



**P.S. 239Q
2009-10
SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)**

SCHOOL: 24Q239

ADDRESS: 1715 WEIRFIELD STREET, RIDGEWOOD, NEW YORK 11385

TELEPHONE: (718) 381-4009

FAX: (718) 381-0592

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

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

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: 239Q **SCHOOL NAME:** Police Officer Ramon Suarez School

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 1715 Weirfield Street, Ridgewood, NY 11385

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: (718) 381 - 4009 **FAX:** (718) 381 - 0592

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Robin L. Connolly **EMAIL ADDRESS:** rconnol@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON: Jamie Vetter

PRINCIPAL: Robin L. Connolly

UFT CHAPTER LEADER: Marisa Jones

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT: Esperanza Cancel

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

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL SUPPORT ORGANIZATION (SSO) INFORMATION

DISTRICT: 24 **SSO NAME:** ICI

SSO NETWORK LEADER: Audrey Murphy

SUPERINTENDENT: Madelene Taub-Chan, I.A.

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

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

Name	Position and Constituent Group Represented	Signature
Robin L. Connolly	*Principal or Designee	
Marisa Jones	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Esperanza Cancel	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
Nancy Rivera	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
	Student Representative <i>(optional for elementary and middle schools; a minimum of two members required for high schools)</i>	
	CBO Representative, if applicable	
Jamie Vetter	SLT Chair (teacher)/ Pre-k and K Teachers and Paras	
Stella Kostopoulos	AP/ 3 rd and 4 th grade Teachers; Clusters; P.75 staff; Guidance	
Livia San Andres	Teacher/ 5 th Grade Teachers; IEP Team; School Nurse	
Alice Serrano	Parent/Parents	
Lydia Ramos	Parent/Parents	
Gloria Perez	Parent/Parents	
	Member/	

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

* Core (mandatory) SLT members.

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

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.

Public School 239Q is a state of the art building that opened its doors in the fall of 2003. This pre-kindergarten to fifth grade school serves a population of approximately 800 students, including 62 District 75 citywide special education students housed in our second floor wing. One hundred and thirty seven kindergarten students are housed at an annex located one block away. Our students come from culturally diverse backgrounds.

Our vision is to instill a love of learning for all members of the community (students, staff and parents). With this vision in mind, we adopted the motto, "Building a Community of Lifelong Learners, One Individual at a Time."

Our goal to develop our students as readers, writers, mathematicians, historians and scientists, as well as productive citizens in a risk-free environment, is attained through our rigorous instructional programs that support the needs of our individual students.

Through a readers and writers workshop approach we are able to provide our students with a rigorous balanced literacy program. Administrators and teachers from as close as Long Island and as far as Washington State visit our school to see the reading and writing workshop model in action. Through our use of the Everyday Mathematics Program, Foss Science Program and New York State Standards Based Social Studies Program, we provide our students with a hands-on differentiated instructional program in all content areas.

Our new and improved computer lab and six moving computer carts allow for the opportunity to integrate technology in all content areas. In addition, Smart Boards, Elmos and overhead projectors are available to all staff as a teaching to tool to integrate technology and enhance engagement in student learning.

We collaborate with the Greater Ridgewood Youth Council which provides a Homework Help program for our students.

Since 2004, we have participated with I.S. 77 in the "Ramp – Up" program. The seventh grade students from I.S. 77 come to our school and participate in reading with our first grade classes. Our high quality professional development provides our teachers with the tools they need to assess, analyze and plan instruction that best meets the needs of their students.

In order to best meet the needs of the whole child, we have been engaged in various study groups and training in brain research to study how children learn and the implications for instruction. Over thirty staff members have been trained and certified in Mel Levine's, *Schools Attuned*.

Our Parent Teacher Association is active and plays an integral role in our school and works collaboratively with the administration and staff as members of the PTA and School Leadership Team.

CEP Section III: School Profile

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT									
School Name:		P.S. 239							
District:		24	DBN:	24Q239	School BEDS Code:		342400010239		
DEMOGRAPHICS									
Grades Served:	Pre-K	√	3	√	7		11		
	K	√	4	√	8		12		
	1	√	5	√	9		Ungraded	√	
	2	√	6		10				
Enrollment				Attendance - % of days students attended :					
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08*	2008-09		
Pre-K	61	34	36		92.8	93.2	94.2		
Kindergarten	105	103	115	Student Stability - % of Enrollment :					
Grade 1	144	116	126	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Grade 2	137	151	109		93.5	93.4	92.9		
Grade 3	143	139	123	Poverty Rate - % of Enrollment :					
Grade 4	117	139	123	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Grade 5	119	115	141		80.9	82.2	79.9		
Grade 6	0	0	0	Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number :					
Grade 7	0	0	0	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Grade 8	0	0	0		3	14	52		
Grade 9	0	0	0	Recent Immigrants - Total Number :					
Grade 10	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Grade 11	0	0	0		30	9	20		
Grade 12	0	0	0	Special Education Enrollment:					
Ungraded	0	7	3	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Total	826	792	797						
Special Education Enrollment:				Suspensions (OSYD Reporting) - Total Number:					
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
# in Self-Contained Classes	21	34	46	Principal Suspensions	16	20	52		
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	15	30	30	Superintendent Suspensions	1	11	20		
Number all others	35	26	29	Special High School Programs - Total Number:					
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:				CTE Program Participants	0	0	0		
(BESIS Survey)				Early College HS Program Participants	0	0	0		
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	Number of Staff - Includes all full-time staff:					
# in Transitional Bilingual Classes	9	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0						
# receiving ESL services only	221	227	223	Number of Teachers	46	62	66		

CEP Section III: School Profile

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT							
# ELLs with IEPs	11	0	6	Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	5	15	14
These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.				Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	N/A	4	7
Overage Students (# entering students overage for grade)				Teacher Qualifications:			
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
(As of October 31)	0	0	0	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100.0	100.0	100.0
				% more than 2 years teaching in this school	71.7	50.0	59.1
				% more than 5 years teaching anywhere	32.6	25.8	36.4
Ethnicity and Gender - % of Enrollment:				% Masters Degree or higher	83.0	77.0	71.0
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	% core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	100.0	86.5	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.1	0.2	0.3				
Black or African American	2.5	3.3	2.5				
Hispanic or Latino	79.9	78.5	81.3				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	7.1	6.9	7.9				
White	10.3	11.0	8.0				
Male	50.5	49.8	49.7				
Female	49.5	50.2	50.3				
2009-10 TITLE I STATUS							
√	Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP)						
	Title I Targeted Assistance						
	Non-Title I						
Years the School Received Title I Part A Funding:				2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
				√	√	√	√
NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY							
SURR School (Yes/No)	If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:						
Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2008-09) Based on 2007-08 Performance:							
√	In Good Standing (IGS)						
	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1						
	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 2						
	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) – Year 1						
	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) – Year 2/Planning for Restructuring (PFR)						
	NCLB Restructuring – Year ____						
	School Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP) – Year ____						

CEP Section III: School Profile

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT

Individual Subject/Area Ratings:							
Elementary/Middle Level				Secondary Level			
ELA:				ELA:			
Math:				Math:			
Science:				Graduation Rate:			

This school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for each accountability measure:							
		Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
Student Groups		ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad Rate
All Students							
Ethnicity							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Black or African American							
Hispanic or Latino							
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander							
White							
Other Groups							
Students with Disabilities							
Limited English Proficient							
Economically Disadvantaged							
Student groups making AYP in each subject		0	0	0	0	0	0

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY							
Progress Report Results – 2008-09				Quality Review Results – 2008-09			
Overall Letter Grade:	A	Overall Evaluation:		NR			
Overall Score:	95.7	Quality Statement Scores:					
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data					
School Environment:	12.7	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals					
<i>(Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)</i>		Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals					
School Performance:	15.5	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals					
<i>(Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)</i>		Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise					
Student Progress:	60						
<i>(Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)</i>							
Additional Credit:	7.5						

KEY: AYP STATUS	KEY: QUALITY REVIEW SCORE
√ = Made AYP	Δ = Underdeveloped
√ ^{SH} = Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target	► = Underdeveloped with Proficient Features
X = Did Not Make AYP	√ = Proficient
– = Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status	W = Well Developed
	◇ = Outstanding
	NR = No Review Required

* = For Progress Report Attendance Rate(s) - If more than one attendance rate given, it is displayed as K-8/9-12.

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

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

ELA Results Over Six Years

<u>Year</u>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Sc. Score</u>	<u># Tested</u>	<u>Level 1</u>	<u>Level 2</u>	<u>Level 3</u>	<u>Level 4</u>	<u>Level 3 & 4</u>
2004	3	611.3	112	24(21.4%)	53(47.3%)	29(25.9%)	6 (5.4%)	35 (31.3%)
2005	3	628.6	110	17(15.5%)	35(31.8%)	39(35.5%)	19(17.3%)	58 (52.7%)
2006	3	650.4	71	7 (9.9%)	31(43.7%)	33(46.5%)	0 (0.0%)	33 (46.5%)
2007	3	640.6	135	25(18.5%)	60(44.4%)	48(35.6%)	2 (1.5%)	50 (37.0%)
2008	3	651.5	124	12(9.7%)	51(41.1%)	57(46%)	4 (3.2%)	61 (49.2%)
2009	3	654.7	132	3 (2.3%)	51(38.6%)	75(56.8%)	3 (2.3%)	78 (59.1%)
2004	4	642.1	84	2 (2.5%)	46(54.8%)	33(39.3%)	3 (3.6%)	36 (42.9%)
2005	4	635.0	100	13(12%)	51(51%)	36(36%)	1 (1%)	37 (37%)
2006	4	654.7	99	10(10.1%)	35(35.4%)	52(52.5%)	2 (2.0%)	54 (54.5%)
2007	4	646.4	116	14(12.1%)	51(44%)	47(40.5%)	4 (3.4%)	51 (44.0%)
2008	4	638.9	137	30(21.9%)	45(32.9%)	61(44.5%)	1 (0.7%)	62 (45.3%)
2009	4	656.6	115	6 (5.2%)	39(33.9%)	68(59.1%)	2 (1.7%)	70 (60.9%)
2005	5	666.2	79	2 (2.5%)	24(30.4%)	51(64.6%)	2 (2.5%)	53 (67.1%)
2006	5	647.2	106	7 (6.6%)	47(44.3%)	50(47.2%)	2 (1.9%)	52 (49.1%)
2007	5	650.2	110	4 (3.6%)	53(48.2%)	52(47.3%)	1 (0.9%)	53 (48.2%)
2008	5	654.6	112	2 (2.7%)	31(27.7%)	78(69.6%)	0 0	78 (69.6%)
2009	5	658.3	136	3 (2.2%)	44(32.4%)	83(61.0%)	6 (4.4%)	89 (65.4%)

An analysis of students meeting standards (Levels 3 & 4) over the last six years fluctuated up and down. A commonality we found in grades 3 – 5 was that in 2007, the first year that English Language Learners were tested after only one year in an English Language School System, scores dropped. In addition, it was the first year that our self-contained special education students took the New York State English Language Arts assessment in grade 3.

In 2008, there was a dramatic increase in the number of students meeting standards (Levels 3 & 4) in grades 3 and 5, with a minimal increase in grade 4. The increase in grades 3 & 5 could partly be due to

teacher stability in grades 3 and 5 and the minimal increase in grade 4 due to the large turnover rate in grade 4 teachers.

Overall, in 2008, our students meeting standards (Levels 3 & 4) increased by 11.2%.

In 2009, the number of students meeting standards (Levels 3 and 4) in grades 3 and 4 increased over 10% and 15% respectively from 2008, but declined slightly in grade 5. The grade 5 decrease may be attributed to the test results of our special education self-contained students.

Longitudinal ELA Results over Three Years

<u>Year</u>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Sc. Score</u>	<u># Tested</u>	<u>Level 1</u>	<u>Level 2</u>	<u>Level 3</u>	<u>Level 4</u>	<u>Level 3& 4</u>
2007	3	640.6	135	25(18.5%)	60(44.4%)	48(35.6%)	2 (1.5%)	50 (37.0%)
2008	4	638.9	137	30(21.9%)	45(32.9%)	61(44.5%)	1 (0.7%)	62 (45.3%)
2009	5	658.3	136	3 (2.2%)	44(32.4%)	83(61.0%)	6 (4.4%)	89 (65.4%)

An analysis of the longitudinal ELA results over the last three years shows a steady increase in the number of students meeting state standards.

Sub-Group ELA Findings:

Grades 3-5 ELA Data Analysis

Overall

- Grade Five had the greatest percentage of students that met or exceeded NYS Standards in ELA (65.4%).

Gender

- Overall, 57% (110/193) of the male students met or exceeded NYS Standards in ELA versus 63.7% (128/191) of the females. Thus, revealing a 6.7% difference in performance by gender.
- Grade Five had the smallest difference in performance by gender (0.3%).
- Grade Three had the greatest difference in performance by gender (16.3%). Only 48.3% (33/68) male students scored Levels 3 & 4 versus 64.8% (46/71) females.

