



P.S. 053 BAY TERRACE

2009-10

SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)

SCHOOL: P.S. 053 BAY TERRACE
ADDRESS: 330 DURANT AVENUE, STATEN ISLAND, NY,
10308
TELEPHONE: 718-987-8020
FAX: 718-987-3675

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

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

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: 31R053 **SCHOOL NAME:** P.S. 053 Bay Terrace

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 330 DURANT AVENUE, STATEN ISLAND, NY, 10308

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 718-987-8020 **FAX:** 718-987-3675

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Annette Esposito **EMAIL ADDRESS** aesposi@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION / TITLE **PRINT/TYPE NAME**
SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON: Paul Reformato

PRINCIPAL: Annette Esposito

UFT CHAPTER LEADER: Sharon Coughlin

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT: Michele Squicciarini

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE:
(Required for high schools) _____

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL SUPPORT ORGANIZATION (SSO) INFORMATION

DISTRICT: 31 **SSO NAME:** Empowerment Support Organization

SSO NETWORK LEADER: Opromalla, Neal

SUPERINTENDENT: Margaret Schultz Margaret Schultz

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

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

Name	Position and Constituent Group Represented	Signature
Annette Esposito	Principal	Electronic Signature Approved.
Paul Reformato	Admin/CSA	Electronic Signature Approved.
Carol Bilbao	UFT Member	Electronic Signature Approved.
Roseann DiMambro	UFT Member	Electronic Signature Approved.
Estelle Manzi	UFT Member	Electronic Signature Approved.
Irva Schulman	Parent	Electronic Signature Approved.
Barbara Avenoso	Parent	Electronic Signature Approved.
Christine Mazola	Parent	Electronic Signature Approved.
Frank Squicciarini	Parent	Electronic Signature Approved.
Michele Squicciarini	PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	Electronic Signature Approved.

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

* Core (mandatory) SLT members.

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

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

The Bay Terrace School is an elementary school serving 712 students in Pre-Kindergarten through Grade 5. We are based in a middle-class neighborhood in Staten Island, New York, and are comprised of a dedicated staff of teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals, and other significant individuals. The entire faculty strives to make each student happy and eager to learn while attending school.

Our curriculum is coherent and instruction is differentiated to meet the needs of all students in both general and special education. A product of the technical age, we provide wireless access to the Internet, laptops, and SMART Boards in all classrooms. Our science lab provides hands on experiments on a routine basis. Conscious of our environment, we have 'gone green' and conserve the use of paper and energy when feasible. The entire school participates in a recycling program and fifth grade students make up a recycling committee.

Family involvement is an essential ingredient for a successful educational program. Parents are involved in various activities and workshops throughout the course of the year. i.e. family involvement night, PTA meetings, and parent workshops. Many initiatives are put into place in conjunction with the parent coordinator and PTA President. P.S. 53 provides instructional and social programs such as Latchkey and After School Programs, such as Drama, Sports, Lego Robotics , and Science Wizards. A partnership with the community enriches our learning environment with programs such as Reading Volunteers, Common Cents Penny Harvest, Project Hospitality, Safe House, March of Dimes, Ann Douglas Betta Place Project, Heartwood School, and Bank Street School American History Project and Eger Nursing Home. We are proud of our "Partnership in Education" with the US Coast Guard.

P.S. 53 showcases its talents by entering various contests. We participate in Spelling Bees, Choral Concerts, Ezra Jack Keats Book making Contest, Storytelling Festival, Poetry Festival, Math Blaster, Water Conservation, Science Expo, Ecology Fair and Fourth Grade "Readers are Leaders."

We have initiated the use of computer technology to communicate with parents and teachers i.e.: school-wide initiatives, PTA information, classroom activities and morning announcements. Technology is being used to share information and best practices in classrooms. We have also initiated an instructional strategy schoolwide, the "Word Wizard" program which enhances the use of vocabulary.

We have maintained teacher collaboration and staff development through two common preparation periods per week where teachers, coaches, administrators and the Inquiry Team come together and decide what needs should be addressed to target our student population. Inquiry work is part of our extended day program for teachers. On Wednesdays, teachers are involved in goal setting, monitoring summative and formative assessments. and working with ARIS, Acuity, and planning for inquiry students.

