of our students. In addition, this program was previously implemented in grades 4 and 5 in 2008-2009 school year, with successful results. Therefore, the decision was made to implement Reading Street in third grade would be the best fit for our students needs and in improving our NYS ELA scores.

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

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

Subject Area
(where relevant) : _____

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>1. By June 2010, the communication between home and school will increase as evidenced by an improvement of scores on the communication portion of the learning environment survey.</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>Every grade level will have their own web site describing units of study, materials, trips, special events, long term projects, holidays, test dates, etc. Every month a newsletter will be sent home describing the goals in each subject for every grade level. Agenda books for students in grades 3 – 5 will include monthly goals written by each student. This agenda will act as a tool for communication. Monthly letters from the principal to the community, which will include a monthly calendar will be sent home on the first of each month. Workshops for parents provided by the parent coordinator, literacy coach, math coach, ARIS coordinator, computer teacher, science teacher, reading teachers, and guidance counselors will be held every month. Some workshops will be held during the day others in the evening. Creation of a parent handbook in every language spoken in the school will be distributed in September. Parents will receive monthly scores on all assessments taken in school. In addition, a curriculum corner/guide for each grade will be written and sent home monthly. The PTA newsletter is written every 3 months and will also be sent home in 2 languages. (English/Spanish)</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>Funding Source: Parent Involvement Staffing/Training/Schedule: In house training</p>

<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Instruments of Measure: Agendas from meetings, sign in sheets, calendars, letters, new letters, agenda books, parent handbooks, Learning environment survey. Surveys will be sent home periodically to different classes.</p> <p>Interval of Periodic Review: Monthly review of all communication. Every 3 months we will survey a different group of parents.</p> <p>Projected Gains: 2% gain in Progress Report and Parent Survey from the DOE.</p>
--	---

Subject Area (where relevant) : _____

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>2. By June 2010, we will create and implement an in house data collection system as measured by an increased identification of children that need additional help as well as improved differentiated instruction.</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>Meet and plan with the Promethean staff to create assessments used by all staff members. Tests will be given on the Promethean boards or on line. The computer will grade the assessments and break the scores down into sub categories, male vs. female, ESL, ethnicity, free lunch, special education, etc. All scores will be graphed. Teachers will know who needs work in these areas. Parents will receive monthly scores. All assessments must be downloaded into the computer. Key staff will work with all teachers and provide professional development on the use of the Promethean program and how to interpret and use the data.</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>Funding Source: Reso A grant, School Fund, PTA</p> <p>Staffing/Training/Schedule: Promethean staff will provide training on Staff Development days.</p>

<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Instruments of Measure:</p> <p>Spreadsheets will show how often the program is being used. Walk-throughs and observations of class instruction using the boards. Testing data will be distributed to parents monthly.</p> <p>Interval of Periodic Review:</p> <p>November 2009, March 2010, June 2010</p> <p>Projected Gains:</p> <p>N/A</p>
--	---

**Subject Area
(where relevant) :** _____

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>3. By June 2010, there will be an increase in the number of staff involved in Inquiry work as evidenced by staff participation at Inquiry Team meetings.</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>During common preps teachers will meet to discuss Inquiry team children. Technology programs,</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>Funding Source:</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Staffing/Training/Schedule:</p> <p>Monthly grade conferences, Faculty conferences, lunch and learns</p>

<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Instruments of Measure:</p> <p>Agendas and sign in sheets, case studies of students, student's work and assessments will indicate that the inquiry teams are active. Activity on ARIS.</p> <p>Interval of Periodic Review:</p> <p>Monthly meetings with staff members and monthly inquiry team meetings</p> <p>Projected Gains:</p> <p>Increased number of differentiated small groups, increase just right reading levels of 1-2 levels by June.</p>
--	--

Subject Area (where relevant) : _____

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>4. By June 2010, there will be a grade wide implementation of the Reading Street program for grade 3 as measured by increased participation in professional development and increased grade3 NYS ELA scores.</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>AIS staff, ESL push in staff and all third grade classroom teachers will have small group instruction every day during fourth period for our third grade students. As children gain mastery of certain skills groups will change. There will be an emphasis on vocabulary development and the use of visual technology to give the children a working knowledge of the material before we start each unit. Teachers will meet once a week to plan. A reading teacher will be in charge of gathering materials to extend the learning for the 37 minutes.</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>Funding Source:</p> <p>NYSTL money</p> <p>Staffing/Training/Schedule:</p> <p>Third grade teachers are going to have on going training in Reading Street. Schedules of teachers, AIS staff, Title 1, SETTS teacher and ESL teachers have been aligned to guarantee small group instruction.</p>

<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Instruments of Measure: The use of diagnostic and predictive assessments will be used along with weekly, end of unit and benchmark tests from the reading street program.</p> <p>Interval of Period Review: Reading levels are tested 3x a year, as well as at the end of each unit. In addition students take a weekly exam to test reading comprehension skills and vocabulary knowledge based on each story.</p> <p>Projected Gains: Just Right Levels will go up at least one level by June. Increase weekly test scores as students master the program. We will see gains on the short response section of the ELA test of 1.5% in grade 3.</p>
--	--

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010

Directions: All schools must complete Appendices 1, 2, 3, 7, & 9. (Note: Appendix 8 will not be required for this year.) All Title I schools must complete Appendix 4. All schools identified under NCLB or SED for School Improvement, including Improvement – Year 1 and Year 2, Corrective Action (CA) – Year 1 and Year 2, and Restructured Schools, must complete Appendix 5. All Schools Under Registration Review (SURR) must complete Appendix 6. **Note: Please refer to the accompanying CEP Guide for specific CEP submission instructions and timelines.**

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

APPENDIX 8: CONTRACTS FOR EXCELLENCE (C4E) SCHOOL-BASED EXPENDITURES FOR 2009-10 (NOTE: APPENDIX 8 WILL NOT BE REQUIRED FOR THIS YEAR)

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

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

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

Grade	ELA	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	At-risk Services: Guidance Counselor	At-risk Services: School Psychologist	At-risk Services: Social Worker	At-risk Health-related Services
	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS				
K	26	26	N/A	N/A	13			
1	46	46	N/A	N/A	24			
2	44	44	N/A	N/A	14			
3	48	48	N/A	N/A	10			
4	85	85	10		11			
5	78	78			32			
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

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

o Students in Grades 10 – 12 who scored below the approved passing grade on any Regents examination required for graduation in English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies.

Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services

<p>Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)</p>	<p>Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).</p>
<p>ELA:</p>	<p>Grades K-5 Headsprouts, Raz Kids K-3 and ELL's, Gr. 1 ELL students, Explode the code, Gr. 2 Open Court Basal Readers, Gr. 2and3 STARS, Gr. 1-5 Treasure Chest, Gr. 2and3 Buckle Down, Gr. 1and 2 Wilson, Foundations Gr.1 (ELL), Gr. 3 Guided Reading leveled sets, Gr. 3, 4and 5 Big Book by George (strategy kit), Gr. 3and4 Teacher trade books, Gr. 4and 5 Fresh Reads, Gr. 3-5 STARS, Decodable readers with Phonics Strategies. These programs are being used in the grades that are indicated as an intervention in small groups. They are being used in extended day, push in programs and after school. In addition the classroom instruction the teachers are assessing these students and tracking their progress while looking for trends to target instructional needs. The support staff is included in common preps to discuss students with the classroom teachers to maintain a collaborative focus of instruction</p>
<p>Mathematics:</p>	<p>Gr. 3and5 Skills Links (EDM), Gr. 3and4 Elements of Math,Gr. 5, Super Sourche Gr, 3-5, DynaMath Gr. 5, math games EDM manipulatives and Think Fun games. These programs are being used in the grades that are indicated. They are being used during extended day, push in programs, and after school. In addition to classroom instruction the teachers are assessing these students and tracking their progress while looking for trends to target instructional needs. The support staff is included in common preps to discuss student with the classroom teachers to maintain a collaborative focus of instruction.</p>
<p>Science:</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Social Studies:</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:</p>	<p>Our two guidance counselors are seeing both mandated as well as at risk students in our school. One services grades K,2,4 and the other grades1,3,5. Their goal is to improve the social, emotional and academic performance of our students. In addition we have a SAPIS worker (Substance Abuse Prevention Intervention Specialist) 3 days a week. She provides counseling services to students and their families for substance abuse, antisocial behavior (fighting), poor academic achievement, personal problems, family problems and crisis intervention.</p>

At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	N/A
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	
At-risk Health-related Services:	

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.

The P.S. 212 Language Allocation Policy (School Year 2009-2010)

Part I: School ELL Profile

Our school's goal is to ensure a strong academic program for all our English Language Learners, and we accomplish this by offering our ELL students all the necessary services in meeting the New York State English Language Arts (ELA) and English as a Second Language (ESL) learning standards as well as the content area standards in Math, Social Studies and Science. We also accomplish this by providing them with quality instructional programs and by holding them to the same high performance expectations as we do all our students. Furthermore, our programs provide the support and scaffolding structures necessary for ELL students to perform well and to succeed at the various language proficiency levels. These structures are reflected through our school's language allocation strategies, which assist us in meeting the needs of our ELL population.

A. Language Allocation Policy Team Composition

Our language allocation policy team, our school leadership team, and all teachers who work closely with our ELL students meet on a regular basis to review the data from various assessments, analyze the results and make decisions on how to best meet the needs of our ELL students. In other words, we use the data results to drive the instruction for our ELL students. The members of our language allocation policy team represent different constituencies of the school. The principal Carin Ellis, assistant principal Dr. Melissa Haidary, ESL Specialist Irene Zajac, our literacy coach Danielle Mahoney, math coach Debbie Levy, Title I Reading teacher Angela Pollina, a kindergarten teacher, Maria Bermudez, our guidance counselor Martha Alsina, parent coordinator Olga Flores, and a parent from our school leadership committee Jane Buenaventura, provide input from their own specialized expertise as they analyze and assess the individual needs of our ELL population.

B. Teacher Qualifications

We currently have 10 certified ESL teachers and 1 certified Bilingual teacher in our school.

C. School Demographics

Our school is composed of a very diverse ethnic and cultural student population. As of October 1st, we had 776 total number of students in the school, of which 182 are ELL students. They comprise 23.45% of our student population.

Part II: ELL Identification Process

Question 1: When students arrive at the school to be registered there are several important steps taken to insure proper class and program placement.

- If students are transfers from other NYC public schools, we examine student records for proper placement
 - If students are new to this country or new to NYC Public School system we administer the Home Language Survey questionnaire. Based on the answers to HLIS form, we do the following:
-

- If home language is English, child is placed in a general education classroom.
- If home language is a language other than English, an informal interview is conducted to evaluate Native Language and English Language proficiency. If student does not speak any other language but English, he/she is not LEP and is placed in a general education classroom.
- If student speaks a language other than English and student speaks little or no English, the LAB-R is administered first in English and then if the native language is Spanish, it is also administered in Spanish.
 - Depending on the score of the LAB-R in English student is placed accordingly. If student scores at the Proficient Level, then student is not LEP and enters a general education classroom.
 - If students scores at the Beginning, Intermediate or Advanced Levels student is LEP and is placed in a ELL program/classroom.

Question 2: What structures are in place at your school to ensure that parents understand all three program choices?

Early in the Fall of each year, once we have the results of the ELL assessments, we report them to the parents and inform them of the program choices that are available to their children. Through parent orientation meetings, parents are given their children's test results, they are shown a video of the different programs available, and are given pamphlets in several languages that contain more detailed information on all programs available to their children. Teachers and other personnel speaking the parents' language are also there to provide all necessary explanations to the parents. Parents are then given a Parent Program Selection form, which they fill out and designate the program they prefer for their child. The organization of this meeting, the filling out of the forms and the placement of students are collaboratively accomplished by the principal, the assistant principal, and ELL program specialist, input by the teachers, the parent coordinator, as well as the informed consent of the parents.