Students with Disabilities vs. General Education

- Grade Five had the highest percentage of students with disabilities that met NYS Standards in ELA (31%).
- Grade Four had the greatest % of students with disabilities that partially met or did not meet NYS Standards in ELA (88.2%).

English Proficient vs. Limited English Proficient

- Overall, there was a performance gap of 31.5% for EP vs. LEP students that met or exceeded NYS Standards in ELA.

- Grade Five LEP students had the highest percentage of students that met NYS Standards in ELA (46.3%).
- Grade Three students demonstrated the biggest performance gap of 35.4% between EP vs. LEP students (EP = 72.1% vs. LEP = 36.7%).

Ethnicity

- Grade Three demonstrated the greatest difference in performance by gender for Hispanic students (12.2%).

Other Findings:

We further identified the areas of weakness in English Language Arts by analyzing running record results for grades K-5; predictives for grades 3, 4 and 5; and the New York City Progress Report. We also analyzed our New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test results for our ELL students. In addition, the work of the inquiry team focusing on grade 4 students also provided us with some insights as to our students' needs.

NYC Progress Report – Student Progress

Student Progress for English Language Arts indicates the following:

- 1 Year of Progress: In 2009, 74.6% of our students made at least one year of progress compared to 62.8% of our students who made at least 1 year of progress in 2008. The 2009 results represents, we are 113.6% of the way from the lowest (47.0%) to the highest (71.3%) score relative to our Peer Horizon and 107.6% of the way relative to our City Horizon.
- Average Change in Proficiency from Level 1 and Level 2 students: is 0.50 in 2009 vs. 0.28 in 2008. This represents that we are 128% of the way from the lowest (0.18) to the highest (0.43) score relative to our Peer Horizon and 100% of the way relative to our City Horizon
- Percentage of Students in School's Lowest 1/3 Students Making at Least 1 Year of Progress: In 2009, 95% of our student in the school's lowest 1/3 made at least 1 year of progress compared to 75% in 2008. This result of 95% means we are 98.6% of the way from the lowest (59.8%) to the highest (95.5%) score relative to our Peer Horizon and 99.2% of the way relative to our City Horizon.

In addition, the school received extra credit for closing the achievement gap for English Language Learners, special education and Hispanic students in the lowest 1/3 citywide.

Headsprout Data Analysis 2008/2009

Headsprout Grade 1 Increase

Levels Up	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Totals
Females #/%	0	2/6	12/36	10/30	6/18	3/9	0	0	33/100
Males #/%	0	4/13	12/39	8/25	6/19	1/3	0	0	31/100
All #/%	0	6/9	24/37	18/28	12/19	4/6	0	0	64/100

Most 1st graders made gains of 2-4 reading levels between September and March.

Headsprout Grade 2 Increase

Levels Up #/%	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Totals
Females #/%	0	2/6	5/15	10/30	10/30	3/9	2/6	1/3	33/100
Males #/%	1/3	2/6	6/19	8/26	8/26	3/10	3/10	0	31/100
All	1/1	4/6	11/17	18/28	18/28	6/9	5/8	1/1	64/100

Most 2nd graders made gains of 2-4 reading levels between September and March.

TC Reading Data Analysis September 2008-June 2009

Overall ELL's 2008-2009

Grade/Average	September '08	November '08	March '09	June '09
1 (14.35%)	27.2%	4.35%	12.91%	12.91%
2 (15.71%)	3.45%	6.66%	24.14%	28.57%
3 (44.01%)	44.2%	43.3%	44.6%	43.94%
4 (23.80%)	22.9%	24%	20.7%	27.59%
5 (15.23%)	6.6%	6.6%	27.7%	20%
Total (22.6%)	Total 20.87%	Total 16.9%	Total 26.0%	Total 26.6%

Grade 3 ELL students consistently demonstrated the highest percentage of students reading on or above grade level.

Overall, ELL students in Grades 1 & 5 had the lowest percentage of students reading on or above grade level.

**Overall Reading Level Analysis
2008-2009**

Grade/Average	September '08	November '08	March '09	June '09
1 (Avge: 42.6%)	61.6%	36.3%	38.5%	34.1%
2 (Avge: 52.1%)	42.2%	42.6%	59%	64.4%
3 (Avge: 65.6%)	63%	63.7%	67.9%	67.8%
4 (Avge: 64.5%)	61.9%	62.5%	64.2%	69.4%
5 (Avge: 51.7%)	40%	40.7%	70%	56.3%
School Avg: 55.3%	School Avg: 53.7%	School Avg: 49.2%	School Avg: 59.9%	School Avg: 52.4%

Overall, Grades 1 and 5 had the lowest percentage of students reading on or above grade level.

**Overall Males
2008-2009**

Grade/Average	September '08	November '08	March '09	June '09
1 (Avge: 35.1%)	62.5%	4.35%	39.44%	34.25%
2 (Avge: 52.1%)	39.2%	41.17%	63.46%	64.71%
3 (Avge: 64.2%)	63.2%	62.87%	60.58%	70%
4 (Avge: 49.8%)	28.1%	54.72%	56.35%	60.38%
5 (Avge: 39%)	32.8%	30.14%	43.2%	50%
Total Av. (48%)	Total (45.2%)	Total (38.7%)	Total (52.6%)	Total (55.9%)

**Overall Females
2008-2009**

Grade/Average	September '08	November '08	March '09	June '09
1 (Avge: 42.2%)	60.7%	36.8%	37.5%	33.9%
2 (Avge: 52.2%)	45.4%	43.8%	55.7%	64.1%
3 (Avge: 65.7%)	62.8%	64.7%	67.5%	67.7%
4 (Avge: 73.6%)	68.5%	79.1%	70.5%	76.4%
5 (Avge: 56.7%)	47.7%	52.4%	63.6%	63.3%
Total (58%)	Total (57%)	Total (55.4%)	Total (59%)	Total (61.1%)

Grade 2 has the smallest performance gap by gender.
Grades 4 and 5 had the largest performance gap by gender.

**Overall Students with Disabilities
2008-2009**

Grade/Average	September '08	November '08	March '09	June '09
1 (35%)	45.4% (22 students)	33.3% (21 students)	35.7% (28 students)	25% (32 students)
2 (90.6%)	100% (2 students)	100% (2 students)	100% (2 students)	62.5% (8 students)
3 (54.6%)	52.8% (17 students)	50% (18 students)	61.9% (21 students)	53.8% (26 students)
4 (25.8%)	26.2% (19 students)	26.3% (19 students)	22.2% (18 students)	28.5% (19 students)
5 (12.2%)	10% (30 students)	3.3% (30 students)	10.3% (30 students)	25% (28 students)
Total (43.6%)	Total (46.9%)	Total (42.6%)	Total (46%)	Total (39%)

Grade 5 had the smallest percentage of students with disabilities reading on or above grade level.

Grades 3, 4 and 5 Predictive Findings:

Based on our analysis of the Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 predictives, the following findings were found:

Overall in Grades 3, 4, & 5, the students made performance gains on the ELA Predictive's during the 2008-2009 school year.

In Grade 3, the average student's score increased by 16% (47%→63%). By Performance Indicator, continued areas of concern are vocabulary/word solving, relevant and irrelevant information, and making inferences.

In Grade 4, the average student's score increased by 5% (56%→61%). By Performance Indicator, continued areas of concern are vocabulary/word solving, and making inferences.

In Grade 5, the average student's score increased by 7% (46%→53%). By Performance indicator, continued areas of concern are vocabulary/word solving, identifying the central idea and supporting details from a text, and the genre of poetry.

2009 NYSESLAT Data Analysis

School Totals

	K	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Listening & Speaking						
B	2	2	0	1	1	0
I	8	3	0	2	4	2
A	21	19	19	34	11	13
P	4	7	9	30	16	31
Reading & Writing						
B	20	7	8	3	6	9
I	12	10	17	19	10	9
A	3	11	3	38	11	18

P	0	3	0	7	5	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Student Progress

B→I	24	10%
B→A	5	2.1%
B→P	1	0.4%
I→A	45	18.9%
I→P	5	2.1%
A→P	17	7.1%

Decline/Negative Growth

I→B	9	3.76%
A→I	21	8.79%

No Change

B→B	44	18.4%
I→I	32	13.4%
A→A	36	15.1%

Overall

40.6% (97)	Demonstrated Progress
46.9% (112)	No Change
12.5% (30)	Negative Progress (A→I or I→B)

23/239 completely scored out of ESL = 9.6%

NYSESLAT Narrative Summary

Listening & Speaking Performance

In all grades (K-5) 41% (98/239) of the students scored Proficient. 67% (31/46) of those students were in grade five. 43% (55/127) of the students were in grades two-four, and 17% (11/66) were in K&1. Thus, revealing that grade five had the largest percentage of students that scored at the Proficient level in this component. Based on Disability Status the data demonstrated that K&1 student's had the smallest performance gap (3%) between General Education and Students with Disabilities and grade five students had the greatest (27%). Overall, our female ESL students demonstrated greater success in scoring at the Proficient level. Grade five female students demonstrated the smallest difference (4%) in performance at the English Proficient level and the female students in Grades 2-4 demonstrated the greatest difference (41%) in performance at the Proficient level.

Reading & Writing Performance

In all grades (K-5) 10% (24/239) of the students scored Proficient. 22% (10/46) of those students were in grade five. 9% (21/127) of the students in grades two-four, and 5% (12/66) were in K&1. Thus, revealing that grade five had the largest percentage of students that scored at the Proficient level in this component. Based on Disability Status the data demonstrated that grades two-four student's had the smallest performance gap (2%) between General Education and Students with Disabilities and grade five students had the greatest (14%). Our female ESL students demonstrated greater success in scoring

at the Proficient level in Grades K-4 however, in grade five the males demonstrated greater success in scoring at the Proficient level.

Student Progress Analysis

Overall, our NYSESLAT data from 2008-2009 indicates that 40.6% (97/239) of our ESL students demonstrated progress and moved up one or more performance levels. 12.5% (30/97) of those students were at the Beginner level, 46.4% (50/97) were Intermediate ELL learners and 7.1% (17/97) were Advanced ELL learners. Our Intermediate ELL learners demonstrated the greatest success in moving up from one performance level to the next and our Advanced ELL learners made the smallest amount of growth.

9.6% (23/239) of our students scored out of ESL and have been identified as being Proficient in English. The majority of these students were Advanced ELL learners in grades 3, 4, and 5.

Our data also reveals that 46.9% (112/239) of our students did not move from one level of proficiency to the next. The majority of them were Beginners in Kindergarten. Upon further analysis, it was noted that the majority of these students did move positively in the Listening and Speaking modalities however not in Reading and Writing; thus requiring them to remain at the lower proficiency level. Effective differentiated instructional initiatives to support these students during reading and writing must be identified to ensure language progress.

Grade 4 Inquiry Findings

Our work with the fourth grade lowest ELL students, in ELA, found that students were lacking vocabulary skills. We focused on building students academic vocabulary by using Margarita Calderón's 7 Step Process for pre-teaching vocabulary and incorporating hands-on teaching. We found that 80.4% of students met their June goal.

Staff Needs Assessment

A needs assessment of our staff indicates further professional development in the area of data analysis, instructional practices to support data results and specific needs in literacy such as: word study, guided reading, and reading and writing strategy lessons. In addition, in the area of math, teachers identified as a need, the development of math strategy lessons.

Attendance

Although our attendance rate increased from 2004 to 2009 from 91.1% to 94.2%, we feel that greater attendance will impact on our student performance and therefore, we have been striving to reach a minimum of 95%.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

- ✓ Reading Level Gains
- ✓ Predictive Results
- ✓ 74.6% of our students made 1 year of progress in ELA
- ✓ 95% of students in the lowest third made at least 1 year of progress in ELA
- ✓ A preliminary analysis of the percent of students at levels 3 & 4 increased from 54.2% (2008) to 61.9% (2009).

We feel our major accomplishments were achieved through our restructuring of our Academic Intervention Services program to provide push-in, small group instruction during the readers' workshop period. This approach provided students with more individualized reading instruction targeting the assessed needs of our students. In addition, our work with the new Department of Education data tools and periodic assessments provided us with more information about our students' needs.

In addition, our ESL teachers provided instruction through a push-in model during the reading and writing workshop period and will continue this model during the 2009-2010 school year.

In addition, our professional development continued to focus on building the capacity of our teachers to better address the identified needs of our students. We continued to focus our professional development on teaching strategies for English Language Learners and at-risk students. Our addition of two ESL teachers helped us meet the needs of our growing ELL population. The implementation of Imagine Learning in our after school program helped our beginning and low level intermediate ELL students. The implementation of Wordly Wise 3000 helped our higher level intermediate and advanced ELL students.

We will continue these initiatives in the 2009-2010 school year.