Student attendance this year is approximately 95%. Incentives provided by the school are helping to attain this. Global Connect calls parents to notify them of their child's absences or latenesses.

The Independent Investigation Method (a successful research program) is in K-5. Currently we are serving students with an art, band, and music program to further their education in the Arts.

SECTION III - Cont'd

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT					
School Name:	P.S. 053 Bay Terrace				
District:	31	DBN #:	31R053	School BEDS Code #:	31R053

DEMOGRAPHICS									
Grades Served in 2008-09:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pre-K	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> K	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 7
	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	<input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 11	<input type="checkbox"/> 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ungraded			
Enrollment:				Attendance: - % of days students attended					
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Pre-K	57	47	36		93.9	93.2	94.4		
Kindergarten	96	112	106						
Grade 1	124	101	111	Student Stability: - % of Enrollment					
Grade 2	115	121	113	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Grade 3	93	109	114		97.5	97.1	95.83		
Grade 4	119	93	112						
Grade 5	102	122	96	Poverty Rate: - % of Enrollment:					
Grade 6	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Grade 7	0	0	0			97.5	97.1		
Grade 8	0	0	0						
Grade 9	0	0	0	Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:					
Grade 10	0	0	0	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Grade 11	0	0	0		0	1	2		
Grade 12	0	0	0						
Ungraded	0	0	1	Recent Immigrants: - Total Number					
Total	706	705	689	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
					0.0	0.0	1		
Special Education Enrollment:				Suspensions: (OSYD Reporting) - Total Number					

(As October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
# in Self-Contained Classes	17	22	27				
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	63	65	56	Principal Suspensions	0	2	TBD
Number all others	53	50	49	Superintendent Suspensions	3	0	TBD
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>							
				Special High School Programs: - Total Number:			
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment (BESIS Survey)				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	CTE Program Participants	0	0	0
# in Trans. Bilingual Classes	0	0	0	Early College HS Participants	0	0	0
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0				
# receiving ESL services only	22	21	17	Number of Staff: - Includes all full-time staff:			
# ELLs with IEPs	2	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
<i>These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.</i>				Number of Teachers	50	57	55
				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	6	10	10
Overage Students: # entering students overage for grade							
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	N/A	7	7
	0	0	0				
				Teacher Qualifications:			
Ethnicity and Gender: % of Enrollment				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100.0	96.5	92.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.6	0.6	0.7	Percent more than two years teaching in this school	72.0	70.2	69.1
Black or African American	1.6	1.7	2.5	Percent more than five years teaching anywhere	60.0	63.2	65.5
Hispanic or Latino	8.2	7.9	9.1				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	2.8	3.6	3.8	Percent Masters Degree or higher	98.0	98.0	100.0
White	86.8	86.2	83.2	Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	98.3	98.6	100.0
Multi-racial							
Male	55.1	55.7	54.9				
Female	44.9	44.3	45.1				

2009-10 TITLE I STATUS

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

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

SURR School: Yes No If yes, area(s) of SURR identification: _____

Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2009-10 Based on 2008-09 Performance):

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In Good Standing (IGS)
<input type="checkbox"/>	School in Need of Improvement (SINI)Improvement - Year 1
<input type="checkbox"/>	School in Need of Improvement (SINI)Improvement - Year 2
<input type="checkbox"/>	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) - Year 1
<input type="checkbox"/>	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) - Year 2/Planning for Restructuring (PFR)
<input type="checkbox"/>	NCLB Restructuring - Year ____
<input type="checkbox"/>	School Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP) - Year ____

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

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

Student Groups	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
	ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad. Rate
All Students	√	√	√			
Ethnicity						
American Indian or Alaska Native	-	-	-			
Black or African American	-	-	-			
Hispanic or Latino	-	-	-			
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	-	-	-			
White	√	√	√			
Other Groups						
Students with Disabilities	√	√	-			
Limited English Proficient	-	-	-			
Economically Disadvantaged	√	√	-			
Student groups making AYP in each subject	4	4	2	0	0	0

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results - 2008-09		Quality Review Results - 2008-09	
Overall Letter Grade	A	Overall Evaluation:	
Overall Score	76.0	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	
School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)	10.9	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	
School Performance (Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)	18.0	Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	
Student Progress (Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)	46.3	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	
Additional Credit	0.8	Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	
<i>Note: Progress Report grades are not yet available for District 75 schools.</i>			

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

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

The percent of students meeting or exceeding State Standards in ELA for the 2008-2009 school year is 91.9%.