Question 3: Describe how your school ensures that entitlement letters are distributed and Parent Survey and Program Selection Forms are returned?

Early in the Fall of each year, once we have the results of the NYSESLAT and LAB-R assessments, several letters go out to parents of students that have taken the NYSESLAT or LAB-R. Based on the students' results they receive one of the following entitlement letters:

- Passed NYSESLAT, no longer require ESL services
- Failed NYSESLAT, still require ESL services
- Passed LAB-R, do not require ESL services
- Failed LAB-R, require ESL services

The Parent Survey and Program Selection forms are returned to the school on the same day or the parent orientation meetings. If parents are not able to attend the meetings, pamphlets, survey and program selection form are sent home and returned almost immediately. The assistant principal, together with the ESL Program Specialist and Parent Coordinator keep a list of surveys and program selection forms that have been returned and then contact parents that have not returned them and are urged to do so as soon as possible.

Question 5: After reviewing the Parent Survey and Program Selection forms for the past few years, what is the trend in program choices that parents have requested?

Question 6: Are the program models offered at your school aligned with parent requests?

The parent body of PS 212 has consistently elected for the students to be in a self contained ESL class. Although at the yearly meeting the option of Transitional Bilingual Education as well as Dual Language programs are offered, our parents prefer the Free Standing ESL model. Most of our parents for the past three years have opted for English as a Second Language program for their children. This has been evident in their choices on the parent survey selection forms. About 98% of the parents choose English as a Second Language Program as their number one choice. This is especially evident with our Kindergarten parents. Most of our Kindergarten students attend Pre-K programs in which the language of instruction is English. As a result, parents of incoming Kindergarten students prefer that their children continue in ESL classes in which English is used as the language of instruction. For this reason, we only have a Free Standing English as a Second Language Program in our school. Our goal is to align our programs with the requests of the parents and to best meet the needs of their children.

As students continually register in our school throughout the school year, our ELL program coordinator meets with the parents and goes through the process described above explaining the program choices to them. Our parents are given a clear understanding of each program type and how it can meet the needs of their children. We also let parents know that, if they choose a program that we may not offer or because we may not have enough numbers of parents requesting a bilingual class, they have the option of taking their child to another school that has the program of their choice. In such cases, parents always choose to keep their children in our school, because they like the programs we offer, they have the opportunity to meet the teachers and visit the classrooms where they see the program in operation.

Part III: ELL Demographics

A. English Language Learner Programs

Our school provides our ELL students with the ESL instructional programs that are recommended by the Integrated Service Center. We have a Free Standing ESL class in Grades K, 1, 2 and 3. Those ELL students who are not in a self-contained ESL class due to high registers or because they are in Special Education classes or in our Kindergarten, Third Grade and Fourth Grade ICT classes, also get individualized and small group ESL instruction from our push-in ESL teacher. The following Free-Standing ESL classes are in each grade:

Kindergarten	2 ESL Classes
First Grade	1 ESL Class
Second Grade	1 ESL Class
Third Grade	1 ESL Class

We provide our students with the appropriate units of ESL instruction as determined by the New York State Commissioner's Part 154 Regulations. Students who are in the beginning and intermediate language proficiency levels get at least two periods of ESL a day, 360 minutes a week, and those students who are in the advanced language proficiency level get at least one period of ESL a day, 180 minutes a week, together with a minimum of another daily period of English language arts. All our self-contained ESL teachers and our push-in/pull-out ESL teacher are ESL state certified. They are continually involved in on-going professional development that is school-based as well as regionally based in the balanced literacy as well as in the ESL best practices.

B. ELL Years of Service and Programs and ELL's by sub-groups

Number of ELLs by Subgroups

ALL ELLs	182	Newcomers	130	Special Education	23
SIFE	1	ELLs 4-6 years	28	Long Term	0

ELLs by Subgroups

ELLs (0-3 years)			ELLs (4-6 years)			Long Term (6 more)		
ALL	SIFE	Special Education	ALL	SIFE	Special Education	ALL	SIFE	Special Education
130	1	8	28	0	15	0	0	0

C. Home Language Breakdown and ELL Programs

We have the following numbers of ELL's by grade in each language group:

Language	K	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Spanish	35	26	21	30	23	26	161
Chinese	3	0	0	0	0	1	4
Tagalog	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Bengali	2	2	0	2	1	3	10
Punjabi	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Other	1	1	0	0	0	2	4

As of October 1, 2009, we have about 182 ELL students. The majority of our ELL students are Hispanic at 88.46% of our ELL population. These students were identified as ELL's based on scores obtained from the LAB-R and the NYSESLAT assessments. We use the Home Language Identification Parent Survey Form to determine the eligibility of students who are newcomers to the public school system, such as Kindergarten students or newly arrived immigrant students, to take the LAB-R assessment, and we use the

results of the LAB-R and the NYSESLAT tests along with the parent program choice to place students in appropriate classes and in the programs they need to succeed.

D. Programming and Scheduling Information

Question 1: How is instruction delivered?

The instructional approaches that we use to provide meaningful learning experiences for our ELL students are effective and are researched-based. Research shows that language learning and literacy learning are interrelated. They are both developmental, cognitive processes that promote the acquisition of the four skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. Before planning the learning experiences for ELL's, our teachers also use formal and informal assessments to learn their level of English language proficiency and their current levels of knowledge and skills in literacy and the content areas.

Our goal according to our Comprehensive Educational Plan is to provide the necessary support and scaffolding to our ELL students to help them succeed in their classes. We want our ELL students to test out of ESL and be mainstreamed as quickly as possible or have them move up at least one level in their English language proficiency. Meeting all the citywide and statewide standards along with the English as a Second Language standards are a continuous goal for our school. The balanced literacy approaches combined with ESL strategies are incorporated in all our ESL programs and help to meet the needs of our ELL students. Both approaches provide opportunities for dialogue, discussion, inquiry and cooperative learning. The following practices are an integral part of our ELL programs.

1. A print-rich classroom environment is essential for effective instruction and learning to take place for our ELL students.
 - Desks and tables are arranged so that students can work in cooperative groups.
 - Charts, word walls and rubrics are student friendly and include a lot of visuals.
 - Classroom libraries are attractive, well organized and include leveled books, genres, author studies and multicultural books that reflect authentic literature in fiction and non-fiction categories.
 - A rug area is available for shared learning experiences to take place.
 - Learning centers such as literacy centers in reading and writing and a listening center with books on tape are available.
 - Picture dictionaries, thesauruses, and magazines are available.
 - Manipulatives and other auditory and kinesthetic materials are used for literacy and content area instruction.
 - Charts are displayed that show what makes a good reader and writer.
 - Computers are used to develop their reading/writing skills through rotated use.
 - Student work is displayed on bulletin boards, shared and celebrated on an on-going basis.
2. Shared reading and writing experiences provide opportunities for our teachers to model good reading and writing strategies through the use of the Naturalistic Approach and the Language Experience Approach.
 - The read aloud with accountable talk, shared reading and guided reading provide opportunities for our ELL students to listen and interact in meaningful language experiences. Dialogue, storytelling and dramatization will be incorporated through partnerships.
 - Big books, mentor texts that are well illustrated, and have repeated words and predictable language patterns are used for reading and teaching the necessary strategies and skills to our ELL students.
 - Poetry, songs, nursery rhymes and chants are also used to develop their language and literacy skills in a fun and natural way.

- Through interactive writing, shared writing and guided writing the teacher uses students' personal experiences to develop writing pieces that reflect small moments, how-to pieces, all about books, memoirs, poetry and responses to literature
3. The use of whole group and small group direct teaching is pervasive in all our ELL programs and it is scaffolded by the following practices during our reading and writing workshop.
 - Activating students' prior knowledge on a given topic.
 - Explicit modeling of a strategy through mini lessons using well illustrated texts.
 - Introduction of new vocabulary through actions, gestures, pantomime and pictures. (Total Physical Response)
 - Use of graphic organizers, charts and rubrics to aid comprehension.
 - Use of repetition, restatements, periodic summaries and paraphrasing to clarify the learning experience.
 - Speaking in relatively short sentences and using key words in giving directions.
 - Employing role-play, drama and improvisation to enhance communication and understanding.
 - Creating task flow charts with illustrations to help monitor learning.
 - Allowing students to try out a modeled strategy through turn and talk sessions or think-pair share sessions.
 - Re-teaching and reinforcing strategies through strategy groups, guided reading/ writing groups, and individual conferences.
 - Sharing of student use of strategies through mid-workshop interruptions and share sessions.
 4. Our ELL students are given many daily opportunities to interact in meaningful and varied cooperative learning group situations. Through dialogue and discussion, students express their own thoughts, think out loud, listen to other viewpoints, share ideas and hear other problem-solving strategies, all of which help them to form a deeper understanding of the concepts they are studying and at the same time help to develop their language skills.
 - Good group management routines are implemented by modeling of roles and responsibilities of group members and through the use of monitoring charts.
 - Students participate in groups to solve math problems coming up with multiple solutions.
 - They work in partnerships to read and discuss books or share and/or edit writing pieces.
 - They work in pair-share or turn and talk sessions where they share ideas.
 - They analyze story elements through literature circles.
 - They work in groups working on exploratory math and science activities and projects.
 5. Through our researched-based Open Court Phonics Program, our ELL students are systematically taught print awareness, letter recognition, oral blending and segmentation, encoding/decoding and rhyming words. Phonics skills are taught through the use of thematically based big books that include emergent stories, poems, nursery rhymes and songs. The program also uses a multi-sensory approach, which is excellent for our ELL students. The use of puppets, cassettes, picture cards, songs, and movement activities using all body parts are an integral part of the program. Furthermore, this program is emphasized in grades K-1, where we find it has the strongest impact. Not only does it help students to improve their language skills, but it also benefits our struggling readers.
 6. Thematic units are developed and used through language arts such as author studies, genre studies and through science and social studies. Shared experiences, use of prior knowledge, concepts and vocabulary related to themes are explored and developed within each unit. Interdisciplinary skills and concepts are developed using rich multi-cultural literature providing a

meaningful context for learning. Through thematic instruction our ELL students are able to see patterns and make connections that relate to their every day lives.

7. As a school of literacy and technology, we have created an infrastructure in our technology program that enhances all our programs, while it supports and scaffolds all the skills of our ELL students. Our computer teacher works with our ELL classes through a six week cycle developing their reading and writing skills through content area thematic projects. Our ELL students develop their skills by using a variety of software programs that include interactive activities, such as games, stories, vocabulary, phonemic awareness, comprehension skills and content area activities. They are trained to use Microsoft Word in writing small moment stories, non-narrative selections, poetry, and research reports. They are taught how and are given the opportunity to use the internet, Promethean Board, develop slides for power point presentations and participate in teleconferencing. All these activities help to develop the students' language proficiency as well as their academic skills. Many of these activities result in meaningful projects and or products that are displayed on bulletin boards, technology fairs and school-related newsletters. Celebration of student work, of course, helps to boost the self-esteem of our ELL students.
 8. The use of specific informal assessments that are systematically used within the teaching/learning process have helped to drive instruction and learning for our ELL students and help to improve their skills.
 - Our teachers do periodic reading running records to identify reading levels and match ELL students to “just right books”.
 - Through daily reading and writing conferences teachers continually assess the needs of ELL students and plan small group instruction in meeting their needs. Teachers have created group charts to help them plan and assess their students.
 - Reading and writing rubrics are developed on the grade, written on charts and used by students and teachers to monitor student work.
 - The use of “kid watching” and the use of conference notes help teachers to see patterns in learning and needs and to plan accordingly.
 - Giving children opportunities to do peer editing help children to share their ideas and skills as they support and assess one another.
 - Our ELL teachers collaborate with other teachers on the grade as well as with each other in planning units of study, in pacing and modifying lessons to meet the needs of our ELL students.
 9. Our ESL teachers provide opportunities for modeling and sharing instructional strategies in the balanced literacy components. Our literacy coach and teachers collaborate in providing explicit models and strategies to make the teaching/learning process more effective for our teachers and our ELL students.
 10. We also provide opportunities for our ELL students to improve their language and literacy skills through creative activities through the Arts. Children's self-confidence and morale are improved through their participation in these activities as well.
 - Our fourth and fifth graders sing in a chorus sponsored by the Bronx Council of the Arts and have special performances throughout the year.
 - Our First and Second Grade students have worked with artists in residence to learn to dance, cook, fine arts and music presentations.
 - Students receive music once a week, which they sing in order to support language acquisition skills.
 - Our students participate in Visual Thinking Strategies (VTS) program. This program enhances verbal communication skills, thinking skills and reasoning skills.
-

- Our students participate in a choral music program at least once a week. Our students work with artist in residence on different topics such as dance, cooking, fine art etc. Students also participate in our after school activities such as HANAC, a community based organization. Children participate in doing homework, arts and crafts, Physical Education and dance. Many of our students also participate in Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts.