AIDS

A significant aid to our continuous school improvement has been the continuation and expansion of Inquiry Teams. The work of Inquiry Teams gave us the venue to look closely at small targeted groups of students, the ability to drill down to determine specific students' needs, and also examine the delivery of instruction. The work of Inquiry Teams has helped us as a school community to collaboratively analyze student data and teaching practices, identify student needs, create a plan of action and revise as needed. The work of inquiry teams will continue during the 2009-2010 school year.

BARRIERS

The growing number of ELL students, within the last couple of years, has impacted on our need to provide more intense ELL professional development and hire new, often inexperienced, ELL teachers to meet the challenging needs of first year ELL students to attain state standards as per the NYS Accountability Measure.

Due to the budget cuts for the 2009-2010 school year, we have had to eliminate many of our project arts programs and extended day programs, that support student academic learning.

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

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

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

Annual Goal	Description
SMART GOAL- By June 2010, students performing at proficiency (levels 3 & 4) on the ELA exam will increase by 5% as measured by the Progress Report.	After a comprehensive analysis of our students performing at levels 3 and 4 on the NYS ELA, we found that we only scored at 64.8% relative to our peer horizon and scored 60.1% on the NYC Progress Report. The SLT determined that there was a valid need to continue to increase the percentage of students meeting state standards.
SMART GOAL- By June 2010, there will be a 5% increase in the number of ELL students making at least one year of progress on the State English Language Arts Exam.	Although our ELL’s did make Adequate Yearly Progress in ELA on the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 NYS School Report Card, and made progress from year- to- year on the ELA, the SLT determined the need to continue our ELL’s progress.
SMART GOAL- By June 2010, 90% of all teachers will take part in inquiry teams as measured by agendas, minutes from meetings, and student work.	In order to eventually meet our goal of 1.5 years of progress for every student, we need to continue the work of inquiry teams.
SMART GOAL- By June 2010, ninety percent of all teachers will use formal/informal data and inform instruction more efficiently as measured by lesson plans, conference notes, strategy lessons, running records, and the NYC Predictives/ITAs and NYS ELA assessments.	A review of the results of our professional development needs survey and recommendations of the Learning Committee, it was determined that in order for teachers to use data more effectively, teachers needed additional professional development in certain key areas such as data analysis, instructional practices to support data results and specific needs in literacy such as: word study, guided reading, and reading and writing strategy lessons.
SMART GOAL- By June 2010, the overall school attendance rate will increase by 1% from the previous year as measured by the school’s Periodic Attendance Report (PAR).	After an analysis of our ELA results and student attendance, we determined that increased student attendance would positively impact on student achievement.

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): English Language Arts

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2010, students performing at proficiency (levels 3 & 4) on the ELA exam will increase by 5% as measured by the Progress Report.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue to support students who are not progressing within proficiency levels 3 & 4 with small group and one-on-one instruction during reading workshop through our push-in AIS model. Our AIS personnel will be responsible for providing these services on a daily basis. 2. Continue to support our second grade at-risk students through the implementation of the Fountas and Pinnell’s Leveled Literacy Intervention Program. A select number of second grade students will be targeted for daily small group intervention in order to increase their reading levels. Our Leveled Literacy Intervention Specialist will be responsible for providing these services on a daily basis. 3. Implement Margarita Calderón’s Seven Step Process to preteach vocabulary before minilessons in all content areas. 4. Continue to provide teachers with time to plan curriculum that meets the needs of their students throughout the school year. Teachers will develop teaching points and strategy lessons in alignment with the units of study and student needs. Time is provided during coaching, staff and faculty conferences and June planning days. The literacy coach and assistant principals will be responsible for the planning and implementation of curriculum development activities. The principal and assistant principals will be responsible for supervising these activities. 5. Continue the work of the inquiry teams. The inquiry teams will meet weekly to work and discuss the progress of their target populations. The core team will meet monthly to

	<p>share out progress being made by all teams.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Provide professional development in non-fiction comprehension skills 7. Continue the use of Stephanie Harvey's Comprehension Toolkit 8. Increase the number of non-fiction genres to balance out the literacy program 9. Implement Comprehension Toolkit in Grade 2 10. During non-fiction units of study, guided reading will be done in non-fiction books to support non-fiction comprehension skills
<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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title I SWP; EGCSR Fed. Program; TL Fair Student Funding 2. Contract for Excellence will fund our Leveled Literacy Intervention Teacher. 3. TL Children First Funding, Title I SWP and TL Fair Funding will fund our planning time to develop curriculum. 4. Contract for Excellence 5. TL Fair Student funding will support the work of our inquiry teams. 6. Contract for Excellence 7. TL Fair Funding
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By June 2010, the number of students performing at proficiency (levels 3 & 4) will increase by 5% as measured by the Progress Report tools. • Students will show reading level gains on the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment administered 3x a year. • October 2009-June2010, students will show growth in reading and writing as evidenced on their running records, published writing pieces, reading logs, teachers' conferring notes, and reading and writing on demands.

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>By June 2010, there will be a 5% increase in the number of ELL students making at least one year of progress on the State English Language Arts Exam.</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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue staff development for ESL and classroom teachers in the readers and writers workshop model and in effective ESL research-based methods that support the needs of our ESL students. Professional development will be provided by Integrated Curriculum Instructional Team, literacy coach, and assistant principal in charge of ESL. 2. Continue to provide mandated push-in ESL services during readers and writers workshop periods. ESL teachers will be responsible for the planning and

	<p>implementation of minilesson, strategy lessons, guided reading, etc. Administration will be responsible for monitoring the program.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Continue the Title III Extended Day Program for ELL students. Continue the use of the computer-based Imagine Learning Program for our beginning ELL students to further develop their oral and receptive language skills. Intermediate and advanced ELLs will be provided with instruction in writing to become proficient writers. 4. Pending funding, continue the Title III Summer School Program for ELLs with less than three years in an English Language School System. The program will focus on the development of reading and writing skills; and the development of nonfiction academic language through project-based cooperative group activities. Summer School teachers will be responsible for implementation and student progress. Summer School Site Coordinator will monitor implementation and student progress. 5. Provide interclass visitations in support of guided reading and running records
<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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TL Children First Funding will support professional development for ESL teachers in readers and writers workshop 2. TL Fair Student funding will support professional development for all teachers. 3. Title III 4. Title III dollars will fund teacher per session and cost of materials.
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By June 2010, there will be a 5% increase in the number of ELL students making at least one year of progress on the state English Language Arts Exam. • By June 2010, 42% of ELLs will advance in level on the NYSESLAT. • ELL Students will show reading level gains on the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment administered 3x a year. • October 2009-June 2010, students will show growth in reading and writing as evidenced on their running records, published writing pieces, reading logs, teachers' conferring notes, and reading and writing on demands.

Subject/Area (where relevant): ELA

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2010, 90% of all teachers will take part in inquiry teams as measured by agendas, minutes from meetings, and student work.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Expand the work of the inquiry teams by creating grade level inquiry teams. The core inquiry team members will be responsible for monitoring the work of the inquiry teams. 2. Provide inquiry team members with on-going professional development once a week. Senior Achievement Facilitator and core inquiry team members will be responsible for professional development. 3. The core inquiry team will meet monthly after school to discuss the progress of all inquiry teams. 4. Provide time for each team to report back to all staff members via faculty conferences, newsletters, conference days and other times invited by administration.
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TL Children First Funding 2. TL Data Specialist 3. TL Children First Funding
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By October 2009, expand the work of the inquiry teams by creating grade level inquiry teams. • By June 2010, 75% of students involved in inquiry will have met their June goals. • By June 2010, 100% of classroom teachers will take part in grade level inquiry teams as measured by agendas, minutes from meetings, student work.

Subject/Area (where relevant): ELA

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2010, ninety percent of all teachers will use formal/informal data and inform instruction more efficiently as measured by lesson plans, conference notes, strategy lessons, running records, and the NYS ELA assessments.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continuation of schoolwide data binders to systematically record and analyze student progress and needs individually by class, across grades and schoolwide. Teachers will receive professional development on Acuity, Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessments, Marie Clay’s Running Records, Predictives, and the ELA State Assessments as tools to inform instruction. Professional development will be provided bi-monthly by the literacy coach. In addition, faculty and grade conferences will focus on the analysis of data. All classroom, AIS and ESL teachers are responsible for recording and analyzing student data. Administration will be responsible for monitoring class data binders. 2. Continuation of schoolwide professional development strategies to meet the identified needs of our students. Professional development will focus on data analysis, instructional practices to support data results and specific needs in literacy such as: word study, guided reading, and reading and writing strategy lessons. In addition, Margarita Calderon’s Seven Step Approach to vocabulary development will be implemented in all content areas. Professional development will be provided by the literacy coach, and assistant principals. Administration will monitor professional development and classroom implementation. 3. Continue professional development on the work of inquiry teams. Professional development will be provided by the data specialist and the core inquiry team members.
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TL Children First Funding; TL Fair Student Funding; Contract for Excellence 2. TL Children First Funding; Contract for Excellence; Title I SWP; TL Fair Student Funding 3. TL Fair Student dollars will support the work of the Inquiry Teams

<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By October 2009, 100% of staff will have data binders in place as observed through collection of binders by administration three times a year. • From September 2009-June 2010, ongoing professional development (twice a month) will be conducted as evidenced by meeting agendas and implementation of strategies in classrooms as evidenced by walkthroughs and formal and informal observations by administration. • By June 2010, 100% of classroom teachers will take part in inquiry teams as measured by agendas, minutes from meetings, student work. • By June 2010, the number of students reading at our above grade level will increase by 10% as measured by the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessments administered 3X a year. • October 2009-June 2010, students will show growth in reading and writing as evidenced on their running records, published writing pieces, reading logs, teachers' conferring notes and reading and writing on demands.
--	---

Subject/Area (where relevant): Attendance

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>By June 2010, the overall school attendance rate will increase by 1% from the previous year as measured by the school's Periodic Attendance Report (PAR).</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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analyze schoolwide data on a monthly basis and take appropriate action. The Attendance Committee will be responsible for the analysis and outreach to parents. 2. Analyze longitudinal correlation between attendance and student achievement. Administration will be responsible for yearly analysis. 3. Share school and class data with classroom and AIS teachers at faculty and/or grade conferences and through quarterly reports to classroom teachers. Administration will be responsible to share data with classroom teachers. 4. Follow school's attendance plan that includes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Discussing the importance of attendance and its correlation to student progress at Faculty meetings and PTA meetings. b. Teachers discussing with parents attendance concerns via telephone or one-on-

	<p>one conferences.</p> <p>c. School personnel making daily telephone contacts with parents of absent students.</p> <p>d. Guidance and administration meeting with parents of chronic absentees.</p> <p>5. Distribute monthly attendance awards at PTA meetings. PTA executive board members distribute student awards.</p> <p>6. Hold monthly attendance celebrations for classes with the best attendance on each grade. Guidance Counselors and selected teachers will be responsible for planning and running attendance celebrations.</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>2. TL Fair Funding; Title I SWP</p> <p>4. Title I SWP; TL Fair Student Funding; TL Parent Coordinator</p> <p>5. PTA budget will help support attendance awards.</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased monthly attendance as evidenced on ATS class and schoolwide attendance reports. • Increased parent outreach as evidenced by daily attendance telephone logs. • Increased distribution of monthly attendance certificates. • By June 2010, the overall school attendance rate will increase by 1% from the previous year as measured by the school's Periodic Attendance Report (PAR).