The percent of students meeting or exceeding State Standards in Math for the 2008-2009 school year is 99.1.

62.2% of students in grades 3-4-5 made at least one year of progress on the 2008-2009 ELA exam.

80.3% of students in grades 3-4-5 made at least one year of progress on the 2008-2009 State Math exam.

PS 53 was recognized by the United States Department Of Education as a No Child Left Behind Blue Ribbon School. This is awarded to schools performing within the top ten percent of schools nationwide, as measured by state tests in both ELA and Math.

PS 53 received a grade of Well Developed on the Quality Review of December 5-7, 2007. The recommendations made to the school included the following:

To extend the use of action plans to set challenging long term goals that maintain the progress of our level four students.

Continue to use action research programs to identify and improve deficiencies in students' learning.

A significant barrier to the school's continuous improvement is lack of funding.

Since PS 53 received a score of "B" on the 2007-2008 Progress report and received a grade of Well Developed on the Quality Review there was no Quality Review necessary for the 2008-2009 school year.

Additionally, PS 53 received a score of "A" on the Progress report for the 2008-2009 school year.

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

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

Annual Goal	Short Description
Goal 1: By June 2010, there will be a 3-5% increase in the number of students in grades K-5 meeting and or exceeding grade level benchmarks as measured by DRA-2.	After conducting our needs assessment, the SLT determined that there were students who still did not meet grade level standards as measured by the DRA-2 assessment. The SLT determined that an increase in the number of students meeting and or exceeding standards should become a school goal
Goal 2: By June 2010, 90% of the schools' classroom teachers will work on inquiry teams to plan and implement targeted instruction for students performing below grade level standards in ELA as measured by the DRA-2.	After conducting our needs assessment, the SLT determined that in order to move students who are performing below grade level standards in ELA, teachers will need to work in collaboration with their colleagues to analyze student performance data and plan targeted instruction in order to accelerate the reading performance of these students.
Goal 3: By June 2010, 80% of classroom teachers will use student performance data to plan for focused, small group strategy instruction in ELA as measured by classroom walkthroughs and observations.	After conducting our needs assessment, the SLT determined that in order for teachers to plan focused, small group strategy lessons for their students in ELA, they need to become more experienced in the analysis of student performance data.

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) : Reading and Writing

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>Goal 1: By June 2010, there will be a 3-5% increase in the number of students in grades K-5 meeting and or exceeding grade level benchmarks as measured by DRA-2.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>A grant through the Staten Island Foundation (\$9,600) will be used to hire reading and writing consultants from Literacy Support Systems to provide professional development for classroom teachers at the school for eight days (October-May).</p> <p>Bi-weekly common prep periods will be scheduled for all teachers to debrief and plan lessons with consultation. (September-June)</p> <p>Literacy Coach, funded with C4E (\$36,864) and TL (\$48,890) will assist teachers with planning, demonstration lessons, provide feedback to teachers for their lessons, and participate in grade level meetings (September-June).</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant (\$9,600) for Reading and Writing consultants for 8 days on-site (October-May). • Literacy Coach (C4E and TL) • Per diem - 35 days (\$5,400) to provide absence coverage for teachers to attend training • Reading Recovery Teacher - EGCR Federal Programs • Guidance Counselor - 44.59% Fair Student Fund for "at risk" students. • AIS/Data Specialist - TL (DRA-2 training, ARIS training, item analysis by utilizing standardized tests and periodic assessments- (September-June).