We are confident that these instructional strategies provide a standards-based learning environment that supports our ELL students in their achievement as well as in providing them with a well-rounded education.

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

Our school only offers freestanding ESL model. We currently have self-contained classes in grades K-3. Those classes have programmed specific ESL and ELA instruction time into their week. ELA instruction is 50 minutes per day for all levels (total 250 minutes per week) and ESL instruction is 75 minutes per day for the Beginning and Intermediate students and 45 minutes per day for Advanced levels. In grades 4,5 and self-contained special education classes, we have a push-in and pull-out models. The ESL teachers are made aware of the amount of required ESL instructional time needed for each student depending on their level.

Question 3: Describe how the content areas are delivered in each program model? Please specify language and the instructional approaches and methods used to make content comprehensible to enrich language development.

We only offer a freestanding ESL model. In this model the instructional approaches that we use to teach the content areas to our ELL students are effective and are researched-based. Research shows that language learning and literacy learning are interrelated. They are both developmental, cognitive processes that promote the acquisition of the four skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. Before planning the learning experiences for ELL's, our teachers also use formal and informal assessments to learn their level of English language proficiency and their current levels of knowledge and skills in literacy and the content areas.

The use of whole group and small group direct teaching is pervasive in all our ELL programs and it is scaffolded by the following practices during content area instruction:

- Activating students' prior knowledge on a given topic.
- Explicit modeling of a strategy through mini lessons using well illustrated texts.
- Introduction of new vocabulary through actions, gestures, pantomime and pictures. (Total Physical Response)
- Using prefixes, suffixes, and root words to figure out meaning of new vocabulary words.
- Interactive word wall with pictures, definitions and examples for each word.
- Use of graphic organizers, charts and rubrics to aid comprehension.
- Use of repetition, restatements, periodic summaries and paraphrasing to clarify the learning experience.
- Speaking in relatively short sentences and using key words in giving directions.
- Creating task flow charts with illustrations to help monitor learning.
- Allowing students to try out a modeled strategy through turn and talk sessions or think-pair share sessions.
- Re-teaching and reinforcing strategies through strategy groups.
- Sharing of student use of strategies through mid-workshop interruptions and share sessions.

Question 4: How do you differentiate instruction for ELL subgroups?

a. Our Plan for SIFE Students

We currently have 1SIFE student at the present time

- Our strong, researched-based Open Court Phonics program is very successful in teaching students the phonemic principles of the English language through themes, big books, large picture letter cards, games, songs and nursery rhymes using a multi-sensory approach.
- Individual and small group instruction through our AIS staff will provide the students with the additional support to fill in the gaps in their education using such supplementary programs as the Wilson Method, Foundations, Headsprouts and rich just-right leveled multi-cultural classroom libraries.
- Our Reading Street program has an ELL component that supports the learning the style of our SIFE student.

b. Our plan for ELL's who have been in our school less than three years. (newcomers) Students who may fall into this category will be provided with all the structures that I have described above, the steps described below and all the strategies described under the Language Allocation Strategies section.

- These students based on their language proficiency level will receive the appropriate number of ESL periods as described under our ELL programs.
- Phonics and word study will be emphasized through read alouds using big books with lots of rhyming words.
- Differentiated instruction through small group strategy groups and guided reading groups will focus on their reading and writing skills.
- Computer software programs and internet subscriptions will be used to incorporate reading strategies and decoding to help students become more proficient readers as well as develop their language skills. (e.g. Reader Rabbit, Arthur, Headsprout, RAZ-Kids, etc.)
- These students will participate in our after school Title III program where they will get additional support in reading, writing and math.

c. Our plan for ELL's who have been in the country for more than 6 years

We presently do not have any students in this category. But if we do in the future, one of our concerns would be to look at all the assessments of such children to see why they have not tested out of ESL. If it is not language but some other learning needs that the students may have, we would try to address them through thorough evaluations, which would include all our support staff. These may include our school-based support team, our guidance counselor, our SETSS personnel as well as the ESL teachers and administration.

Based on these decisions, our LAP committee will develop individual student plans to meet the individual needs of these children as they relate to the different curriculum areas.

d. Our plan for ELL's identified as having special needs.

The Special Education component of our school consists of three self-contained classrooms which have 15 ELL students, a Kindergarten ICT class that has 2 special needs ELL students, a Third Grade ICT class that has 2 and a Fourth Grade ICT class that has 4 special needs ELL students. The total number of special needs ELL students is 23. Our plan for these students includes the following:

- They get 4-8 periods of ESL by a licensed ESL teacher a week.

- We mainstream them as much as possible in the different subject areas. Our first grade and fifth grade special needs students are pulled out and mainstreamed with other General Education students for at least one period each day.
- Differentiated instruction is incorporated in all subject areas based on their levels and needs.
- Use of computer technology to help these students learn through multi-sensory activities.
- Use of the Open Court Phonics, Wilson, Reading Street and Treasure Chest program. The Wilson method helps children to develop their decoding skills and language development.
- Participation in the after school Title III ESL program provides additional support for them in reading and math.
- Students will also receive small group instruction and AIS intervention services.

Question 5: Describe your targeted intervention programs for ELLs in ELA, math and other content areas. Please list the range of intervention services offered in your school for the above areas as well as the languages in which they are offered.

Resources and Support for our intervention programs (offered in English only)

- Push-in or pull-out reading and ELL teacher small group support for ELL students for reading, writing, math, science and social studies
- SETTS teacher pull-out group reading and math
- After school ESL program for grades 1-5 using Treasure Chest ELL program
- Leveled classroom libraries (fiction and non-fiction), Author Studies and Trade Books
- Guided Reading materials
- Open Court Phonics Program, the Wilson Method, Explode the Code, Foundations, Primary Phonics, and websites such as: Starfall.com, Headsprout.com and RazKids.com
- Books on tape, Values Curriculum (supports social development) created and developed by a group of our teachers and our literacy coach.
- Everyday Mathematics as our main program and The Math in Minutes program is used for our small AIS groups.
- Social Studies texts such as Making a Difference, Communities Around the World, Explore New York along with non-fiction leveled classroom libraries by Rosen and National Geographic.
- Classroom computers, mobile laptops, software, internet access, Promethean Boards and digital media
- ESL materials to support language development are the American Start with English, Amazing English and Oxford English Children's Dictionaries series

Question 6: Describe your plan for continuing transitional support for ELL's reaching proficiency on the NYSESLAT

For these students we provide intense AIS academic intervention services in reading and math through individual and small group instruction for the following year and for each year after that, as it is necessary based on formal and informal assessments. We also have these students participate in our after school Title I program as long as it's needed to help strengthen their skills and strategies.

Question 9: How are ELL's afforded equal access to all school programs? Describe after school and supplemental services offered to ELL's in your building.

All after school programs are offered to all students in the school (General Ed, ELL's and Special Ed). Our school offers the following after school programs: chess club for grades 3-5, tennis club grades 2-5, instrumental music club grade 2 and chorus club grades 3-5 and ESL classes grades 1-5.

Question 10: What instructional materials, including technology, are used to support ELLs? See question 1 and question 5.

Question 11. How is native language support delivered in each program model?

Currently we only offer an English only self-contained program model and a pull-out/push-in program model. In order for students to succeed in the acquisition of any language, we must ensure that there is transference of skills from their native language to English. Prior to beginning any new unit of study, our ESL teachers build background knowledge. With this knowledge we are able to scaffold learning and introduce them to hands-on real life experiences. One example of using native language skills is since the majority of our students are of Hispanic background, we are able to use their native language as a tool for instruction. Academically we show them the similarities of words in Spanish and English. Cognates are words that have similar pronunciations and spellings in both languages, and frequently have the same meaning (i.e. musica/music, ciencia/science, papel/paper). We take neighborhood walks and talk about the ethnic culture that surrounds us.

In addition, there is a Language Transfer section included every week in the Treasure Chest reading program to help teachers become more aware of how to include native language skills into their teaching.

Question 12: Do required services support, and resources correspond to ELL's ages and grade levels? YES

Question 13: Include a description of activities in your school to assist newly enrolled students before the beginning of the school year.

We currently do not offer any activities before the beginning of the school year, but if any new ELL students are enrolled, we have a beginners ELL group. This group meets two-three times a week. Some of the activities include, walk through the building (identify and locate nurse's office, cafeteria, auditorium, gymnasium, main office, etc.) walk through the community (identify community buildings such as fire house, library, food stores, etc.)/ The students also practice conversational techniques through a variety of mock scenarios.

F. Professional Development and Support for School Staff

Question 1: Describe the professional development plan for all ELL personnel at the school.

- ELL teachers will meet with General Education teachers during grade meetings to plan units of study in reading and math but ELL teachers will differentiate instruction to meet the needs of their students.
- ELL teachers will be trained in using math manipulatives and games by our math coach to make math instruction more interesting and enjoyable for their students.
- VTS will train all teachers.
- LeAp -A hands-on, arts-based approach utilizes visual arts, music, dance, and theater, to improve students' test scores across the board.
 - 40 one-hour, in-classroom training sessions using hands-on and arts-based active instructional methodologies to teach your current curriculum. LeAp teaching artists will plan with teachers from each school at the NYU sessions described below. The teaching artist will devise lesson plans using LeAp strategies, but the content will be derived from the teachers' individual curriculum needs. During LeAp classes, participating teachers will assist their LeAp teaching artists to create a collaborative environment.
 - 7 days of professional development for your participating teachers and literacy coaches at New York University

- K-2 trains teachers to use the arts and hands-on strategies to teach literacy, e.g. creating clay letters to promote alphabet letter recognition and phonemic awareness; singing to improve decoding skills; miming to build vocabulary; illustrating silly sentences to reinforce sight words, etc.
- 3-5 trains teachers to use arts and hands-on strategies to teach literacy, e.g. playing the hot seat game to build problem solving skills; singing to improve decoding skills and concepts of English grammar; miming to build vocabulary; dancing to explain and reinforce correct sentence structure, etc.
- The CookShop nutrition education program is one of the Food Bank's initiatives to address food poverty in our city. Using a 20-week classroom based, teacher-led curriculum, CookShop Classroom teaches students the value of health, nutrition, cooking and eating fruits, vegetables, and whole grains while bringing urban children closer to the realities of our food production system.
- LSO will provide professional development for all teachers in ELL.
- Publishers of Treasure Chest will provide ESL PD.
- They will also get technology training so that they can incorporate more computer instruction into all curriculum areas.
-

Some areas that we will be focusing through our workshops/activities during the school year will be:

- Reading Street Program
- Treasure Chest
- Bank Street
- Use of Promethean Boards for lessons and assessing student knowledge
- Assessing Student's Work
- Goal Setting for staff and students
- How shared reading, interactive writing, read aloud with accountable talk, phonics and word study can support literacy and the content areas
- How to modify and differentiate instruction within the balanced literacy components so as to better meet the needs of our at risk students, our ELL students and our Special Education students
- Grade planning of units of study in literacy and the content areas
- How to analyze the results of formal and informal assessments to drive instruction
- How to incorporate more effective small group instruction using strategy groups and guided reading/writing groups
- The components of the Everyday Mathematics program with an emphasis on the morning routines, games, manipulatives, problem solving steps and special emphasis on developing writing in Math using math journals.
- Sharing of effective ESL strategies among ESL teachers and monolingual teachers in literacy and the content areas
- How to use technology to support literacy and content area instruction
- Effective classroom management strategies that will support the balanced literacy components

Question 2. What support do you provide staff to assist ELL's as they transition from elementary school to middle school?