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENT FOR ALL TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

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

Grade	ELA	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	At-risk Services: Guidance Counselor	At-risk Services: School Psychologist	At-risk Services: Social Worker	At-risk Health-related Services
	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS				
K	0	0	N/A	N/A	3	NA	0	NA
1	54	0	N/A	N/A	4	NA	0	NA
2	80	45	N/A	N/A	12	NA	0	NA
3	40	38	N/A	N/A	1	NA	0	NA
4	83	45	42	0	18	NA	0	NA
5	71	39	0	46	16	NA	0	NA
6								
7								
8								

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

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

Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).
<p>ELA: Foundations K-2: During the Day 4X-5X week/Small & Whole Group</p>	<p>K-2 teachers conduct Foundations lessons during the word work period. Foundations is a phonological/phonemic awareness, and spelling program that serves as a prevention program to help reduce reading and spelling failure. Foundations provides research-based strategies in a 30-minute daily lesson. The lessons focus on carefully sequenced skills that include print knowledge, alphabet awareness, phonological awareness, phonemic awareness, decoding, vocabulary, fluency, and spelling. Critical thinking, speaking and listening skills are practiced during storytime activities.</p>
<p>ELA: Wordly Wise Grade K: During the Day 4X week/Small & Whole Group</p>	<p>Wordly Wise 3000 for kindergarten students develops key oral vocabulary that lays the foundation for literacy success and prepares students for the content–area reading they will encounter in later grades. Flexible lesson plans introduce and develop vocabulary in 20–25 minute lessons, three to four days a week.</p>
<p>ELA: Wordly Wise Grades 1 & 2: During 50-Minute Program 3X week/Small Group</p>	<p>The Wordly Wise 3000 for first and second grade students will be implemented to support identified AIS students who stay for the 50-Minute Program. The program teaches key oral vocabulary that lays the foundation for literacy success and prepares students for the content area reading they will encounter in later grades. Flexible lesson plans introduce and develop vocabulary in 20–25 minute lessons, three days a week.</p>
<p>ELA: Wilson Reading Program: During the Day 4X week/Small Group</p>	<p>Our Special Education Teacher Support Services, Collaborative Team Teaching and Individualized Educational Plan teachers provide a small number of our at-risk students with AIS using the Wilson Reading Program.</p>
<p>ELA: Headsprout Program Grades 1&2: During school day and 50-Minute Program/3X-4Xweek/ one-on-one</p>	<p>The Headsprout Program is administered to students in grades 1 & 2 who are reading below grade level four times a week during the school day, and also selected students attending the 50-Minute Program, three times a week. Students use the computerized episodes to work on phonemic awareness, alphabet recognition, decoding, sight words and reading comprehension.</p>

<p>ELA 50 Minute Program Grade 1-5 3X/Week/Small Group</p>	<p>Our Extended Day Program provides at-risk students with additional support in literacy on alternating weeks with Drop Everything And Read (DEAR), while the teacher conducts one-on-one conferring or small group instruction based on assessed needs.</p>
<p>ELA 50 minute program Grade 5 3X/Week/Small Group</p>	<p>The fifth grade Extended Day students will participate in book club reading and discussions based on genres of interest.</p>
<p>ELA: Push-In AIS Literacy 1 - 5th Grade Reading: During the Day 5X week/Small Group</p>	<p>The kindergarten through fifth graders who receive AIS support within their classroom are provided with small group and one-on-one instruction during reading workshop on a daily basis. This environment has proven to be more conducive to learning and successful for our at-risk students. Strategy and skill based lessons are given with teaching points directly targeted to suit individual needs. During these sessions, strategies of successful readers are modeled and then attempted by each student individually.</p>
<p>ELA: Pull –Out AIS Literacy Intervention Program Grade 2 Reading: During the Day 5X week/Small Group</p>	<p>The at-risk second graders will receive small group intervention (4 students per period) by a Leveled Literacy Intervention Specialist using the Fountas and Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention Program. The program targets students who are reading below grade level starting at level C. The program provides is designed to target these students with thirty minutes of highly concentrated instruction in reading, writing, phonics/word study, and vocabulary.</p>
<p>ELA Title III ELL Program Extended Day/3Xweek (two hours)/Small Group</p>	<p>ELL students who are newcomers and/or at the beginner proficiency level will receive instruction using the research-based program Imagine Learning. This technology tool will support their vocabulary development and customize the language support they receive. Intermediate and advanced students will be given instruction using Wordly Wise 3000. This program will enhance their oral language and vocabulary proficiency.</p>
<p>Mathematics: Mathematics: Push-In AIS 2nd - 5th Grade Math: During the Day 5X week/Small Group</p>	<p>The second through fifth graders who receive AIS support within their classroom are provided with small group and one-on-one instruction during math workshop on a daily basis. This environment has proven to be more conducive to learning and successful for at-risk students. Strategy and skill based lessons are given with teaching points directly targeted to suit individual needs. During these sessions, strategies of successful mathematicians are modeled and then attempted by each student individually, often through hands-on activities.</p>
<p>Mathematics 50 Minute Program Grade 1-5 3X/Week/Small Group</p>	<p>Our 50- Minute program provides our at-risk students with additional support in mathematics by participating in Ground Works on alternating weeks. Teachers conduct small group instruction in Reasoning with Numbers, Algebraic Thinking, Reasoning with Geometry, Reasoning about Measurement and Reasoning with Data & Probability.</p>

<p>Science: Grades 3-5 1X/Week/Small Group</p>	<p>Science instruction will be provided through a co-teaching model through the classroom and science teacher. This model will allow for smaller grouping and more individualized instruction.</p>
<p>Social Studies: Grades 3-5 2X/week</p>	<p>Students receive additional support in Social Studies through the use of Stephanie Harvey's Non-fiction Comprehension Toolkit.</p>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor: During the Day (As needed)</p>	<p>The guidance counselors provide counseling services for our at-risk students. Counseling services may include: one-on-one sessions and group sessions focusing on behavior management, academic support, conflict resolution and crisis intervention.</p>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist: During the Day (As needed)</p>	<p>Provide informal observations of students at-risk of referral and provide guidance to classroom teachers and families</p>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker: During the day (As needed)</p>	<p>Provide informal observations of students at-risk of referral and provide guidance to classroom teachers and families</p>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the IEP Teacher: During the day 5X/Week/Small Group</p>	<p>Small group instruction will be provided for at-risk students by the IEP teacher.</p>
<p>At-risk Health-related Services:</p>	

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.

2009-2010

P.S. 239's Language Program Description

PART I: SCHOOL ELL PROFILE

P.S. 239 is a six year old PreK-5 school, located in Ridgewood, Queens. We have **796** students, enrolled with **30.5% (243)** ELLs. Of the **243** ELL students, **185** students have been ELLs for 3 years or less; **16** of them special education students. **Fifty-six** students have been ELLs for 4-6 years; **nineteen** of them are special education students. Approximately **79.8%** (194) come from homes where **Spanish** is the primary language. The second most spoken language is **Arabic** with **6.2% (15)** students. Our school implements an ESL program in accordance with CR Part II and Title III guidelines. All five ESL teachers are fully certified.

Our school LAP team consists of the principal, one assistant principal, a literacy coach, one ESL teacher, two classroom teachers, the parent coordinator, one related service provider, one parent representative, our guidance counselor.

English as a Second Language (ESL) Program:

Twenty classes contain ESL students in grades K-5. All of the ESL teachers provide a push-in model of instruction. Beginner and Intermediate ELLs receive **eight-50 minute** periods of ESL per week while Advanced students receive **four 50-minute** periods per week. The students are grouped together by proficiency level to maximize **servicing**.

PART II: ELL IDENTIFICATION PROCESS

Upon registering their child at P.S. 239, parents and/or guardians must complete the Home Language Identification Survey with the assistance of an ESL teacher. The ESL teacher evaluates the Home Language Identification Survey and informally interviews the parent and the child to determine eligibility for LAB-R testing. If the child is eligible for testing, an ESL teacher will administer the LAB-R within ten days of the student's admission date. Students who are identified as entitled to ELL services are immediately placed in the appropriate class by an assistant principal in consultation with the parent in their native language, if available. Student placement is based on the following criteria: LAB-R results, students' academic performance, language proficiency, and school history. Students who are entitled and are native Spanish speakers are administered the Spanish LAB to determine their proficiency in their native language. ELLs are then assessed annually with the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT). The NYSESLAT is administered by our five certified ESL teachers, implementing the students' mandated testing accommodations and are organized into small testing groups to maintain an optimal testing environment.

Parents of those students who are identified as entitled to ELL services are notified via a formal Entitlement Letter and are invited to attend a Parent Orientation that acquaints parents with three types of ELL programs. During the orientation, parents watch a DVD which describes the following programs in detail and are informed regarding the effectiveness of them based on research: Transition Bilingual Education, English as a Second Language (ESL), and Dual Language. Parents complete a Parent Survey and Program Selection Form and their choice is documented for our records so that if fifteen or more parents in two contiguous grades choose Transitional Bilingual Education, we will begin the process of creating a TBE program. Parent Orientations are on-going throughout the school year and are offered during AM and PM hours to accommodate their work schedules.

ESL teachers complete an Entitlement Letter for each new student identified as needing ELL services based upon their LAB-R score. A copy is retained in a binder in the ESL office, and another copy is placed in the student’s cumulative record. A binder is also kept for copies of the Parent Survey and Program Selection form. Parent choice is documented and trends are recorded over time. If the parent does not attend the Parent Orientation nor returns the Survey and Selection Form, a second and third (if necessary) copy is sent home and the ESL teachers follow up with phone calls to the parent or guardian.

ELL students are placed in classrooms which will be serviced by an ESL teacher in a small group setting. The classes are comprised of ELLs and non-ELLs. Parents are notified via a Placement Letter in English and in their native language.

The majority of parents in our school have chosen Freestanding ESL. During the 2008-2009 school year, 32 parents chose ESL on their Program Selection Form. 4 parents chose TBE, 2 in Kindergarten (Spanish), 1 in First Grade (Nepali), and 1 in Third Grade (Spanish). None of the parents chose Dual Language.

The majority of our parents want their children to be in a classroom in which English is the primary language used. Therefore, our ESL program aligns with parent requests.

PART III: ELL DEMOGRAPHICS

Number of Students in ESL Push-in by Grade

	K	1	2	3	4	5
Totals	34	32	33	66	32	46

ELLs by Subgroups

ELLs (0-3 yrs)

ELLs (4-6 yrs)

Long-Term ELLs (6+yrs)

	All	SIFE	Special Ed.		All	SIFE	Special Ed.		All	SIFE	Special Ed.
TBE	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0
Dual Language	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0
ESL	185	0	16		56	0	19		2	0	0
Total	185	0	16		56	0	19		2	0	0

Number of ELLs by Grade by Language Group

	K	1	2	3	4	5
Spanish	31	24	24	47	27	41
Chinese	0	0	0	4	0	0
Russian	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bengali	0	0	1	0	0	0
Urdu	1	0	0	0	1	0
Arabic	1	3	4	3	3	1
Haitian/Creole	0	0	0	0	0	0
French	0	0	0	0	0	0
Korean	0	0	0	0	0	0
Punjabi	0	0	0	0	0	0
Polish	1	1	2	4	0	0
Albanian	0	0	2	2	0	0
Other	0	4	0	6	1	4
Totals	34	32	33	66	32	46

Program and Scheduling Information

The ESL teachers utilize a push in model during Readers and Writers Workshop to provide ELLs with individualized differentiated instruction. The students are homogeneously grouped by proficiency level to maximize servicing. A Balanced Literacy approach is taught through the Teachers College Readers and Writers Workshop model to facilitate learning through small group instruction, guided reading, interactive writing, and strategy lessons. They scaffold learning via visuals, realia, TPR, and graphic organizers. In Readers and Writers Workshop, ELL teachers provide small group instruction, which target ELL students' needs. During Reading Workshop two guided reading sessions are conducted based on reading level. In addition, a modified Guided Reading approach is utilized to target language development, fluency, comprehension and word study strategies. This modified approach requires that the teacher read the text aloud to model fluency and generate discussions regarding comprehension and vocabulary. During Writing Workshop, two small group strategy lessons are conducted to target the students' writing goals/needs. The instructional schedule in Grades K-5 reflects a greater emphasis on reading for beginner and intermediate ELLs, and writing for advanced ELLs.

The ELLs who have not made significant English proficiency gains receive supplementary intervention programs to address their reading needs. These programs are: Headsprout, Wilson Reading, and Fountas & Pinnell's Leveled Literacy Intervention System in addition to their ESL instruction.

Our school uses a variety of assessment tools used to identify students' strengths and needs: Running Records, Fountas & Pinnell Benchmark Assessments, Writing on Demands, LAB-R, Acuity, NYSESLAT, NYS ELA and NYS Math. They provide necessary information to plan and inform instruction.

Administration programs the ESL teachers to ensure that the mandated instructional periods are provided according to proficiency level. Five ESL teachers each service one entire grade level, with the grade level that has the smallest ELL population being split between two ESL teachers. The students are heterogeneously grouped with English dominant students to allow students to hear and converse with native language speakers of English. However, within these classes the students are grouped by proficiency levels in order to maximize ESL teacher services. Two common preps a week have also been built into their schedules so that the ESL teachers can collaborate with classroom teachers for planning purposes and to discuss specific students' needs.

Beginner and Intermediate students receive 400 minutes a week of ESL instruction with an emphasis on shared reading and interactive writing to help them develop their oral language and promote their reading and writing skills. The ESL teachers in grades K-5 push-in five times a week for reading and three times a week for writing.

Advanced students receive 200 minutes of ESL in order to promote continued growth in writing, which remains an area of need based on our NYSESLAT data. The ESL teachers in grades K-5 push-in four times a week for writing.

Native language support is present in our ESL program through the use of native language texts for cross-cultural learning, realia, dictionaries/glossaries, visual aids, and partnerships between ELLs of the same native language to support them academically and socially as members of our school community.