- Inter-departmentalized reading and ESL instruction
- Technological skills that offer to translate work into home language
- Grade level support (Higher Order Thinking Skills)
- Curriculum taught is on grade level in all subject areas but delivery and instruction is differentiated
- Independent research projects are assigned to students

- Juicy sentences are explicitly taught to increase vocabulary

Question 3: Describe the minimum 7.5 hours of ELL training for all staff, other than those who hold ESL and bilingual licenses.

Through the above listed professional development activities our entire staff will have participated in at least 7.5 hours of ELL professional development. New this year, we have begun to have “lunch and learns” to all staff from various members of our teaching community. Topics include but are not limited to:

- Technology – Promethean Boards, websites such as Scholastic.com, Brainpopesl.com
- Math Games
- ELL Strategies for content areas from Christian Celic author of book *English Language Learners Day by Day, K-6*

Since the majority of our student population is ESL, the professional development activities include ESL teaching strategies for all curriculum areas.

G. Parental Involvement

Question 1: Describe the parent involvement in your school, including parents of ELLs.

PS 212 has a Parent Teacher Association (PTA) that is interested in addressing all the needs of our parent community. All parents are automatic members and are encouraged to partake in all fundraising efforts, workshops, learning opportunities and school activities such as Heritage Night, Pajama Day, Pumpkin Day, etc. The Parent Coordinator, Counselors and Administration work together in determining the needs of children and parents including those of ELLs. Our school community provides the following workshops:

- Art Workshop for parents and children before each holiday
- Meet the Teacher Night
- Curriculum Night
- Science Night
- Testing Night

In addition, our Parent Coordinator, assists parents with HLIS forms during registration. She works closely with AP during Orientation ESL Meetings helping parents fill out the Parent Survey and Program Selection Form. She schedules meetings with ELL parents to show the Orientation Video for Parents of Newly Enrolled English Language Learners.

All workshops, brochures, pamphlets, videos, forms and documentation are available in English/Spanish. Other languages are made available upon request.

Question 2: Does the school partner with other agencies or Community Based Organizations to provide workshops or services to ELL parents?

Our school offers adult ESL classes, two days a week taught by our own teacher. In addition, an outside agency, Office of Adult Education, with Larry and Starr, also provide adult ESL classes here at PS 212. This is a wonderful program that not only involves our P.S. 212Q parents but people who live in our Jackson Heights Community.

In addition to the partnerships listed below, weekly Parent Involvement Art, Health, Education Workshops are held weekly in English/Spanish.

- Alley Pond Environmental Center
- American Cancer Society
- American Diabetes Association
- American Heart Association
- City Harvest – Book Collection, Food Collection
- Dr. Krieger, IES Medical
- Dr. Sabogal, NYHQ
- Dt. Tardeo, Privilege Care
- Dr. Tsourounnkis, Queens Chiropractic
- Fidelis care
- Food Bank of NYC – Cookshop for Adults
- Healthfirst
- Ident-a-Kid
- Jackson Heights Beautification Group
- Metlife
- Neighborhood Health Providers
- New York Hospital of Queens
- NYC Department of Health – Healthy Homes and Lead Poisoning
- NY FDNY – CPR
- Smile Mobile Dentists
- Somos-Padres Parent Outreach
- St. Mary's Clothes Collection
- The NYC Immigration Coalition
- Time Warner Cable – Cybersafety
- Urban Park Rangers

Question 3: How do you evaluate the needs of parents?

Our school community interacts a lot with parents and knows of prevalent issues throughout the school. In response, we often base the need for certain workshops on the issues that our students/parents are confronting. During workshops there is always a question and answer session to assess if any further action is required. In addition, we conduct parent surveys throughout the year, in conjunction with the DOE Parent Survey in the Spring.

Question 4: How do your parental involvement activities address the needs of the parents?

Many parents express a variety of concerns when they meet with any of the members of our school community. During meetings we discuss them and make every effort to address as many of those issues as possible. They may have a need for information on a process such as middle school articulation, ESL, Adult Education, Mental Health Services, tutoring for their child, Enrichment Programs, etc. We often provide referrals or support the parents needs.

The Parent Coordinator gears all activities for maximum for parent involvement. She addresses all issues from health, academics, testing, food stamps, free health care, tutors, childcare, Special Education, ARIS, ACUITY, ACCESS NY, Learning Disorders, free glasses, uniforms, warm clothes, nutrition, after school programs etc. Ultimately, she tries to furnish the parents with knowledge necessary to navigate their way through a problem or crisis regardless of the language they speak at home.

IV. Assessment Analysis

A: Assessment Analysis

Based on these assessments, we have identified the following ELL students in each grade by their proficiency level:

Number of ELL's by Grade and English Proficiency Level

Grade	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Total
K	12	6	23	41
1	9	7	13	29
2	2	4	15	21
3	1	14	18	33
4	4	6	16	26
5	4	11	17	32
Totals	32	48	102	182

School Total = 182 ELL's

Analysis of Student Performance on the NYSESLAT from 2007-2009

Reading and Writing Results for Grades K-5

R & W All students	# Tested	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Proficient
2009	205	6%	20%	38%	36%
2008	177	10%	30%	42%	18%

K-1 R & W	# Tested	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Proficient
2009	86	6.0%	20.0%	38.0%	36.0%
2008	80	8.0%	30.0%	36.0%	26.0%
2007	82	4.0%	15.0%	34.0%	48.0%
2-4 R & W	# Tested	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Proficient
2009	99	6.0%	27.0%	47.0%	19.0%
2008	77	8.0%	32.0%	49.0%	10.0%
2007	78	10.0%	24.0%	27.0%	38.0%
05 R & W	# Tested	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Proficient
2009	20	5.0%	30.0%	45.0%	20.0%
2008	20	25.0%	20.0%	40.0%	15.0%
2007	15	13.0%	40.0%	27.0%	20.0%

Listening and Speaking Results for Grades K-5

L&S All Students	# Tested	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Proficient
2009	205	1%	7%	24%	68%
2008	177	3%	6%	44	47%

K-1 L & S	# Tested	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Proficient
2009	86	0.0%	2.0%	14.0%	84.0%
2008	80	1.0%	8.0%	51.0%	40.0%
2007	82	0.0%	7.0%	37.0%	56.0%
2-4 L & S	# Tested	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Proficient
2009	99	1.0%	9.0%	29.0%	61.0%

2008	77	3.0%	3.0%	38.0%	57.0%
2007	78	3.0%	5.0%	45.0%	47.0%
5 L & S					
	# Tested	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Proficient
2009	20	5.0%	20.0%	40.0%	35.0%
2008	20	10.0%	10.0%	40.0%	40.0%
2007	15	0.0%	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%

Summary of Data Analysis/Findings for ELL Student Performance on the NYSESLAT: Analysis of ELL student achievement of the 2009 NYSESLAT shows that overall our students are progressing in an upward fashion. On the R/W portion of the exam, our percentage of students achieving Proficient doubled to 36% in one year. All the other levels decreased a total of 18%. On the L/S portion of the exam, again our students showed great gains. There was a 21% increase in the amount of students achieving the Proficient level on the NYSESLAT. Again we see a positive decrease in the amount of students on the B, I, and A levels totaling 21%.

Our K-1 students showed a considerable increase in their performance on the 2009 NYSESLAT in all areas tested. The most significant being the Listening/Speaking (L/S) portion of the test. Students increased by 44% to the Proficient level and a decrease in all the other levels for L/S. On the Reading/Writing (R/W) portion of the test, there was a 12% decrease in the Beginner and Intermediate levels, while there was a 12% increase on the Advanced and Proficient levels. Hence, our students' performance levels are showing a steady improvement over the past 3 years. The data reveals that our students performed better on the 2009 NYSESLAT L/S portion and our percentages surpass those of the 2007 NYSESLAT.

Our 2-4 students showed a small increase in their performance on the 2009 NYSESLAT results. Both R/W and L/S portions of the test show an increase on the Proficient Levels. Surprisingly, on the R/W portion of the test, there was a combined decreased of 9% in the B, I, and A levels, while there was a 9% increased in the Proficient levels. We can safely say that our students are showing steady improvement in R/W. On the L/S portion of the test, there were mixed results. While the Proficient levels did increase slightly 4%, our Intermediate group also increased by 6%. Our Advanced and Beginning groups decreased by a total of 11%, telling us that additional support must be given to those groups of students.

Our grade 5 students showed a steady progress. In the R/W portion of the test, they showed some gains in the Intermediate, Advanced and Proficient levels. Although, they did show a significant decrease in the Beginning level of 20%. Hence, telling us that they have moved in an upward fashion. On the other hand our students did not show improvement on the L/S portion of the test. Although our Beginning levels decreased by 5% our Intermediate levels increased by 10% and our Proficient students decreased by 5%, telling us that we need to give additional support to our students on the L/S portion of the test.

Summary of Data Analysis/Findings for ELL Student Performance on the ELA:

In grades K-2 we use the TCRWP assessment to find the reading levels of the students. We have used this information to help us set benchmarks for these students to meet. These benchmarks may not be "on grade level" but are adjusted to meet the needs of the students that

are just acquiring the English language. We assess the students' reading levels three times a year (Fall, Winter and Spring). We have created after-school programs and small group instruction during the A.I.S. morning to assist these students acquiring the English language. These groups are based on their reading levels and are adjusted accordingly.

Results for **Grade 3 English Language Learners** indicate the percentage of students scoring at a Level 1 decreased from 35% to 13.0%, a decrease of 22.0%. The percent of students scoring at a Level 2 decreased from 55% to 27.0% a decrease of 28.0%. The percentage of students scoring at a Level 3 increased from 10% to 60.0%, an increase of 50.0%. An analysis of this three-year trend in ELA English Language Learners student performance indicates that the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 and Level 2 decreased and the percentage of students scoring at a level 3 increased thus indicating noteworthy gains. This positive trend in student achievement will be maintained by continuing activities and programs that strengthen the skills of students scoring on Level 3.

Results for **Grade 4 English Language Learners** indicate the percentage of students scoring at a Level 1 decreased from 28% to 22%, a decrease of 6.0%. The percent of students scoring at a Level 2 increased from 52% to 56.0% an increase of 4.0%. The percentage of students scoring at a Level 3 increased from 20% to 22.0%, an increase of 2.0%. An analysis of this three-year trend in ELA English Language Learners student performance indicates that the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 decreased and the percentage of students scoring at a level 2 and 3 increased thus indicating a positive trend. We have addressed the lack of level 4's in this population by small group instruction, differentiation of instruction, targeting specific areas of need as indicated by Acuity, unit tests and informal assessments.