Our ESL teachers support Beginner and Intermediate students using a push-in model during Readers and Writers Workshop. During Readers Workshop the ESL teachers provide students with small-group instruction by following the Teachers College workshop model. This supports learning in the four modalities in English as they learn new strategies during Readers and Writers Workshop. They begin each session with a minilesson that includes four essential components: demonstration, active involvement, link, and a share. Then, two guided reading lessons are conducted based on student reading levels. For students reading levels A-H, a modified guided reading approach is utilized. This is an interactive approach to improve comprehension and affords students the opportunity to listen as the teacher models fluency by reading aloud the text. Further, the teacher presents the culturally-relevant text through a group discussion connecting the content and language structure to the students' personal lives through the use of realia and conducting a picture walk.

During Writers Workshop the ESL teachers provide students with small-group instruction utilizing a model of instruction for writing following the Teachers College writing process. They begin each session with a minilesson and then conduct small group strategy lessons to target their writing

goals/needs based on their Writing on Demands, notebook entries, and published pieces. The writing process takes approximately four weeks per unit of study and includes: collecting, choosing a seed idea, nurturing, drafting, revising, and publishing/celebrating. The ESL teachers incorporate shared writing and interactive writing during strategy lessons to enrich language development.

Our ESL teachers support Advanced students using a push-in model during Writers Workshop, which is based on our NYSESLAT data as an area of need. The model of instruction is the same as for Beginner and Intermediate students. However, the small group strategy lessons are conducted to promote more independent writing to emphasize organization, composition and meaning.

All teachers utilize Margarita Calderon's Seven Step Process in all content areas to introduce and pre-teach new Tier II and Tier III words that need special attention and are key to comprehending the text or lecture. This vocabulary-building strategy is implemented to support students' reading comprehension and oral language development. Further, interactive content area word walls are displayed in classrooms and accessible to all students.

Instruction is differentiated for the following subgroups:

Our instructional plan for **SIFE** students will incorporate intervention and emotional support from our guidance counselor. These students will receive the mandated number of minutes per week of ESL instruction based on their proficiency level and in accordance with NYS CR Part 154. We will provide the students with a supplementary reading intervention program based on their reading needs during the school day, which would be in addition to them receiving ESL services based on their proficiency level. Our school has three such programs, which are Headsprout, Wilson Reading and Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention System. They will be invited to attend our 50 minute small-group program Tuesday through Thursday where they will participate in Imagine Learning, which is a computer-based one-on-one instructional program. In addition, they will be invited to attend our Title III Extended Day Program to augment their reading and writing skills.

The ELLs in our school that are here **less than three years (newcomers)** receive the mandated number of minutes per week of ESL instruction based on their proficiency level and in accordance with NYS CR Part 154. Emotional support was provided by our guidance counselor to help them effectively embrace our school culture during the month of September. In addition, they receive Wordly Wise (K-5) a minimum of three times a week during the school day. This program focuses on improving students' vocabulary through direct instruction. The activities scaffold their learning of new words with Bloom's taxonomy. Further, K-2 students receive Foundations during the Word Work period approx. four times a week. This program provides students with phonological/phonemic awareness, phonics, and spelling intervention strategies to build their reading and spelling skills. Students in grades 3-5 receive instruction using the Comprehension Toolkit two times a week during Word Work. This instructional approach helps to build students' comprehension skills through responsive teaching by using a wide variety of informational texts. The active literacy program targets the following six strategy clusters to form the foundation of comprehension instruction: monitor comprehension, activate and connect, ask questions, infer meaning, determine importance, and summarize and synthesize. These students also attend our 50 minute small-group program Tuesday through Thursday where they are participating either in Imagine Learning, designated book clubs, DEAR time (Drop Everything and Read) and/or receiving math intervention using Groundworks. They are also invited to attend our Title III Extended Day Program to augment their academic skills.

Our **4-6 year ELLs** receive the mandated number of minutes per week of ESL instruction based on their proficiency level and in accordance with NYS CR Part 154. Within the mandated instructional time these students receive small group instruction in writing, which has been identified as their major area of weakness. Further, strategy lessons are conducted daily to address their individual writing goals. These goals strongly emphasize elaboration, maintaining focus, and sentence variety. These students are also provided with a supplementary intervention program to support their reading needs based on their reading levels. The supplementary intervention programs that are offered: Wilson Reading, and Fountas & Pinnell's Leveled Intervention System. These students receive Worldly Wise a minimum of three times a week during the school day as well as the Comprehension Toolkit two times a week during Word Work. These students also attend our 50 minute small-group program Tuesday through Thursday where they are participating either in a designated book club, DEAR time (Drop Everything and Read) and/or receiving math intervention using Groundworks. The students are also invited to attend our Title III Extended Day Program to augment their academic skills.

Long-Term ELLs will receive the mandated number of minutes per week of ESL instruction based on their proficiency level and in accordance with NYS CR Part 154. We will provide these students with a supplementary intervention program to support their reading needs based on their reading levels. The supplementary intervention programs that are offered: Headsprout, Wilson Reading, and Fountas & Pinnell's Leveled Intervention System. These students receive Worldly Wise a minimum of three times a week during the school day as well as the Comprehension Toolkit two times a week during Word Work. These students will attend our 50 minute small-group program Tuesday through Thursday where they will participate in a designated book club based on selected grade appropriate literature and will be invited to attend our Title III Extended Day Program to augment their academic skills.

ELLs identified as having special needs receive the mandated number of minutes per week of ESL instruction based on their proficiency level and in accordance with NYS CR Part 154. Push-in ESL instruction is the preferred model used to support their academic needs in Reading and Writing to maximize the flow of instruction within their normal class setting. These students also receive supplementary reading intervention to support their reading needs based on their reading levels. The supplementary intervention programs that are offered are: Headsprout, Wilson Reading, and Fountas & Pinnell's Leveled Intervention System. Contingent on the student's grade level they receive Foundations, Wordly Wise and/or the Comprehension Toolkit during Word Work. These students attend our 50 minute small-group program Tuesday through Thursday and are participating either in DEAR time, and/or receiving math intervention using Groundworks.

Our school provides our ELL students with three supplementary reading programs. They are Wilson Reading, Headsprout, and Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention System, which are contingent based on students' reading level. During Readers Workshop two guided reading sessions are conducted based on reading level. Further, contingent on the student's grade level they can receive Foundations, Wordly Wise and/or the Comprehension Toolkit during Word Work. Our 50 minute small-group sessions, Tuesday through Thursday afford them the opportunity to participate either in a designated book club, Imagine Learning, DEAR time, and/or receive math intervention. Our school has also adopted Margarita Calderon's Seven Step Process in content areas to introduce and pre-teach new Tier II and Tier III words that need special attention and are key to comprehending the text or lecture. We will also have an after-school program open to ELLs using Title III funding. English is the language of instruction for all of the targeted intervention programs listed above, however native language support is provided for Spanish-speaking students in Math. Native language literature and glossaries are also accessible to ESL students to support their literacy development in English. Lastly, AIS Reading and Math intervention services are available to ELL students in grades 1-5 based on their academic needs to provide them with small-group instruction.

Former ELLs receive additional support after achieving proficiency on the NYSESLAT in that they are placed in classes with ELLs and receive small group instruction from the classroom teacher. They also receive testing accommodations for two years upon reaching proficiency on the NYSESLAT Exam.

Our classroom teachers have been trained to employ a variety of ESL strategies to make content comprehensible to enrich language development and differentiate learning for ESL students. The following are some of the instructional approaches and methods that are utilized: pre-teaching new vocabulary, visual support and realia, technology tools, interactive writing, shared reading/writing, graphic organizers, writing prompts, flexible grouping based on academic needs and language support, use of manipulatives, real-life experiences and field trips. In mathematics, the students are also provided with math materials in their native language. Our school library also offers a wide selection of native language literature to support content area instruction.

Margarita Calderon's Seven Step Process is a new initiative that we have adopted for this upcoming school year to help build students' academic language skills in all content areas, as a result of our Inquiry Work with ELL students last year (2008-2009). In addition, we have reading academic intervention teachers and ESL teachers pushing in together to service ELLs during reading workshop.

Equal access to all school programs is granted to our ELL students to promote their academic success. **Our ELLs (0-3 years)** benefit from receiving AIS (Academic Intervention Services) in math and reading, Imagine Learning, Fifty Minute Extended Day Program, Headsprout, Title III After-school Program, Wilson Reading, Foundations, WordlyWise, and My Access! (technology-based writing tool). These intervention programs are all conducted in English. **Our ELLs (4-6 years)** also have access to these intervention programs and in addition benefit from the Comprehension Toolkit and Tabula Digita, which is a computer based mathematics program. **Our Long-Term ELLs (completed 6 years)** receive priority for all of the intervention programs above, receive guidance support, and are included in our school's inquiry work.

The instructional materials used to support our **ELLs (0-3 years, 4-6 years, and those that completed six years)** during Readers and Writers Workshop and all content area instruction include the following: visuals, realia, math manipulatives, bilingual/picture dictionaries, manipulatives, maps and charts, video/DVD collections, graphic organizers, and hands-on science materials.

In our ESL program, **native language support** is delivered through peer-partnerships in Readers and Writers workshop with students of the same native language. Bilingual and picture dictionaries, realia and graphic organizers are also integrated to support language growth. In mathematics, Everyday Mathematics materials in Spanish are utilized to provide native language support. Our school library gives our students access to a variety of native language literature. Further, our teachers provide native language support, if available, by translating the content to serve as a scaffolding technique, when necessary.

All of the materials are grade level appropriate and the students are grouped by grade level when they receive AIS support and ESL services and the supplementary reading programs that are provided usually correspond to the ELL's grade and reading levels.

We provide a Jumpstart Kindergarten orientation Session in June that is designed to inform parents of incoming kindergarten students about our school and its programs. We review parent surveys and program selection forms to determine trends of parental choice for program offerings. Our guidance counselor also meets with all newly enrolled ELL students to provide them with social support and to introduce them to peers of their native language from other classes.

Professional Development and Support for School Staff

The ESL push-in teachers and classroom teachers of ELLs will continue to attend Teacher College Calendar Days and other off-site professional development sessions offered by our Network Support Specialists, and the Office of English Language Learners to support their professional growth and provide a differentiated approach to the classroom curriculum.

Our entire school staff, which includes administration, ESL teachers, bilingual teachers, common branch and special education teachers, paraprofessionals, guidance counselor, and all related service providers that work with ELLs will receive professional development in order to fulfill the minimum mandate of 7.5 hours. On October 15th, November 5th and January 7th grade conferences were conducted by members of administration. They provided professional development in research-based strategies to promote academic literacy, Margarita Calderon's pre-teaching vocabulary strategies to promote students' word knowledge, testing accommodations to make assessments more comprehensible for ELLs, and curriculum development for ELLs during Readers Workshop.

Members of administration also provided ELL training on Election Day (November 3rd) and focused on research-based strategies to support reading comprehension for ELL students in the upper grade grades and Lower grade teachers received training in emergent intervention strategies to support decoding, phonics, word solving, and the reading-writing connection.

The remaining mandated hours of professional development will be fulfilled during an all-day professional development meeting on March 27th. The emphasis will be on writing strategies for struggling ELLs and students with IEPs such as: outlines and graphic organizers, POWER, which stands for Prewriting, Organizing, Writing, Escaping and Rewriting, Interactive Writing, and Partner Writing.

Our guidance counselor meets with all teachers of fifth grade ELLs to provide them vital information so that they can make informed decisions regarding middle school and avails herself to clarify questions and follow-up with middle school issues that may arise on an individual basis.

Parental Involvement

Parents play a vital role in the decision-making for selecting programs for their children. We provide parents with orientation sessions throughout the year that describe the various programs being offered as well as The Language Allocation Policy. The orientation workshops take place in September, November, February, and May. A DVD in nine languages provides parents of newly enrolled ELLs with information to choose educational options for their children. The parents are provided with student expectations and general educational program options. A Spanish interpreter is provided during all orientation meetings.

In June 2009 we provided a Jump Start workshop designed to inform parents of incoming kindergarten students about our school and its programs. We reviewed parent surveys and program selection forms to determine trends of parental choice for program offerings. We also hosted a Meet the Teacher Night in September 2009 to provide parents with an overview of our initiatives, goals, objectives, and student expectations.

Parents are also involved in Family Game Night which includes Math and Literacy games that promote learning and foster parent-child academic interaction. Parents are invited to join their child’s class on school-organized field trips, as well as to writing celebrations. Parent-Teacher Conferences offer parents the opportunity to see their child’s classroom and discuss curriculum and progress with classroom, ESL and AIS teachers.

We evaluate the needs of the parents by reviewing and analyzing the Learning Survey completed by all parents. We have established a Learning Survey Committee made up of administrators and teachers to address the parents’ needs as stated in the completed surveys. The school works closely with the PTA to identify and address the needs of the parents.

Our parental involvement activities allow parents to become more aware of the choices available to them, the programs being used to address their child’s academic needs, and activities they can do with their children to promote their learning. Bilingual monthly newsletters are sent home via backpack to communicate with parents.