Results for **Grade 5 English Language Learners** indicate the percentage of students scoring at a Level 1 decrease from 22.2% to 0%, a decrease of 22.2%. The percent of students scoring at a Level 2 increased from 55.6% to 67.0% an increase of 11.4%. The percentage of students scoring at a Level 3 increased from 22.2% to 33.0%, an increase of 10.8%. An analysis of this three-year trend in ELA English Language Learners student performance indicates that the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 decreased and the percentage of students scoring at a level 2 and 3 increased thus indicating noteworthy gains. This positive trend in student achievement will be maintained by continuing activities and programs that strengthen the skills of students scoring on Level 3.

The above data indicated the following implications for instruction so that we may develop and strengthen the reading and writing strategies for our ELL students and to continue to improve their listening and speaking skills:

Implications for ELL Instruction in Reading and Writing

Provide differentiated instruction through Treasure Chest; an ESL program geared to all levels and through just right leveled classroom libraries.

- We will continue to implement the reading program for our English Language Learners, Treasure Chest. Scaffolded lessons will provide instruction and application for specific language-acquisition strategies and reading skills. Differentiated instruction is imbedded into the program, as there are three levels, based upon NYSESLAT scores and teacher assessment.
 - Increase instruction through small strategy and guided reading groups based on similar needs and proficiency levels.
 - In order to promote language development oral language, vocabulary, comprehension, writing are part of the daily lessons.
 - Continue intense instruction in phonemic awareness through our researched-based Open Court Phonics Program.
 - Provide vocabulary development through word work using Words Their Way word sorts, word walls and word games.
-

- Increase opportunities for Read Alouds with accountable talk and interactive read alouds to develop reading strategies and language development.
- Books on tape will also be made available in listening centers to reinforce reading.
- Explicit modeling of writing strategies through the Writing workshop, interactive writing and small guided writing groups.
- Progress will be measured through informal assessments, monitoring students' proficiency.
- Formal weekly assessments will track language structure, vocabulary, phonics and comprehension.
- Reading strategies and skills are formally assessed via the unit tests woven into Treasure Chest.
- ELL's will use computer software to help strengthen their reading and writing skills through modeling and imitation.
- ESL teachers will use data from informal and formal assessments and conference notes to align units of study and to meet the needs of students.
- Increase participation of ELL students in receiving individual and small group instruction from AIS Title I push-in /pull-out staff in reading and writing using the Wilson Method and Foundations Phonics program.
- Increase participation of ELL students in our after school Title III program in which they will receive additional support in reading and writing.

Our periodic and interim assessments have been extremely helpful in driving instruction. We have opted out of taking the ELL Periodic Assessments. The students do take the general education periodic assessments. Through these tests we are able to differentiate instruction and flexibly group our students. Teachers can give ELLs assignments online that address specific needs of each student individually. These assignments can be done in school or at home. The teacher is given the results of the assignments and can continue assigning that same skill or address another area in need of support. Our school leadership team and Inquiry Team periodically review the results of the assessments and make decisions such as adding new students to extended day, moving students to different groups, providing additional instruction in a low performing content area, or moving students to higher performing groups.

Summary of Data Analysis/Findings for ELL Student Performance on Math Assessment: The results of our content area assessments also impact on the instruction of our ELL students. Math data based on the 2008-2009 New York State Math test indicates that 20 of our 25 third grade ELL students or 80% tested in the Level 3 and 4 categories combined and 4 students or 17% scored in the Level 2 category. Twenty out of our 30 fourth grade ELL students or 80% scored in the Level 3 and 4 category while 7 of the students or 23% scored in the Level 2 category. The ELL students' scoring in the Level 3 and 4 categories was significant and more support is still needed. We will continue to provide a strong Math program for our ELL's, which is evident through the following steps that we will take:

Implications for ELL Instruction in Math

- Incorporating differentiated instruction for ELL's through the Everyday Mathematics Program.
- Building of math skills through the use of manipulatives and games.
- Emphasizing of problem-solving strategies through continued modeling and cooperative learning groups.
- Continued incorporation of the Math Message and the Everyday math routines, which help to develop math skills and language.
- Increasing the use of computer software to develop and reinforce math skills.
- Increased use of the math resources made available on the Performance Series website to create assignments and quizzes based on the needs of ELL students.
- Using more of math literature to teach math skills in an interesting and meaningful context.

- Development and use of math rubrics by teachers to assess student work and realign instruction.
- Development of math vocabulary through the math word wall and through math related accountable talk.
- Increasing writing relating to Math so that children can write to explain the steps they took in solving a problem, how they feel about or how well they understand math concepts and skills.
- Increased ELL participation in individual and small group Math instruction by our AIS Title I staff.

Our periodic and interim assessments have been extremely helpful in driving instruction. We have opted out of taking the ELL Periodic Assessments. The students do take the general education periodic assessments. Through these tests we are able to differentiate instruction and flexibly group our students. Teachers can give ELLs assignments online that address specific needs of each student individually. These assignments can be done in school or at home. The teacher is given the results of the assignments and can continue assigning that same skill or address another area in need of support. Our school leadership team and Inquiry Team periodically review the results of the assessments and make decisions such as adding new students to extended day, moving students to different groups, providing additional instruction in a low performing content area, or moving students to higher performing groups.

Summary of Data Analysis/Findings for ELL Student Performance on Science and Social Studies Assessment: Out of the 29 ELL fourth grade students who took the Spring 2009 New York State Science assessment, 6 students or 21% scored in the level 4 category, an increase of 9% from the previous year. 10 students or 34% scored in the level 3 category, (a decrease of 7% from last year – these students moved to a level 4 hence the 10% increase in level 4); 8 students or 28% scored in the Level 2 category (no change from last year) and 5 students or 17% scored in the Level 1 category (very slight change from 2008). Out of the 15 ELL fifth grade students who took the 2008 New York State Social Studies assessment only 5 students or 33% scored at the level 3 category, 2 students or 13% scored in the Level 2 category and 8 students or 53% percent scored in the Level 1 category. It is evident that our students need continued support in these two areas especially in Social Studies. Based on these results, our school has taken the following steps in helping our ELL students to improve in these two content areas:

Implications for ELL Instruction in Science and Social Studies

- Implementation of a Social Studies cluster position through which all of our third, fourth and fifth grade ESL students are serviced weekly in addition to their regular Social Studies instruction by their classroom teacher.
- Continuation of our Science cluster teacher who also services our third, fourth and fifth grade ESL students. In addition, we have added a K-2 science cluster to support and prepare our early childhood ELL students.
- Increased use of such Social Studies materials as maps, globes, atlases, and rich, non-fiction leveled classroom libraries will help to support and enrich the learning of our ELL students.
- More hands on experimentation, observation, and videos to reinforce the scientific concepts.
- Computer software will be used to reinforce student knowledge of scientific concepts and social studies skills while promoting literacy in both these areas.
- Science themes will be emphasized through live animal investigations such as butterflies, beetles, earthworms, snails and crickets using the scientific method.
- Increased ELL participation in field trips, such as to the Hall of Science, in the Crazy Contraption contest and Star Lab, the portable planetarium will provide realistic experiences for our ELL students.
- Intense instruction using social studies non-fiction literature and increased use of primary sources will better prepare our students in answering document-based questions for the Social Studies assessment.

- Implementation of a new reading series Reading Street in grades third, fourth and fifth grade, which composes primarily of nonfiction text (60%) with Social Studies and Science based themes.

In order for students to succeed in the acquisition of any language, we must ensure that there is a transference of skills from their native language to English. Prior to beginning any new unit of study, our ESL teachers build background knowledge. With this knowledge we are able to scaffold learning and introduce them to hands-on real life experiences. One example of using native language skills is since the majority of our students are of Hispanic background, we are able to use their native language as a tool for instruction. Academically we show them the similarities of words in Spanish and English. Cognates are words that have similar pronunciations and spellings in both languages, and frequently have the same meaning (i.e. musica/music, ciencia/science, papel/paper). We take neighborhood walks and talk about the ethnic culture that surrounds us.

Our periodic and interim assessments have been extremely helpful in driving instruction. We have opted out of taking the ELL Periodic Assessments. The students do take the general education periodic assessments. Through these tests we are able to differentiate instruction and flexibly group our students. Teachers can give ELLs assignments online that address specific needs of each student individually. These assignments can be done in school or at home. The teacher is given the results of the assignments and can continue assigning that same skill or address another area in need of support. Our school leadership team and Inquiry Team periodically review the results of the assessments and make decisions such as adding new students to extended day, moving students to different groups, providing additional instruction in a low performing content area, or moving students to higher performing groups.

In addition, there is a Language Transfer section included every week in the Treasure Chest reading program to help teachers become more aware of how to include native language skills into their teaching.

Part V: LAP Team Assurances

Name	Title	Signature (original signatures on file in school)	Date
Carin Ellis	Principal	<i>Carin Ellis</i>	01/19/2010
Dr. Melissa Haidary	Assistant Principal	<i>Dr. Melissa Haidary</i>	01/19/2010
Olga Flores	Parent Coordinator	<i>Olga Flores</i>	01/19/2010
Irene Zajac	ESL Teacher	<i>Irene Zajac</i>	01/19/2010
Jane Buenaventura	Parent	<i>Jane Buenaventura</i>	01/19/2010
Angela Pollina	AIS Reading 1-5	<i>Angela Pollina</i>	01/19/2010
Maria Bermudez	Kindergarten ESL	<i>Maria Bermudez</i>	01/19/2010
Danielle Mahoney	Coach	<i>Danielle Mahoney</i>	01/19/2010
Debbie Levy	Coach	<i>Debbie Levy</i>	01/19/2010
Martha Alsina	Guidance Counselor	<i>Martha Alsina</i>	01/19/2010
Nancy DiMaggio	Network Leader	<i>Nancy DiMaggio</i>	01/19/2010

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 75

Non-LEP 0

Number of Teachers 13

Other Staff (Specify) 1

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.

The PS 212 Title III program will provide our English Language Learners with supplementary instruction through an Extended Day Program. The program will service our ELL students in grades 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 who score at the different proficiency levels on the LAB-R and the NYSESLAT. The extended day program will take place twice a week every Tuesday and Thursday. It will consist of 43 sessions of five classes of 15 students in each class in grades 1,2,3,4 and 5 from November 2009 to the end of May 2010. The total number of ELL students to be served will be 75. The hours of the program will be from 3:00 to 4:30. On Tuesdays the focus will be on literacy and on Thursday it will be on Math. Certified ESL teachers will provide instruction aligned with the

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.

For 2009-2010 our CEP and our Language Allocation Policy identifies high quality instruction for all staff including our ESL teachers. The focus is on Balanced Literacy, Balanced Math and content areas with an emphasis on ESL methodology. Our teachers will be trained to use various strategies to meet the needs of ELL students and to better prepare them for all state wide assessments. Topics will be devoted to literacy and content area learning with a focus on ESL strategies. Our goal is to build academic language by enhancing our science and social studies curriculum.

In literacy the following workshops will be held:

- Developing comprehension skills within the balanced literacy components
- Using Shared Reading and Word Study to support the ELL students
- Use of Strategy and Guided

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

-

School: PS 212

BEDS Code: 34-30-00-01-0212

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)	\$3765.60	5 teachers for 45 sessions for 1.5 hours- after school ESL classes 1 supervisor for 45 sessions for 1.5 hours

- Per session - Per diem		1 teacher for 10 parent workshops for 2 hours 1 teacher for 40 sessions for 1.5 hours for after school ESL parent class 5 teachers for 7 workshops for 1.5 hours 1 teacher (conducts workshop) for 7 workshops for 1.5 hours
Purchased services - High quality staff and curriculum development contracts	\$ 0	NA
Supplies and materials - Must be supplemental. - Additional curricula, instructional materials. - Must be clearly listed.	\$1882.80	Ttreasure Chest Workbooks
Educational Software (Object Code 199)	\$0	NA
Travel	\$0	NA
Other	\$627.60	Parent Activities
TOTAL	\$6,276.00	

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

Requirement under Chancellor's Regulations – for all schools

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

Part A: Needs Assessment Findings

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

The HLIS form was used to identify families where a language other than English is used in the home. 77% of the students are Hispanic, 14% are Bengali, Urdu, Korean and other Asian language speakers. The African American population is 1.5% and the white population is 7.5%. The school has a large population of parents from different ethnic backgrounds who need to be kept informed about our school programs, events and our regional events.

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.

Our school is located in the

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.

We plan to use funds to provide translation of items related to how parents can help their children improve the students' level of academic achievement. Additionally we will include information that will keep parents informed of school policies and activities. These steps will enable parents to understand our school and how to work with us to be part of their children's academic lives. We are fortunate that we have many staff member who are Hispanic and Asian Our staff assists with the written translations that need to go out on a weekly and monthly basis. Notifications for special curriculum related parent meetings, PTA meetings and monthly Principal newsletters are a few of the communications that need translating.

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.

Similarly, the oral interpretations are and will continue to be done by our in-house staff. We have our parent coordinator who speaks Spanish fluently and is available on a daily basis for our parents for any concern or need that they have. Our teachers, guidance counselors, secretaries, administrators, paraprofessionals and school aides assist us with oral translations daily. Staff translates at special meetings, workshops and conferences. For example, when parent meetings are held in September for decisions on parent program choice, three translations are present - Spanish, Urdu, Bengali languages as well as films in these languages. Our translators help to make our school more accessible to parents and help to make them feel more welcome. We want to make sure that all parents hear the same information and have an opportunity to voice their questions and concerns.

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>.

Our school will fulfill Section VII of Chancellor's Regulation A-663 regarding parental notification requirements for translation and interpretation services by the following: For written communications throughout the year we will budget money through Title I funds to have in-staff personnel translate specific letters to parents informing them of important information relating to their children's academic, social, health and safety needs. Based on the HLIS forms and the ATS student profile records we will identify the language status of each student. We will record the language on the student's emergency card so that we can provide an interpreter when we need to communicate with the parents. Daily our parent coordinator, our teachers, paraprofessionals, guidance counselors, administrators and school aides will assist us with translation services at conferences, meetings, workshops and any other school functions. For formal meetings and workshops Title I funds will be available to pay staff for per session interpretations throughout the year. At this time we employ staff that speak the same languages as our parent population.

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:	\$467,000	\$34,496	\$501,496
2. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside for Parent Involvement:	\$4,670		
3. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside to Improve Parent Involvement (ARRA Language):		\$345	
4. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified:	#23,350		
5. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect – HQ PD (ARRA Language):		\$1,725	
6. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Professional Development:	\$46,700		
7. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect (Professional Development) (ARRA Language):		\$3,451	

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.

N/A

PART B: TITLE I SCHOOL PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT POLICY AND SCHOOL-PARENT COMPACT

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

I. General Expectations

P.S. 212 Q agrees to implement the following statutory requirements:

- o The school will put into operation programs, activities and procedures for the involvement of parents, consistent with section 1118 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Those programs, activities and procedures will be planned and operated with meaningful consultation with parents of participating children.
- o The school will ensure that the required school-level parental involvement policy meets the requirements of section 1118(b) of the ESEA, and includes, as a component, a school-parent compact consistent with section 1118(d) of the ESEA.
- o The school will incorporate this parental involvement policy into its school improvement plan.
- o In carrying out the Title I, Part A parental involvement requirements, to the extent practicable, the school will provide full opportunities for the participation of parents with limited English proficiency, parents with disabilities, and parents of migratory children, including providing information and school reports required under section 1111 of the ESEA in an understandable and uniform format and, including alternative formats upon request, and, to the extent practicable, in a language parents understand.
- o The school will involve the parents of children served in Title I, Part A programs in decisions about how the 1 percent of Title I, Part A funds reserved for parental involvement is spent.

- o The school will be governed by the following statutory definition of parental involvement, and will carry out programs, activities and procedures in accordance with this definition:
 - o Parental involvement means the participation of parents in regular, two-way, and meaningful communication involving student academic learning and other school activities, including ensuring—
 - that parents play an integral role in assisting their child’s learning;
 - that parents are encouraged to be actively involved in their child’s education at school;
 - parents are full partners in their child’s education and are included, as appropriate, in decision-making and on advisory committees to assist in the education of their child; the carrying out of other activities, such as those described in section 1118 of the ESEA.
 - The school will inform parents and parental organizations of the purpose and existence of the Parental Information and

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

P.S. 212 Q, and the parents of the students participating in activities, services, and programs funded by Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) (participating children), agree that this compact outlines how the parents, the entire school staff, and the students will share the responsibility for improved student academic achievement and the means by which the school and parents will build and develop a partnership that will help children achieve the State’s high standards. This school-parent compact is in effect during school year 2009-2010.

Required School-Parent Compact Provisions

School Responsibilities

P.S. 212 Q will:

1. Provide high-quality curriculum and instruction in a supportive and effective learning environment that enables the participating children to meet the State's student academic achievement standards as follows: Use of our reading and writing workshop, all the balanced literacy components, our everyday math program, our intense intervention programs through small group instruction such as Title I, and Title III ELL programs, AIS services, and technology supported programs.
2. Hold parent-teacher conferences (at least annually in elementary schools) during which this compact will be discussed as it relates to the individual child's achievement. Specifically, those conferences will be held in November 2009 and March 2010.
3. Provide parents with frequent reports on their children's progress. Specifically, the school will provide reports as follows: Report on student programs will be sent at intervals throughout the year. There are 2 predictive assessments and 2 mid-year assessments in ELA and Math that are given to students in Grades 3-5. Parents are provided with a website for checking online and a hardcopy is available for parents who need it. The school holds a technology workshop for parents in the evening and the morning where parents are shown how to go online for results. Results of the RASP tests for Grades K, 1 and 2 are made available at fall and spring PTA meetings. Our parent coordinator assists in explaining reports as necessary in English and Spanish.
4. Provide parents reasonable access to staff. Specifically, staff will be available for consultation with parents as follows: Staff are generally available for consultation before class and during teacher preparation periods. Written notes request and confirm meetings.
5. Provide parents opportunities to volunteer and participate in their child's class, and to observe classroom activities, as follows: Parents can observe classes during open school week in November. This is usually for a 2-hour block in the morning. Parents are requested to assist at special class activities depending on the need. Most parent volunteers work in younger grades and help at holiday sales and other school activities. The parent coordinator is the liaison for these needs.
6. Involve parents in the planning, review, and improvement of the school's parental involvement policy, in an organized, ongoing, and timely way. Parents are involved in formulating the school's parental involvement policy, primarily through the school's leadership team. The DOE send out a parent survey annually. This survey will be reviewed by the SLT team and plans to implement activities to address the areas of need. The topic of parent involvement is revisited frequently by SLT over the course of the year. Topics for parent workshops are suggested.
7. Involve parents in the joint development of any Schoolwide Program plan (for SWP schools), in an organized, ongoing, and timely way. Parent representatives of students receiving Title I services are part of the school's leadership team. Through the school's CEP, they are involved in any SWP plans that are considered.
8. Hold an annual meeting to inform parents of the school's participation in Title I, Part A programs, and to explain the Title I, Part A requirements, and the right of parents to be involved in Title I, Part A programs. The school will convene the meeting at a convenient time to parents, and will offer a flexible number of additional parental involvement meetings, such as in the morning or evening, so that as many parents as possible are able to attend. The school will invite to this meeting all parents of children participating in Title I, Part A programs (participating students), and will encourage them to attend.
9. Provide information to parents of participating students in an understandable and uniform format, including alternative formats upon the request of parents with disabilities, and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand.
10. Provide to parents of participating children information in a timely manner about Title I, Part A programs that includes a description and explanation of the school's curriculum, the forms of academic assessment used to measure children's progress, and the proficiency levels students are expected to meet.

11. On the request of parents, provide opportunities for regular meetings for parents to formulate suggestions, and to participate, as appropriate, in decisions about the education of their children. The school will respond to any such suggestions as soon as practicably possible.
12. Provide to each parent an individual student report about the performance of their child on the State assessment in at least math, language arts and reading.
13. Provide each parent timely notice when their child has been assigned or has been taught for four (4) or more consecutive weeks by a teacher who is not highly qualified within the meaning of the term in section 200.56 of the Title I.

Parent Responsibilities

We, as parents, will support our children's learning in the following ways:

- o Monitoring attendance.
- o Making sure that homework is completed.
- o Monitoring amount of television their children watch.
- o Volunteering in my child's classroom.
- o Participating, as appropriate, in decisions relating to my children's education.
- o Promoting positive use of my child's extracurricular time.
- o Staying informed about my child's education and communicating with the school by promptly reading all notices from the school or the school district either received by my child or by mail and responding, as appropriate.
- o Serving, to the extent possible, on policy advisory groups, such as being the Title I, Part A parent representative on the school's School Improvement Team, the Title I Policy Advisory Committee, the District wide Policy Advisory Council, the State's Committee of Practitioners, the School Support Team or other school advisory or policy groups.

Optional Additional Provisions

Student Responsibilities (revise as appropriate to grade level)

We, as students, will share the responsibility to improve our academic achievement and achieve the State's high standards. Specifically, we will:

- o Do our homework every day and ask for help when we need to.
- o Read at least 30 minutes every day outside of school time.
- o Give to our parents or the adult who is responsible for our welfare all notices and information received by us from my school every day.
 - Set long and short term goals.

PART C: TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM SCHOOLS

Directions: Describe how the school will implement the following components of a Schoolwide Program as required under NCLB.

Note: If a required component is already addressed elsewhere in this plan, you may refer to the page numbers where the response can be found.

1. A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school that is based on information on the performance of children in relation to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards.

A comprehensive needs assessment of 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.

P.S. 212's Leadership and Inquiry Teams will look at assessment scores, students and staff attendance rates, the latest PASS and Quality Reviews, and parent and staff surveys. The needs assessment for the 2009-2010 school year includes a review of the following measures and indicators:

- RASP Assessment system (Teacher's College Version of ECLAS-2)
- LAB-R/NYSESLAT
- ELA scores
- Mathematics scores
- Acuity
- Just Right Levels
- PASS Review
- Student portfolio
- Everyday Math Assessment
- Open Court Phonics
- Conference notes reading and writing workshop
- Teacher created tests
- Weekly and end of unit tests from

2. Schoolwide reform strategies that:

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

Please refer to the following pages for information on reform strategies, effective methods and instructional strategies, curriculum, etc.

ELA -Needs Assessment

Math -Needs Assessment

Science -Needs Assessment

Social Studies -Needs Assessment

Aids and Barriers to Continuous Improvement - Needs Assessment

At risk services Appendix 1
ELL's - Appendix 2 and Needs Assessment

b) Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically-based research that:

o Increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as extended school year, before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities.

Please refer to the following pages for information on reform strategies, effective methods and instructional strategies, curriculum, etc.

- ELA -Needs Assessment
- Math -Needs Assessment
- Science -Needs Assessment
- Social Studies -Needs Assessment
- Aids and Barriers to Continuous Improvement - Needs Assessment
- At risk services Appendix 1
- ELL's - Appendix 2 and Needs Assessment

o Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.

Please refer to the following pages for information on reform strategies, effective methods and instructional strategies, curriculum, etc.

- ELA -Needs Assessment
- Math -Needs Assessment
- Science -Needs Assessment
- Social Studies -Needs Assessment
- Aids and Barriers to Continuous Improvement - Needs Assessment
- At risk services Appendix 1
- ELL's - Appendix 2 and Needs Assessment

o Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.