PART IV: ASSESSMENT ANALYSIS

2009 NYSESLAT Data Analysis

	K	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th
Listening & Speaking						
B	2	2	0	1	1	0
I	8	3	0	2	4	2
A	21	19	19	34	11	13

P	4	7	9	30	16	31
Reading & Writing						
B	20	7	8	3	6	9
I	12	10	17	19	10	9
A	3	11	3	38	11	18
P	0	3	0	7	5	10

Student Progress

B→I 24 10%
B→A 5 2.1%
B→P 1 0.4%

I→A 45 18.9%
I→P 5 2.1%

A→P 17 7.1%

Decline/Negative Growth

I→B 9 3.76%
A→I 21 8.79%

No Change

B→B 44 18.4%
I→I 32 13.4%
A→A 36 15.1%

Overall

40.6% (97) Demonstrated Progress
46.9% (112) No Change
12.5% (30) Negative Progress (A→I or I→B)

23/239 completely scored out of ESL = 9.6%

NYSESLAT Narrative Summary

Listening & Speaking Performance

In all grades (K-5) 41% (98/239) of the students scored Proficient. 67% (31/46) of those students were in grade five. 43% (55/127) of the students were in grades two-four, and 17% (11/66) were in K&1. Thus, revealing that grade five had the largest percentage of students that scored at the Proficient level in this component. Based on Disability Status the data demonstrated that K&1 student's had the smallest performance gap (3%) between General Education and Students with Disabilities and grade five students had the greatest (27%). Overall, our female ESL students demonstrated greater success in scoring at the Proficient level. Grade five female students demonstrated the smallest difference (4%) in performance at the English Proficient level and the female students in Grades 2-4 demonstrated the greatest difference (41%) in performance at the Proficient level.

Reading & Writing Performance

In all grades (K-5) 10% (24/239) of the students scored Proficient. 22% (10/46) of those students were in grade five. 9% (21/127) of the students in grades two-four, and 5% (12/66) were in K&1. Thus, revealing that grade five had the largest percentage of students that scored at the Proficient level in this component. Based on Disability Status the data demonstrated that grades two-four student's had the smallest performance gap (2%) between General Education and Students with Disabilities and grade five students had the greatest (14%). Our female ESL students demonstrated greater success in scoring at the Proficient level in Grades K-4 however, in grade five the males demonstrated greater success in scoring at the Proficient level.

Student Progress Analysis

Overall, our NYSESLAT data from 2008-2009 indicates that 40.6% (97/239) of our ESL students demonstrated progress and moved up one or more performance levels. 12.5% (30/97) of those students were at the Beginner level, 46.4% (50/97) were Intermediate ELLs and 7.1% (17/97) were Advanced ELLs. Our Intermediate ELLs demonstrated the greatest success in moving up from one performance level to the next and our Advanced ELLs made the smallest amount of growth.

9.6% (23/239) of our students scored out of ESL and have been identified as being Proficient in English. The majority of these students were Advanced ELLs in grades 3, 4, and 5.

Our data also reveals that 46.9% (112/239) of our students did not move from one level of proficiency to the next. The majority of them were Beginners in Kindergarten. Upon further analysis, it was noted that the majority of these students did move positively in the Listening and Speaking modalities however not in Reading and Writing; thus requiring them to remain at the lower proficiency level. Effective differentiated instructional initiatives to support these students during reading and writing must be identified to ensure language progress.

The patterns reveals that we need to focus more attention on strengthening students' reading and writing skills. In response to this need we have reading academic intervention teachers and ESL teachers pushing in together to service ELLs during reading workshop. Margarita Calderon's Seven Step Process is another initiative that we have adopted for this upcoming school year to help build students' academic language skills in all content areas, as a result of our Inquiry Work with ELL students last year (2008-2009) and to support their reading comprehension of nonfiction texts.

NYS ELA- Grades 3-5

- Overall, 46.4% of ELL students made exemplary gains of at least one-half of a proficiency level in ELA.
- Overall, 39% (50/128) of our ELLs met or exceeded NYS Standards in ELA. 54% (70/128) partially met NYS Standards in ELA.
- Overall, there was a performance gap of 31.5% for English proficient vs. LEP students that met or exceeded NYS Standards in ELA.
- Grade five LEP students had the highest percentage of students that met NYS Standards in ELA (46.3%).
- Grade three students demonstrated the biggest performance gap of 35.4% between EP vs. LEP students that met or exceeded NYS Standards in ELA (EP = 72.1% vs. LEP = 36.7%).

NYSAA ELA – Grades 4 & 5

- Two ESL students took the NYSAA in ELA and both scored a Level 4. Thus, 100% (2/2) of the students exceeded NYSAA Standards in ELA.

NYS Math – Grades 3-5

- Overall, 40.6% of ELL students made exemplary gains of at least one-half of a proficiency level in Math.
- Overall, 72.4% (105/145) of our ELLs met or exceeded NYS Standards in Math. 18.6% (27/145) partially met NYS Standards in Math.
- Overall, there was a performance gap of 13.6% for English proficient vs. LEP students that met or exceeded NYS Standards in Math.
- Grade three LEP students had the highest percentage of students that met NYS Standards in Math (83.8%).
- Grade four had the greatest percentage of LEP students that partially met or did not meet NYS Standards in Math (57.6%)
- Grade four students demonstrated the biggest performance gap of 21.5% between EP vs. LEP students that met or exceeded NYS Standards in Math (EP = 79% vs. LEP = 57.6%).

Due to the insignificant number of students on each grade taking the translated version of this exam, it is difficult to draw conclusions.

NYSAA Math – Grades 4 & 5

- Two ESL students took the NYSAA in Math and both scored a Level 4. Thus, 100% (2/2) of the students exceeded NYSAA Standards in Math.

NYS Science – Grade 4

- 25.2% (31) LEP students were tested. 54.8% (17) were males and 45.2% (14) were females. By ethnicity, 9.7% (3) are White, 6.4% (2) are Asian, and 83.9% (26) are Hispanic.

- Overall, 45.2% (14) of those LEP students tested scored Levels 3 & 4 and met or exceeded NYS Standards in Science. 25.8% (8) scored Level 2 and partially met State Standards in Science. 29% (9) scored Level 1 and did not meet State Standards in Science.
- By gender, 47.1% (8/17) of the LEP males scored Levels 3 & 4 versus 42.8% (6/14) of the LEP females scored Levels 3 & 4. The difference in performance by gender for Limited English Proficient students was 4.3%.

Due to the insignificant number of students that took the translated version of this exam, it is difficult to draw conclusions.

NYS Social Studies – Grade 5

- 32.4% (45) LEP students were tested. 55.5% (25) were males and 44.5% (20) were females. By ethnicity, 2.2% (1) are White, 8.9% (4) are Asian, and 88.9% (40) are Hispanic.
- 26.7% (12) of those LEP students tested scored Level 3 and met State Standards in Social Studies. 20% (9) scored Level 2, and 53.3% (24) scored Level 1.
- By gender, 36% (9/25) of the LEP males scored Level 3 versus 15% (3/20) of the LEP females that scored Level 3. The difference in performance by gender for Limited English Proficient students was 21%.

Due to the insignificant number of students that took the translated version of this exam, it is difficult to draw conclusions.

NYSSA Social Studies

- One ESL student took the NYSAA in Social Studies and scored a Level 4. Thus, 100% (1/1) exceeded NYSAA Standards in Social Studies.

ELL Periodic Assessments

Our ELLs will take two interim assessments during this academic school year (Fall/Spring). These assessments are used by administration, ELL teachers, and classroom teachers to inform instruction. First, the data is reviewed and analyzed by administration. Then, areas of concern, patterns/trends, and students that are not testing well are targeted. Administration also makes executive decisions to align professional development offered with these needs. Next, time is allocated during coaching sessions and grade conferences so teachers can learn how to understand the student achievement data then, they meet and reflect upon this data in order to make informed instructional decisions so that student learning can continue to improve on a continuous basis.

Finally, we evaluate our ELL programs through informal/formal observations, teacher feedback, walkthroughs, and by reviewing and analyzing data that reflects student achievement and is later discussed during cabinet meetings. They are also reviewed and analyzed during grade conferences and common planning sessions that are conducted by our literacy coach to determine each program's effectiveness and student success.

Part IV/Part B:

Our school uses the following tools to assess early literacy skills of our ELL students: Teachers College running records, Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark assessments, Headsprout, and Teachers College Writing on Demand.

Overall ELLs 2008-2009

Grade	September '08	November '08	March '09	June '09
1	27.2%	4.35%	12.91%	12.91%
2	3.45%	6.66%	24.14%	28.57%
3	44.2%	43.3%	44.6%	43.94%
4	22.9%	24.0%	20.7%	27.59%
5	6.6%	6.6%	27.7%	20.0%

*** Percentage of Students reading on or above by Grade Level (According to TCRWP and Fountas & Pinnell Benchmarks)**

The data above has provided us with valuable information that helped our school make important instructional plans for the 2009-2010 school year. We programmed our ESL teachers to push-in during Readers and Writers Workshop for all grades in order to promote their literacy skills. Wordly Wise is now a component of our Word Work period for all grades in order to develop their knowledge of words and enhance content learning. The structure of the Readers Workshop work period now incorporates two guided reading lessons, which utilizes the data collected from these assessment tools. Further, informal assessments are now conducted more frequently in order to monitor and assess student progress.

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) 3-5

Number of Students to be Served: 70 LEP _____ Non-LEP _____

Number of Teachers 6 Other Staff (Specify) _____

School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview

Title III, Part A LEP Program

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

P.S. 239 Title III program provides ELLs with supplemental services and resource materials through the following:

- **Extended Day P.M. Program (Tues., Wed. & Thurs.) 3:30-5:00 p.m.**
- **Parenting Class: Lifeskills through Literacy (Tues & Thurs.) 3:30-5:00 p.m.**

This Title III program has been designed to support our school's instructional goals and clearly addresses vital areas of need that our English Language Learners have in Grades 2-5. Social Studies was a content area that our students made the least amount of academic gains as per our students' results on the NYS Social Studies Exam in 2008. Further, the 2009 NYSESLAT results and other data sources has helped us discover that our beginner ELL students made the least amount of gains in terms of English-Language acquisition and need more structured communication activities in order to promote the integration of speaking, listening, reading, and writing in ways that reflect natural language use. Further, the data revealed that 46.9% (112/239) of our students did not move from one level of proficiency to the next on the NYSESLAT exam due to their reading and writing skills; thus requiring them to remain at the lower proficiency level. An analysis of student work based on Writing on Demands and published pieces has also confirmed that our students' writing skills is an area of need in Grades 2-5.

We will form **one beginner and three intermediate/advanced classes**. This program will start in January and run through April and has been designed to service approximately 70 students. The students will receive supplemental services from four common branch teachers and one fully-certified ESL teacher who will co-teach with every class for a minimum of 100 minutes a week (two 50 minute sessions) in order to provide rigorous ESL strategies that will enhance and support their learning of Social Studies content. The ESL teacher will co-teach and use the following scaffolding strategies such as conversational prompts, graphic organizers, TPR (Total Physical Response), word banks, visuals, Shared Reading and Writing with the beginner ESL students in order to build their knowledge of the social studies content. For the advanced/intermediate students the ESL teacher will continue to use rigorous ESL strategies, with a strong emphasis on Writing. Interactive Reading and Writing, story maps, and **POWER (Prewriting, Organizing, Writing, Escaping, and Rewriting)** will be used to guide English Language Learners and empower them as writers in conjunction with a technology tool called **MY Access!** Further, a supervisor must be hired and their salary has been incorporated into the budget

since it is the **only after-school program** that has been organized for 2009-2010 school year. We will invite approx. **40 newcomers who are at the beginner proficiency level** in grades 3 and 4 so that we can organize one class. The students will use **Imagine Learning** in order to strengthen their language development and build a foundation that will support their understanding of the Social Studies. Further, we will invite approx. **50 intermediate and advanced proficiency level** students in grades 3-5 and organize three additional classes who will receive instruction using a technology tool called **MY Access!** to support our students writing needs/goals. These technology tools are supplemental resources that will only be used during this after-school program to build their second-language literacy skills in conjunction with grade appropriate social studies curriculum topics.

In order to promote their content knowledge in Social Studies, topics have been selected in alignment with the NYC Scope and Sequence by grade level. The students in Grade 3 will be focusing on the essential features of a community. Grade 4 will be focusing on various aspects of Local and State Government so that students will gain knowledge of the basic rights and responsibilities of being a good citizen. Grade 5 will be focusing on the conservation of resources that have helped and continue to shape our nation by exploring such topics as geography and economics.

ELL students in Grades 3 and 4 who are newcomers and at the **beginner proficiency level** will receive instruction using the research-based computer program called **Imagine Learning**, which is correlated to the English Language Development Standards. This technology tool customizes the language support they will receive because the instruction is individualized through an automated adaptive curriculum. English language learners will use the computer to navigate through a variety of authentic communicative experiences. The students will listen and see new words to enhance their vocabulary and locate and review words they have previously stored by category in a word book. To authenticate the students' listening and speaking skills they will learn songs to encourage experimentation with the English language, watch video clips to learn common conversational phrases, and can record the newly learned phrases and listen to their own recordings. This program also teaches the students to recognize and read sight words to foster their independent reading skills. First-language support is another important feature that students can access and strategically remove as they become more familiar with the English language.

ELL students in Grades 3-5 who are at the **intermediate and advanced proficiency level** will receive writing instruction using a web-based instructional tool called **MY Access!** This multi-functional program is aligned with NYS standards, and provides cross-curricular writing opportunities in social studies in order to link writing skills and content area knowledge. The teachers will guide the students through pre-writing activities, review exemplar papers using the prompts available in order to write persuasive, literary, expository, and informational genres. Their writing will also be assessed by the teacher on an ongoing basis and through the instant diagnostic feedback provided by this web-delivered program.

The students will have a variety of self-assessment tools accessible to them to support their writing needs such as: writing checklists, rubrics, word counter, word bank, and MY Editor. MY Editor provides individualized grammar support. Further, an online portfolio is maintained for every student that includes their drafts, revisions, and feedback. These portfolios are accessible to school administrators and classroom teachers to further assist them with the writing process and to align instruction with the students' targeted writing goals and needs.

The **Parent Involvement** component of this program will provide our ELL Parents with weekly sessions on Wednesdays and Thursdays. This class will be geared to adult beginning learners of English. Basic language skills will be the primary focus in order to help adult learners acquire communication and literacy skills necessary to function in everyday situations. Learning will be scaffolded to support their acquisition of

conversational skills in English as well as learn the expected social behaviors of their new culture. In addition, several sessions will be conducted in the computer lab to familiarize them with technology resources such as Acuity, ARIS, and My Access! to support their students' academic learning. Further, web-browsing that emphasizes links to educational products, homework help, and health and safety are topics that will be covered.

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

Professional development will be coordinated by the principal, assistant principals and literacy coach. The professional development will address the needs of the staff in order to build their capacity to implement the NYS ESL standards, and meet the academic, emotional, and social needs of the students. Further, a survey was conducted to specifically pinpoint teachers' instructional needs. **Imagine Learning** will provide those teachers of beginner/intermediate proficiency level with six hours of professional development. **My Access!** will provide those teachers of intermediate and advanced learners two full days of training. This training will show the teachers how to strategically group students, customize writing assignments, and teach students how to set measurable and achievable writing goals in order to support student success.

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

School: P.S. 239 **BEDS Code:** 342400010239

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

Allocation Amount: \$36,000.00		
Budget Category	Budgeted Amount	Explanation of expenditures in this category as it relates to the program narrative for this title.

Professional salaries (schools must account for fringe benefits) - Per session - Per diem	\$21,572	<i>Teachers – 337 hours = \$16,813@ 49.89 per hour</i> <i>Supervisor – 51 hours = \$2,663 @ 52.21 per hour</i> <i>Teacher (Adult Learning) – 42 hours = \$2,096.00 @ 49.89 per hour</i> <i>Per Session Extended Day ELL Program</i>
Purchased services - High quality staff and curriculum development contracts.		
Supplies and materials - Must be supplemental. - Additional curricula, instructional materials. - Must be clearly listed.	\$2,915.00	<i>Schlessinger Media: DVD Series (My Community, American Government, Map Skills, and Economics) = \$ 700.00</i> <i>Capstone Books: Social Studies related literature: (My Community, Community Helpers, Our Government, Voting & Elections, US Senate, US Presidency, Needs and Wants) = \$1,000.00</i> <i>Crabtree Library Books: Social Studies related literature (Government, Economics in Action, Energy Revolution, Green Team Series, Green Collar Career Series) = \$650.00</i> <i>(<u>Adult Learning</u>): 30 Literacy Plus Student Books + Teacher’s Edition = \$ 565.00</i>
Educational Software (Object Code 199)	\$8,600.00	<i>Imagine Learning = \$3,000.00</i> <i>20 Software Licenses for Beginning ELL Students</i> <i>My Access =\$ 5,600.00</i> <i>40 Software Licenses for Intermediate/Advanced ELL Students + (Professional Development)</i>
Travel	N/A	N/A
Other	\$1,800.00	<i>Parent Involvement: Refreshments for Adult Learning Classes - \$500.00</i> <i>Consumables (Notebooks, Folders, Paper, Charts) – \$1,300.00</i>
TOTAL	\$34,887	

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.

A review of the HLIS form was conducted. The most common language identified was Spanish. Spanish translations, oral and written, will be provided by school staff in a timely and appropriate fashion. In the event that additional translations are needed, we will use the services of a contracted translation agency.

The findings were shared with the school community at Faculty Conferences and PTA meetings.

Language	Number of Parents Requiring Oral and/or Written Translation
Albanian	4
Arabic	18
Polish	12
Spanish	200
Nepalese	8

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.

The greatest need, based on a review of HLIS form, is for Spanish written translations and oral interpretation. The school community was informed of our translation and interpretation needs and services via faculty conferences and PTA meetings.

Part B: Strategies and Activities

1. Describe the written translation services the school will provide, and how they will meet identified needs indicated in Part A. Include procedures to ensure timely provision of translated documents to parents determined to be in need of language assistance services. Indicate whether written translation services will be provided by an outside vendor, or in-house by school staff or parent volunteers. **The school will provide written translations of all forms pertaining to students' health, safety, disciplinary matters and permission slips/consent. These written translations will be provided in a timely fashion by an in-house staff member and the services of the DOE translation unit.**
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. **Oral interpretation services will be provided to parents during monthly parent meetings, disciplinary meetings, registration, parent-teacher conferences and parent workshops. Interpretation services will be provided by an in-house school staff, parent volunteer and outside DOE contracted vendors.**
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>.

Parental notification of translation services available will be conspicuously posted at the school entrance. Contact numbers regarding language assistance will be made available to parents at parent meetings and in the main office. Information pertaining to translation and interpretations will be included in the Safety Plan.

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:	\$512,105	\$43,029	\$555,134
2. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside for Parent Involvement:	\$5,121		
3. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside to Improve Parent Involvement (ARRA Language):		\$430	
4. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified:	\$25,605		
5. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect – HQ PD (ARRA Language):		\$2,152	
6. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Professional Development:	\$51,210		
7. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect (Professional Development) (ARRA Language):		\$4,303	

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 & SCHOOL-PARENT COMPACT

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

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

P.S. 239Q’s PARENT INVOLVEMENT POLICY

P.S. 239Q, in compliance with Title I/PCEN mandates, has implemented a parent involvement policy strengthening the link between the school and the community. P.S. 239Q’s policy is designed to keep parents informed about their public schools by actively involving them in planning and decision-making. Parents are encouraged to participate on the School Leadership Team, the Parent Teacher Association, the Parent Advisory Council, as trained volunteers, and as members of the school’s professional development committee. Educational research has shown a positive correlation between parental involvement and student achievement. The overall aim of the policy is to develop a parent involvement program that will build a home-school partnership that assists parents in acquiring effective parenting skills, provide parents with the information and training needed to effectively become involved in planning and decision making, increase their understanding of the role of the home in enriching education and improving student achievement, and the development of positive attitudes toward the school community as a whole.

The policy is composed of various elements that vary in scope and intensity to meet the diverse needs of the school’s parents. The policy encompasses all parents including parents of ESL, bilingual and special education students. The policy is designed based upon a careful assessment of parents’ needs and the evaluation of the effectiveness of the Title I/ PCEN Parent Involvement Program.

In developing the P.S. 239Q Parent Involvement Policy, executive board members of the Parent Teacher Association and parent members of the School Leadership Team were consulted on the proposed Parent Involvement Policy and asked to survey its members for additional input.

Elections

Elections will be held in conjunction with the Parent Teacher Association elections. The Nominating Committee will canvass the general membership at the March meeting and in writing. The election will occur in June.

To increase parent involvement, P.S. 239Q will:

- Actively involve parents in planning, reviewing and improving the funded programs and parent involvement policy of the school.
- Address any concern raised by parents about Title I Funded Programs at the Parent Teacher Association meetings with the PAC representative.
- Support school committees that include parents such as, the School Leadership Team, Parent Teacher Association, and School Professional Development Advisory Committee.
- Support the school parent coordinator to coordinate all parent activities and serve as a liaison between parents and the school.
- Maintain a parent coordinator in P.S. 239Q to serve as a liaison between the school and the parent community. This parent coordinator will provide parent workshops based on the assessed needs of the parents at the school site. These workshops may include parenting skills and curriculum based workshops to build parents' capacity to help their children at home. Assist in evaluating the effectiveness of the parent involvement program.
- Provide parent workshops at all Parent Association meetings and/or workshops on curriculum, parenting skills, etc. upon request.
- Provide a school informational meeting on all programs in the school.
- Provide written translations in various languages, whenever possible.
- Discuss students' progress, and encourage home-school extension activities to help parents raise their children's achievement levels. Written and verbal progress reports are periodically given to keep parents abreast of their children's progress.
- Encourage school-level parental involvement by:
 - Establishing a Title I Parent Advisory Council committee
 - Develop a school-parent compact
 - Develop a school parent involvement policy
 - Maintain 50% parent participation on the School Leadership Team

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

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

SCHOOL – PARENT COMPACT

School Responsibilities

P.S. 239 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: ongoing staff development for all teachers, literacy coach, guidance counselors, parent coordinator, and administration.**
- 2. Hold parent-teacher conferences during which this compact will be discussed as it relates to the individual child's achievement. Specifically, those conferences will be held in November and March. In addition, upon request, parents may obtain classroom progress reports from student personnel.**
- 3. Provide parents with frequent reports on their children's progress. Specifically, the school will provide reports as follows: Weekly reports can be obtained from individual classroom teachers, AIS personnel, SETTS on request.**
- 4. Provide parents reasonable access to staff. Specifically, staff will be available for consultation with parents as follows: The Parent Coordinator is available daily from 8:00AM to 4:00PM and at other times upon request. Other staff members are available by appointment.**
- 5. Provide parents with opportunities to volunteer and participate and or observe classroom activities, as follows: during open school week, held annually in November; other volunteer opportunities as individual classroom need arises.**
- 6. Involve parents in the planning, review, and improvement of the school's parent involvement policy, in an organized, ongoing, and timely way.**
- 7. Involve parents in the joint development of any Comprehensive Educational Plan in an organized, ongoing and timely way.**
- 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 parent 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, 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 possible, 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, and language arts.
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 such as:

1. Making sure that our children go to school each day and on time and ensuring that they are picked up from school on time
2. Making sure that homework is completed
3. Monitoring the amount of television that our children watch
4. Volunteering in my child's school and attending workshops, focus groups and other parent activities as offered
5. Participating, as appropriate, in decisions relating to my children's education
6. Promoting positive use of my child's extracurricular time
7. 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
8. Serving, to the extent possible, on policy advisory groups, such as being the Title I, Part A parent representative on the School Improvement Team, the Title I Policy Advisory Committee, the District Wide Policy Advisory Council, and SLT.

SIGNATURES:

SCHOOL

PARENT(S)

DATE

DATE

(Please note that signatures are not required)

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.

All students are assessed through the use of informal and formal assessments, NYC Predictives & ITA's, Fountas & Pinnell Benchmark Assessments, teacher conference notes, writing samples, running records, unit assessments in all content areas, school report cards and state assessments. These results are analyzed and based on these findings; students are provided with additional services to best meet their assessed needs.

2. Schoolwide reform strategies that:
 - a) Provide opportunities for all children to meet the State's proficient and advanced levels of student academic achievement.
 - b) Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically-based research that:
 - o Increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as extended school year, before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities.
 - o Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.
 - o Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.
 - o Address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of low academic achieving children and those at risk of not meeting the State academic content standards and are members of the target population of any program that is included in the Schoolwide Program. These programs may include counseling, pupil services, mentoring services, college and career awareness/preparation, and the integration of vocational and technical education programs.
 - o Are consistent with and are designed to implement State and local improvement, if any.
 - c) Provide opportunities for all children to meet the State's proficient and advanced levels of student academic achievement.
 - d) Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically-based research that:
 - o Increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as extended school year, before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities.
 - o Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.
 - o Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.
 - o Address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of low academic achieving children and those at risk of not meeting the State academic content standards and are members of the target population of any program that is included in the Schoolwide Program. These programs may include counseling, pupil services, mentoring services, college and career awareness/preparation, and the integration of vocational and technical education programs.
 - o Are consistent with and are designed to implement State and local improvement, if any.
- A.** All of our students are provided with the opportunity to meet the state's proficient and advanced levels of student

academic achievement through a strong balanced literacy and mathematics program.

- B. Summer School is provided for those students, grades 3-5 who are at-risk or identified as far below state standards. These services are provided pending funding.