Please refer to the following pages for information on reform strategies, effective methods and instructional strategies, curriculum, etc.

- ELA -Needs Assessment
- Math -Needs Assessment
- Science -Needs Assessment
- Social Studies -Needs Assessment
- Aids and Barriers to Continuous Improvement - Needs Assessment
- At risk services Appendix 1

- ELL's - Appendix 2 and Needs Assessment

o Address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of low academic achieving children and those at risk of not meeting the State academic content standards and are members of the target population of any program that is included in the Schoolwide Program. These programs may include counseling, pupil services, mentoring services, college and career awareness/preparation, and the integration of vocational and technical education programs.

Please refer to the following pages for information on reform strategies, effective methods and instructional strategies, curriculum, etc.

- ELA -Needs Assessment
- Math -Needs Assessment
- Science -Needs Assessment
- Social Studies -Needs Assessment
- Aids and Barriers to Continuous Improvement - Needs Assessment
- At risk services Appendix 1
- ELL's - Appendix 2 and Needs Assessment

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

Please refer to the following pages for information on reform strategies, effective methods and instructional strategies, curriculum, etc.

- ELA -Needs Assessment
- Math -Needs Assessment
- Science -Needs Assessment
- Social Studies -Needs Assessment
- Aids and Barriers to Continuous Improvement - Needs Assessment
- At risk services Appendix 1
- ELL's - Appendix 2 and Needs Assessment

3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.

Only staff who are certified may apply for positions as per School Support Organization rules.

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

The school is associated with the Teacher's College Model and is collaborating with Bank Street College.

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

P.S.212 is not a high needs school. We follow all hiring practices as per the UFT contract and School Support Organization guidelines

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

Parent attractions will feature student performances. Parents will come out to see their children perform. As feasible these will be held at night highlighting cultures and student accomplishments. This could recognize students with high attendance or high scores. Parent involvement money could pay for refreshments. Translators could be funded through the school's Language Allocation Plan. In terms of the 9 Principles of Learning this activity is a way to celebrate accomplishments.

Teachers will continue to speak at meetings in 09-10. Parents want to hear about what their children are learning. Again translators will be available through Parent Involvement and the Language Allocation Plan to explain key ideas. Particularly grade wide concerns such as articulation to intermediate schools for grade five parents would be valuable. These meetings could be held during the day or night. In terms of the Principals of Learning these meetings would provide parents with a clear understanding if what is expected from students. Samples of quality work would be displayed.

Improvement Strategies and Activities:

- Parent Involvement Committee
- Parent Teacher meetings
- Parent Coordinator
- PTA Executive Board
- Parent Teacher Association sponsored events
- Parent workshops and after-school ESL classes
- Participation in Pajama Reading Party Day, and Career Day
- Learning Leaders
- School Leadership Team professional development
- PTA Newsletter
- LEAP workshops
- Health Workshops
- Adult chorus
- Pumpkin day, Hispanic Day Parade, Science Fair, Dance Performances, SEM celebrations, holiday performance, 3rd, 4th and 5th grade music performances
- Parents are invited to all school special activities

Professional Development: During after school parent workshops Parent Teacher Conferences, and PTA meetings, parents will be given information on NYS exams, homework policies, technology and other areas of interest. Information also provided for effective parent/teacher conferences prior to report card meetings. The parent coordinator is trained by the Region to search for topics of interest for daytime meetings. A needs survey conducted by PTA, targets areas where parents request help and staff follows up.

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

P.S. 212 holds an open house for incoming Kindergarten students every year in May. At this meeting the kindergarten teachers speak about the different areas of the curriculum that will be taught over the course of the year. We follow the Open Court phonics program, one teacher describes. Then another teacher discusses the Teachers College reading/writing program and literacy in general. A third teacher explains the Everyday Math program. A fourth teacher speaks about general rules followed in kindergarten including ways to be in touch with the teacher. Our student body is approximately 75% Hispanic, the last kindergarten teacher translates the presentation into Spanish. The teachers also provide the parents with a parent handbook.

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.

Throughout the year there are 2 predictive assessments and 2 mid-year assessments used to provide teachers with the individual needs of students in grades 3-5. In lower grades RASP is given for grades K, 1 and 2. In grades 1 and 2 this is done in the fall, winter and spring. In grade K this is done winter and spring. These required instruments give areas of strength and weaknesses. If a number of students have the same problem there are implications for re-teaching and strategy lessons.

Lastly our reorganization process for next year's students gives a snapshot of each student's strengths/weaknesses and a final independent reading level which is then the starting point for September literacy.

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.

The blueprint for SIS services calls for the identification of students performing at levels 1 and 2. The beginning of the year students who were held over or on a potential holdover list are also identified. The AIS team evaluates the needs of the child and members of the team provide remediation in Literacy or Math. Depending on needs various interventions may be used from math software programs to Foundations or Wilson. We organize a self contained class each year where there is a need. This is a small register class (16). Rather than place all efforts only in testing grades we fund paraprofessionals in the lower grades who focus on level 1 and 2 children while providing assistance to all children in the school. Every class has an extra AIS teacher during the reading block.

The ladder of concerns moves from AIS to the PPT when we sense that a more intense remediation is needed. This can then move to the School Based Support Team as necessary, these groups communicate.

Results of interim assessment in Literacy and Math provide the team with feedback as well as the many informal assessments given by

classroom teachers. The required PIP form includes mandatory team /teacher meetings and team/parent meetings so that communication is continuous and instruction can be modified quickly.

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.

The coordination and integration of Federal, State and Local services programs are provided at the School Support Organizational level. At the school level the types of programs noted here are made available to parent through our parent coordinator.

PART D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS

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

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

NA

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

NA

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

a. Give primary consideration to providing extended learning time, such as, extended school year, before/after school, and summer programs and opportunities;

NA

b. Help provide an accelerated, high –quality curriculum, including applied learning; and

NA

c. Minimize removing children from the regular classroom during regular school hours;

NA

4. Coordinate with and support the regular educational program;

NA

5. Provide instruction by highly qualified teachers;

NA

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

NA

7. Provide strategies to increase parental involvement; and

NA

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

NA

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Background

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

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

CURRICULUM AUDIT FINDINGS

KEY FINDING 1: CURRICULUM

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

1A. English Language Arts

Background

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

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

ELA Alignment Issues:

-Gaps in the Written Curriculum. Data show that the written curriculum in use by many schools is not aligned with the state standards in terms of the range of topics covered and the depth of understanding required. All reviewed curricula had gaps relative to the New York State ELA standards. The fewest gaps were found at Grade 2, but the gaps increased as the grade levels increased. Interviewed staff in a number of the schools that were audited reported less consistent and effective curriculum and instruction at the secondary level. These data further indicated that curricula were not adequately articulated—less articulated in secondary than elementary schools.

-Curriculum Maps. The curriculum alignment analyses noted that although a number of curriculum maps had been developed, the mapping has been done at a topical level only and does not drill down to an expected level of cognitive demand that will indicate to teachers what students should know and be able to do at each grade level. These curriculum maps addressed only content topics—not skills to be mastered, strategies to be utilized, or student outcomes to be attained.

-Taught Curriculum. The Surveys of Enacted Curriculum (SEC)² data also show that the taught curriculum is not aligned to the state standards. For example, in the reviewed high school-level ELA classes, auditors observed a great disparity between what is taught and the depth to which it should be taught. A similar lack of depth can be seen in elementary and middle grades as well (specifically Grades 2, 4, 5, and 6) and Grade 8. As one might look at it, the taught ELA curriculum is quite broad but lacks depth in any one area. Although standards indicate that instruction should be focused on having students create written products and spoken presentations, SEC data show quite the opposite. There is very little emphasis on speaking and listening and only a moderately higher level of emphasis on writing. Critical reading also is supposed to have a much greater depth than is currently occurring in high school English classes.

-ELA Materials. In a number of the audited schools, teachers interviewed indicate that they have sufficient amounts of curriculum materials available to them; however, the materials they have are not adequate to meet the needs of all learners, particularly English language learners, students with disabilities, and struggling readers. Further, the materials in use are reportedly often not relevant to the students' background knowledge, suggesting a need for more age appropriate and culturally relevant books and articles for student use.

-English Language Learners.

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

²To examine whether instruction was aligned to the New York state standards and assessments, teachers in the district completed the Surveys of Enacted Curriculum (SEC). Based on two decades of research funded by the National Science Foundation, the SEC are designed to facilitate the comparison of enacted (taught) curriculum to standards

(intended) and assessed curriculum (state tests), using teachers' self-assessments. The data for each teacher consist of more than 500 responses. The disciplinary topic by cognitive-level matrix is presented in graphic form, which creates a common language for comparison and a common metric to maintain comparison objectivity.

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

1A.1: Describe the process your school engaged in, during the 2008-2009 school year, to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.

A school based committee was formed to assess whether this finding was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee met on several occasions. Committee members included a parent, the principal, the assistant principal, the data specialist, the literacy coach, the math coach, the ESL specialist, and 2 members of our inquiry team. During each meeting one component of Key Finding 1A was addressed. The committee reviewed our CEP and evaluated our school's data to look for gaps in our written curriculum, the effectiveness of our curriculum maps, the taught curriculum in ELA especially for ELL's and our materials. The results of this assessment process were shared at an SLT meeting with parents at a PTA meeting, with the staff at a faculty conference and with our SAF and Network Leader. It was determined that the Curriculum Audit findings for ELA were relevant to our school educational program in the area of the taught curriculum for spoken presentations and the emphasis on speaking and listening.

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?

Our committee reviewed and evaluated the taught curriculum for all students with a focus on spoken presentations and an emphasis on speaking and listening activities that are aligned with the state learning standards. While it is evident through lesson plan evaluations and observations that most of the NYS standards are being addressed, they are not being consistently addressed in the areas of spoken presentations, speaking and listening. These are part of the school's current curriculum, although the implementation of these standards is limited, some opportunities were found for improving speaking and listening skills.

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 will not require additional support from central, we will continue to utilize the services from Visual Thinking Strategies, an outside provider. Several of our teachers have attended additional professional development from VTS to become trainers i.e. turn key training for our staff. Ongoing emphasis will be placed on the development of lessons that consistently address the NYS learning standards. This is inclusive of increased spoken presentations and opportunities for improving listening and speaking skills. This initiative is for all students. Some of the proposed activities include:

- Implementation of VTS program, where students have the opportunity to be exposed to 90 different paintings and will continue to be taught how to listen and speak about them over a 3 year period using the following phrases:
 - *“What do you see in this picture?”*
 - *“What more can you find?”*
 - *“What’s going on in this picture?”*
- Expansion of the current school wide enrichment model to include spoken presentations of student projects
- Expand current school wide enrichment model to include all students in grades K-3 (currently only students in grades 4 and 5 participate)
- Increased exposure to dance and music through our choral program, music program, LEAP and classroom activities to support self expression
- Use of classroom charts that focus on good conversational behavior and prompts that scaffold “talk”

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 this finding was relevant to our school’s educational program. The committee met on several occasions. Committee members included a parent, the principal, the assistant principal, the data specialist, the literacy coach, the math coach, the ESL specialist, and 2 members of our inquiry team. During each meeting one component of Key Finding 1B was addressed. The committee reviewed our CEP and evaluated our school’s data to look for alignment issues with the Everyday Mathematics program K-5, more specifically the alignment to the New York state process strands and if 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. The results of this assessment process were shared at an SLT meeting with parents at a PTA meeting, with the staff at a faculty conference and with our SAF and Network Leader. It was determined that the Curriculum Audit findings for Mathematics were relevant to our school educational program in the area of a very weak alignment to the New York state process strands at all grade levels.

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?