Our AIS providers supplement our instructional program by providing small group instruction to those students at-risk of not meeting state standards. Programs include Headsprout, Wordly Wise 3000, and Fountas and Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention in addition to our balanced literacy and mathematics programs.

Through our balanced literacy and mathematics programs we provide a daily three-period literacy block and a daily 60-75 minute mathematics block providing our students with extended instruction in the major content areas.

Our 50-Minute program focuses on meeting the needs of our at-risk students in a small group setting. Programs include: Headsprout, Wilson, and guided reading strategies. In mathematics, we use Groundworks.

Our Extended Day Programs before, after and/or on Saturdays (pending funding) provide our students with the opportunity for small group project-based instruction in literacy and mathematics based on their identified needs (both for enrichment and remediation) using content area materials in social studies and science.

3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.

According to our last completed BEDS Survey for school year 2008-09, 100% of our staff is highly qualified as per state education requirements.

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.

High quality, ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, paraprofessionals and parents is provided as needed through in-house professional development, and DOE professional opportunities.

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

- Attend citywide job fairs.
- Contact local colleges and universities
- Search D.O.E. on-line website

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

Through our parent coordinator's efforts, we will provide parental involvement activities that may include:

- Parent Workshops
- Family Math Night
- Literacy Fair
- **ESL and/or Computer Programs**

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.

Our pre-school students and parents are invited to a kindergarten orientation held every June. The orientation provides parents with information regarding the instructional programs and offers a tour of the facility.

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.

Our School Leadership Team comprised of administrators, teachers and parents meets monthly to discuss the instructional programs and types of academic assessments used. Professional development in data analysis is provided to all teachers. Our literacy coach and administrators assist our teachers in analyzing the academic assessments and plan instruction in order to best meet the needs of our students.

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 first through fifth grade students who receive AIS support within their classrooms are provided with small group and one-on-one instruction during reading workshop on a daily basis. This environment has proven to be more conducive to learning and successful for our at-risk students. Strategy and skill-based lessons are given with teaching points directly targeted to suit individual student needs. During these sessions, strategies of successful readers are modeled and then attempted by each student individually.

In addition, some students who are reading below level participate in Headsprout, a computer assisted reading program. Some students reading below level also participate in Fountas and Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention, an intensive small group reading program.

The second through fifth grade students who receive math AIS support within their classroom are provided with small group and one-on-one instruction during math workshop on a daily basis. This environment has proven to be more conducive to learning and successful for at-risk students. Strategy and skill-based lessons are given with teaching points directly targeted to suit individual needs. During these sessions, strategies of successful mathematicians are modeled and then attempted by each student individually, often through hands-on activities.

Our 50-Minute program focuses on meeting the needs of our at-risk students in a small group setting. Programs include: Headsprout, Wilson, Fountas and Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention, small group reading strategies, and building reading stamina. In mathematics, we use Groundworks.

Our Extended Day Programs before, after and/or on Saturdays (pending funding) provide our students with the opportunity for small group project-based instruction in literacy and mathematics based on their identified needs (both for enrichment and remediation) using content area materials in social studies and science.

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.

As a schoolwide program school, we integrate the use of our Tax Levy, Title 1, and Contract for Excellence funds to support the supplementary services and programs designed to meet the needs of all of our students with a particular focus on those at greatest risk.

Part D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

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

Part A: For All Schools Identified for Improvement

1. For each area of school improvement identification (indicated on your pre-populated School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot, downloadable from your school’s NYCDOE webpage under “Statistics”), describe the school’s findings of the specific academic issues that caused the school to be identified.

NOT APPLICABLE

2. Describe the focused intervention(s) the school will implement to support improved achievement in the grade and subject areas for which the school was identified. Be sure to include strategies to address the needs of all disaggregated groups that failed to meet the AMO, Safe Harbor, and/or 95% participation rate requirement. Note: If this question was already addressed elsewhere in this plan, you may refer to the page numbers where the response can be found.

Part B: For Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1. As required by NCLB legislation, a school identified for school improvement must spend not less than 10 percent of its Title I funds for each fiscal year that the school is in school improvement status for professional development. The professional development must be high quality and address the academic area(s) identified. Describe how the 10 percent of the Title I funds for professional development (amounts specified in Part A of Appendix 4) will be used to remove the school from school improvement.

NOT APPLICABLE

2. Describe the teacher-mentoring program that will be incorporated as part of the school’s strategy for providing high-quality professional development.
3. Describe how the school will notify parents about the school’s identification for school improvement in an understandable and uniform format and to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand.

¹ School Under Registration Review (SURR)

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

All SURR schools must complete this appendix.

SURR Area(s) of Identification: _____ **NOT APPLICABLE**

SURR Group/Phase: _____ **Year of Identification:** _____ **Deadline Year:** _____

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

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

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Background

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

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

CURRICULUM AUDIT FINDINGS

KEY FINDING 1: CURRICULUM

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

1A. English Language Arts

Background

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

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

ELA Alignment Issues:

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

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

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

– **English Language Learners**

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

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

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

The administration, the School Leadership Team Committee and the data specialist met to assess whether this finding was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee reviewed the units of study, pacing calendars and student data, both formal and informal, and compared this data to state standards to determine whether there was relevance to the audit's findings and our school's literacy program.

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?

We feel our literacy program and our unit checklists clearly indicate what students should know and be able to do for each unit of study for each grade. These unit checklists address content topics and skills to be mastered and strategies to be utilized. We found a need to clearly tell our students what outcomes are expected. Therefore, the administration and literacy coach will continue to fine-tune rubrics. There needs to be consistency across the school on how rubrics are being presented to the students so that they have a clearer expectation of what their final published piece should look like. In addition, we also found the need for students to have more opportunities for accountable talk. ELL learning standards also need to be addressed in order to reinforce ELL teaching strategies.

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

We will continue to address the findings stated above by:

- **Providing professional development on fine tuning rubrics**
 - **Providing professional development focusing on listening/speaking standards and addressing those standards within accountable talk**
 - **Continuing ongoing professional development on ELL learning standards and ELL teaching strategies**
-

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.

The administration, the School Leadership Team Committee and the data specialist met to assess whether this finding was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee reviewed the Everyday Math units, pacing calendars and student data both formal and informal and compared this data to state standards to determine whether there was relevance to the audit's findings and our school's mathematics program.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

The evidence found that teachers were not explicitly aware of the process strands because they are embedded in the Everyday Math curriculum. Due to the spiraling within the Everyday Math curriculum, there is a lack of depth of instruction within each unit of study since not every concept is a secure goal in every grade.

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.

We will continue to address the findings stated above by:

- **Providing professional development to strengthen teacher awareness of what content and process strands are and where they are found within the curriculum.**
- **Providing professional development to outline the lessons content and process strands.**

KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION

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

2A – ELA Instruction

Classroom observations in audited schools show that direct instruction was the dominant instructional orientation for ELA instruction in almost 62 percent of K–8 classrooms. (In direct instruction, the teacher may use lecture- or questioning-type format. It includes instances

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

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

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

The administration, the School Leadership Team Committee and the data specialist met to assess whether this finding was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee reviewed the units of study, pacing calendars and student data, both formal and informal, and compared this data to state standards to determine whether there was relevance to the audit's findings and our school's literacy program.

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?

Through our Balanced Literacy model, students participate in daily whole group and small group instruction to promote high student engagement and differentiated instruction. During daily work periods, students are gathered in small groups or individually and are provided with differentiated instruction to address their assessed needs. The grouping of students is flexible in order to address students' individualized needs.

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.

N/A

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.

The administration, the School Leadership Team Committee and the data specialist met to assess whether this finding was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee reviewed the Everyday Math units, pacing calendars and student data, both formal and informal, and compared this data to state standards to determine whether there was relevance to the audit's findings and our school's mathematics program.

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?

During the math period, in addition to hands-on learning and table work, the students participate in math centers. In math centers, students are given the opportunity to participate in numerous Everyday Math games while the classroom teacher addresses individualized student needs. In addition, students also work on computers to sharpen their math skills.

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.

N/A

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

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.

The administration, the School Leadership Team Committee and the data specialist met to assess whether this finding was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee reviewed teacher data to determine whether there was relevance to the audit's findings and our school's literacy 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?

On average, we have approximately ten new teachers every year due to the growth of our student population, maternity leaves, and teacher movement out of state or to the suburbs. This has impeded our ability to build the capacity of all teachers to the next level. Having to focus on training new teachers year after year has impacted on student achievement. However, due to budget cuts, we have no new teachers in the building for the 2009/2010 school year.

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.

In order to address our high turnover rate of teaching staff we continually provide new teachers with:

- **A mentor to work with new staff a minimum of twice a week**
- **Differentiated professional development in order to meet the vast needs of our professional community**
- **Interclass visitations to build teaching capacity**

KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

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

The administration, the School Leadership Team Committee and the data specialist met to assess whether this finding was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee reviewed ELL professional development opportunities to determine whether there was relevance to the audit's findings and our school's educational program.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

Teachers are offered the opportunity to attend numerous ELL professional development given by the city and ICI. In addition, as a school community, ELL professional development is provided on a consistent basis in order to meet the needs of our growing ELL population. We make sure that professional development is turn-keyed to all staff members.

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.

The administration, the School Leadership Team Committee and the data specialist met to assess whether this finding was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee reviewed the dissemination of ELL data and the monitoring of ELL academic progress to determine whether there was relevance to the audit's findings and our school's educational program.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

Every June and/or September, depending when available, testing data including NYS ELA and math assessment, and NYSESLAT, are reported to all teachers of ELL students. In addition, informal student data is assessed continuously throughout the year by weekly conferring sessions and running records and Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessments that are conducted 3 times a year.

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.

The administration, the School Leadership Team and the data specialist met to assess whether this finding was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee reviewed professional development protocols that had been offered to general education teachers, special education teachers and support staff to determine whether there was relevance to the audit's findings to our school's professional development in special education.

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?

A majority of our staff members have received intensive professional development in programs such as Schools Attuned, the Therapeutic Crisis Intervention System (TCI) for behavior management, as well as participated in a number of workshops provided by the ISC to expand their knowledge base on the development of IEPs. However, it was determined that due to our high rate of turnover in our teaching staff; professional development will continue to be provided in order to maintain a high rate of quality in developing and implementing Individual Education Plans for our students population.

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.

In order to address the need to keep staff members aware of instructional approaches to improve student performance and to maintain the integrity of the IEP process, we will continue to:

- **Provide professional development to new staff members on Schools Attuned techniques and strategies.**
- **Use common preps in the school schedule for general education and special education specialists to discuss the implementation of IEPs for their various students.**
- **Utilize the expertise of the Network Support Specialist from the ISC to provide additional professional development in implementing IEPs.**

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

Although IEPs clearly specify testing accommodations and/or modifications for students with disabilities, they do *not* consistently specify accommodations and/or modifications for the *classroom environment* (including instruction). Further, there appears to be lack of alignment between the goals, objectives, and modified promotion criteria that are included in student IEPs and the content on which these students

are assessed on grade-level state tests. Finally, IEPs do not regularly include behavioral plans—including behavioral goals and objectives—even for students with documented behavioral issues and concerns.

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

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

The administration, the School Leadership Team, the data specialist and the IEP teacher met to assess whether this finding was relevant to our school's educational program. The committee reviewed a sampling of our students' Individualized Education Plans (IEPs). The IEPs and student data, both informal and formal data as well as criteria for promotion were compared to the learning standards to determine whether this finding is relevant to the audit's finding and our school's Individual Education Programs.

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?

The administration and the IEP team will continue to fine tune the utilization of grade specific performance indicators provided by Special Education Training and Resource Center. There needs to be an enhancement in the uniformity of the development of goals, objectives as well as modified promotional criteria which in turn addresses the impact of students' strengths and weaknesses on their progress and /or involvement on grade level content areas.

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.

We will address the findings stated above by:

- **Providing professional development on utilizing the New York State education grade specific performance indicators to develop appropriately aligned goals, objectives and modified promotion criteria that meet present academic performance and learning characteristics of the special needs student.**
- **Continuing ongoing professional development on utilizing Acuity test results and resources to design goals and objectives which specifically address the individual academic needs of students being assessed.**

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

This appendix will not be required for 2009-10.

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

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

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:

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

Supporting Students in Temporary Housing (STH)

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

Part A: FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

1. Please identify the number of Students in Temporary Housing who are currently attending your school. (Please note that your current STH population may not be the same as officially reported in DOE systems and may change over the course of the year.)
The number of students in temporary housing is currently 5.
2. Please describe the services you are planning to provide to the STH population.

It is the goal of P.S. 239 to provide all students with the necessary support to help them achieve their academic potential. We provide our STH students with academic intervention services, guidance services and any other services deemed necessary. The parent coordinator will collaborate with the guidance counselor to provide resources for parents.

Part B: FOR NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

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