Our committee reviewed and evaluated the Everyday Mathematics curriculum with a focus on the process strands for all grade levels. It is evident through lesson plan evaluations and classroom observations that the NYS process strands were very weak in our K-5 classrooms. Although the process strand is being addressed, it is not adequate enough.

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.

Our school will not require additional support from central. We will continue to strengthen our current mathematics curriculum process strand by reviewing the current program and continue to create and develop lesson plans that address the process strands in depth. All teachers K-5, including special education and ELL will be part of the process. We will continue to engage our students in activities that foster more reading and writing about math. We will continue engage in the practices of using open-ended responses in the EDM program. More time will be allocated to writing about mathematics, through the use of various activities such as exit cards and math journals. In addition, our students are involved in a Statistics Club, Architecture Club and Think Fun activities.

KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION

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

2A – ELA Instruction

Classroom observations in audited schools show that direct instruction was the dominant instructional orientation for ELA instruction in almost 62 percent of K–8 classrooms. (In direct instruction, the teacher may use lecture- or questioning-type format. It includes instances when the teacher explains a concept, reads to students, or guides students in practicing a concept.) Direct instruction also was observed either frequently or extensively in approximately 54 percent of the high school ELA classrooms visited. On a positive note, high academically focused class time (an estimate of the time spent engaged in educationally relevant activities) was observed frequently or extensively in more than 85 percent of K–8 classrooms visited, though this number fell slightly to just over 75 percent of classrooms at the high school level. Student engagement in ELA classes also was observed to be high - observed frequently or extensively 71 percent of the time in Grades K–8, but this percentage shrank to 49 percent at the high school level. Finally, independent seatwork (students working on self-paced worksheets or individual assignments) was observed frequently or extensively in approximately 32 percent of the K–8 ELA classrooms visited and just over 34 percent of classrooms in high school.

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

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

A school based committee was formed to assess whether this finding was relevant to our school’s educational program. The committee met on several occasions. Committee members included a parent, the principal, the assistant principal, the data specialist, the literacy coach, the math coach, the ESL specialist, and 2 members of our inquiry team. During each meeting one component of Key Finding 2A was addressed. The committee reviewed our CEP and evaluated our school’s data to look at our ELA instruction and if there is use of best practices and research based practices, including differentiated instruction. The results of this assessment process were shared at an SLT meeting with parents at a PTA meeting,

with the staff at a faculty conference and with our SAF and Network Leader. It was determined that the Curriculum Audit findings for ELA Instruction were relevant to our school educational program in the area of best practices and research based practices.

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?

Our committee reviewed and evaluated the amount of time dedicated to direct instruction and student engagement in ELA classes K-5. It was evident through observations (formal and informal) that a high percentage of classroom instruction was done through direct instruction and there was less time for student engagement. Although, it was easier to differentiate instruction in grades K-2, the fact still remains that more support and professional development is needed on the topic of differentiated instruction. There was also a lack of personnel, i.e. to encourage small group instruction.

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.

Our school will not require further support from central. We have taken steps to improve the quality of differentiated instruction. More small groups have been created based on data collected and the needs and learning styles of each individual student. Additionally more staff has been provided to be able to do small group instruction. We will provide professional development, where needed to all staff members. Bank Street College has been chosen as one of our professional development providers this year to work with our grade three teachers. Inter-class visitations will be provided, increase exposure to best practices throughout the building. We will use our out of classroom staff to provided coverage and support. For the first time since the school opened, each grade has at least 2 common preps a week to facilitate and encourage discussions about best practices. Professional development will be provided both during school and after school to explore various learning styles and expand the sharing of best practices. *"Imitation is the highest form of flattery."*

2B – Mathematics Instruction

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

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

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

A school based committee was formed to assess whether this finding was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee met on several occasions. Committee members included a parent, the principal, the assistant principal, the data specialist, the literacy coach, the math coach, the ESL specialist, and 2 members of our inquiry team. During each meeting one component of Key Finding 2B was addressed. The committee reviewed our CEP and evaluated our school's data to look at our Mathematics instruction, concentrating on student activities other than independent seatwork. The results of this assessment process were shared at an SLT meeting with parents at a PTA meeting, with the staff at a faculty conference and with our SAF and Network Leader. It was determined that the Curriculum Audit findings for Math Instruction were relevant to our school educational program in the area of mathematics activities other than independent seatwork and technology.

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?

Our committee reviewed and evaluated our student activities in relation to mathematics and their alignment to the NYS learning standards. It was found that although teachers were planning and executing lessons that required hands-on activities, they were not to the depth that they should be. Hands-on activities is a requirement in our mathematics program, but the implementation of this standard was limited to single time activities, that is very rarely did the activities extend passed the days lesson or even outside the classroom door.

In the area of technology, it is evident that all of the classrooms that have Promethean boards use technology as a vehicle of instruction and for project based learning.

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.

According to our Quality Review, technology should be an area that needed to be addressed last year. It was also one of our school's goals. Aside from purchasing additional computers, laptops, Promethean boards, etc. our school is taking a closer look at the mathematics curriculum and how we can incorporate more technology without losing additional instructional time. Some of the activities we are planning include:

- Higher order thinking problem solving activities have been incorporated into the upper grade curriculum.
- Think Fun Activities
- Weekly usage of the Everyday Math games in all classes K-5

- We will increase the variety of activities that students are exposed to and asked to perform
- Utilize technology better by training teachers and students how to use the Everyday math games online and the math software that is already installed in the classrooms and on the mobile labs
- Games created on the Promethean Board to increase knowledge and allows children to teach each other (e.g. Jeopardy)

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

KEY FINDING 3: TEACHER EXPERIENCE AND STABILITY

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 3:

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

A school based committee was formed to assess whether this finding was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee met one time. Committee members included a parent, the principal, the assistant principal, the data specialist, the literacy coach, the math coach, the ESL specialist and 2 members of our inquiry team. During that meeting Key Finding 3 was addressed. The committee reviewed our CEP and evaluated our school's personnel to look at teacher experience and stability. The results of this assessment process was shared at an SLT meeting with parents at a PTA meeting, with the staff at a faculty conference and with our SAF and Network Leader. It was determined that the teacher Experience and Stability findings were not relevant to our school educational program.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

Our committee reviewed and evaluated past years data and found that our staff is relatively stable. The majority of our teachers have been part of the school since its inception in 2000. As per our school report card, we have a stable teaching staff with a low transfer rate.

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

n/a

KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT - ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

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

A school based committee was formed to assess whether this finding was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee met on one time. Committee members included a parent, the principal, the assistant principal, the data specialist, the literacy coach, the math coach, the ESL specialist and 2 members of our inquiry team. During that meeting Key Finding 4 was addressed. The committee reviewed our CEP and evaluated our school's data to look for professional development opportunities regarding ELL's. The results of this assessment process were shared at an SLT meeting with parents at a PTA meeting, with the staff at a faculty conference and with our SAF and Network Leader. It was determined that the Professional Development - English Language Learners findings were not relevant to our school 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?

Our committee reviewed and evaluated last year's and our current year projected professional development opportunities and our school's current Language Allocation Policy. It has shown that our staff, including ELL teachers are given multiple opportunities to attend professional development relating to ELL's. Some of the providers include:

- Teacher's College calendar days, specifically for ELL's
- Bank Street College
- Treasure Chest professional development
- Professional development from the ISC

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

n/a

KEY FINDING 5: DATA USE AND MONITORING - ELL INSTRUCTION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

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

A school based committee was formed to assess whether this finding was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee met on one occasion. Committee members included a parent, the principal, the assistant principal, the data specialist, the literacy coach, the math coach, the ESL specialist and 2 members of our inquiry team. During that meeting Key Finding 5 was addressed. The committee reviewed our CEP and evaluated our school's data to look at data use and monitoring of ELL instruction and academic progress. The results of this assessment process were shared at an SLT meeting with parents at a PTA meeting, with the staff at a faculty conference and with our SAF and Network Leader. It was determined that the Data Use and Monitoring - ELL Instruction findings were not relevant to our school 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?

Our committee reviewed and evaluated the monitoring of ELL's academic progress and the use of data. The committee also evaluated our school's current Language Allocation Policy. It was found that:

- NYSESLAT results from the Spring are given out to all teachers involved in instructing ELL's in September to assist with initial grouping and placement of students
- The data given to ELL teachers is broken down by proficiency level to provide more support for teachers to inform their instruction
- Teachers receive results from the HILS reports, the LAB-R report, the NYSESLAT report

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

n/a

KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT - SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

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

A school based committee was formed to assess whether this finding was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee met one time. Committee members included a parent, the principal, the data specialist, the literacy coach, the math coach and 2 members of our inquiry team. During that meeting one component of Key Finding 6 was addressed. The committee reviewed our CEP and evaluated our school's data to look for professional development opportunities regarding special education instruction for general education teachers. The results of this assessment process were shared at an SLT meeting with parents at a PTA meeting, with the staff at a faculty conference and with our SAF and Network Leader. It was determined that the Curriculum Audit findings for Professional Development – Special Education were relevant to our school educational program for our general education teachers being familiar with IEP's of their students with disabilities and lack of familiarity with accommodations and modifications.

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?

Our committee reviewed and evaluated the professional development opportunities of our staff members in the area of Special Education, relating to the content of IEP's, modifications and accommodations and behavioral support plans for students with disabilities. While our special education teachers have sufficient understanding and the capacity to implement the range and types of instructional approaches that will help increase access to the general education curriculum and improve student performance, our general education teachers lack the knowledge and have limited exposure to special education approaches. There is a need for additional professional development since we currently have 3 ICT classes (one on grade K, one on grade 3 and one on grade 4).

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.

Our in school, resources are very limited, hence we will require additional support from Central, our Network Leader and/or Network Support Specialists for Special Education. We will survey our staff and pin-point specific areas in need of professional development. As of the current date, the following professional development and support to our staff:

- Our health coordinator will provide professional development in the needed areas.
- Our occupational and physical therapists will also provide additional support on how to manage students in regular education classroom.
- Our health coordinator will provide professional development on Chapter 8.
- District wide special education professional development

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

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

A school based committee was formed to assess whether this finding was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee met on one occasion. Committee members included a parent, the principal, the assistant principal, the data specialist, the literacy coach, the math coach, the ESL specialist and 2 members of our inquiry team. During that meeting Key Finding 7 was addressed. The committee reviewed our CEP and evaluated our school's data to look at individualized education programs accommodations and modifications for the classroom environment. The results of this assessment process were shared at an SLT meeting with parents at a PTA meeting, with the staff at a faculty conference and with our SAF and Network Leader. It was determined that the INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAMS (IEPS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES) findings were not relevant to our school 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 reviewed and evaluated the alignment between the goals, objectives, and modified promotion criteria that are included in student IEP's and the content on which these students are assessed on grade-level state tests and found that our special education unit is highly functioning. The team includes teachers, service providers and SBST. Our students have behavioral modification plans and BIPs.

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

APPENDIX 8: CONTRACTS FOR EXCELLENCE (C4E) SCHOOL-BASED EXPENDITURES FOR 2009-10 (NOTE: APPENDIX 8 WILL NOT BE REQUIRED FOR THIS YEAR)

This appendix will not be required for 2009-10.

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

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

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:

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

Supporting Students in Temporary Housing (STH)

As included in your Office of School and Youth Development Consolidated Plan STH Section and in accordance with the federal McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act and Chancellor's Regulation A-780, schools must identify, serve, and report on students living in temporary housing (STH). For more information on using Title I set-aside funds to support your STH population, please refer to the Frequently Asked Questions document on DOE's website:

<http://schools.nyc.gov/NR/rdonlyres/9831364D-E542-4763-BC2F-7D424EBD5C83/58877/TitleIPartASetAsideforStudentsinTemporaryHousing.pdf>

Part A:

For Title I Schools

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

0

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

n/a

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).

0

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

n/a

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.