<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"> • Students reading and writing folders are kept and reviewed monthly. • Portfolios in reading and writing will be monitored monthly. • Pre and post writing samples will be evaluated using Teachers College Writing Continuum 3 times per year. • Staten Island Foundation Literacy Grant: Monthly agendas Staff Development - Goals/Feedback/Next Steps (Monthly) Final Evaluation in June • DRA-2 Assessments 3 times per year • Standardized Test Scores • Administration walkthroughs and observations.
--	---

Subject Area
(where relevant) :

Inquiry Work

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>Goal 2: By June 2010, 90% of the schools' classroom teachers will work on inquiry teams to plan and implement targeted instruction for students performing below grade level standards in ELA as measured by the DRA-2.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>In September and October all classroom teachers were trained in the use of ARIS:</p> <p>Grade level Inquiry Teams will meet weekly on Wednesday afternoons to engage in Inquiry Work.</p> <p>Core team members (Literacy Coach/Data Specialist/SETTS Teacher, Reading Recovery Teacher, AIS Teacher) will support grade Inquiry Teams in the use of student performance data to select student populations outside the sphere of success, analyze student performance data to determine skill area, reasearch and implement instructional strategies, and monitor effectiveness of instructional strategies.</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>Literacy Coach (C4E and TL)</p> <p>Reading Recovery Teacher (EGCR Federal Program)</p>

	<p>Per Session (Data Specialist allocation)</p> <p>Per diem (prep periods)for Core Team (Inquiry allocation)</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Inquiry Team Profiles on ARIS</p> <p>Inquiry Team Agendas and Minutes</p> <p>Targeted students' progress as measured by teacher made assessments</p> <p>Targeted students' meeting June goal</p>

**Subject Area
(where relevant) :**

ELA

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>Goal 3: By June 2010, 80% of classroom teachers will use student performance data to plan for focused, small group strategy instruction in ELA as measured by classroom walkthroughs and observations.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>Professional Development will be provided to all classroom teachers by grade facilitators on how to analyze data to plan targeted lessons weekly.</p> <p>Teachers will form small groups based on item analysis. Teachers will create targeted lessons for small group instruction. Teachers of grades K-1-2 will attend UFT Teacher Center Professional Development entitled "Guided Reading" 3 times per year.</p> <p>All teachers will receive ongoing support by the Literacy Coach and UFT Teacher Center in planning for small group strategy instruction.</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>Literacy Coach (C4E and TL)</p> <p>Per diem (20 days) Fair Student Funding</p>

	<p>AIS Teacher (TL)</p> <p>Reading Recovery Teacher - (EGCR Federal Program)</p> <p>IEP Teacher (TL IEP Teacher allocation)</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</p> <p><i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Teacher lesson plans, which demonstrate the evidence of small group planning</p> <p>Formal and informal observations</p> <p>Walkthroughs</p> <p>Teacher PD Plans</p>

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010

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

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

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

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

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

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

Grade	ELA	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	At-risk Services: Guidance Counselor	At-risk Services: School Psychologist	At-risk Services: Social Worker	At-risk Health-related Services
	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS				
K	13	13	N/A	N/A	1	3		
1	31	31	N/A	N/A	3	2	1	
2	36	36	N/A	N/A	5	1	2	
3	35	35	N/A	N/A	6			
4	35	35	35	35	6			
5	31	31	31	31	9			
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

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

- o Students in Grade 9 who performed at Level 1 or Level 2 on NYS Grade 8 ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies assessments.
- o Students in Grades 10 – 12 who scored below the approved passing grade on any Regents examination required for graduation in English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies.

Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).
ELA:	<p>Reading Recovery-during the school day</p> <p>Foundations-small group during the school day</p> <p>Wilson-small group during the school day</p> <p>Tune Into Reading- small group during the school day</p> <p>Extended Day 47 Minutes-extended day (small group)</p> <p>Inquiry Work - Extended Day (small group)</p> <p>Inquiry Work - during school day (small group)</p> <p>Push In / Pull Out- small group during the school day</p> <p>Non-Fiction Skill Builders</p> <p>Simple Solutions Grammar Mechanics during school day</p>
Mathematics:	<p>Extended Day 47 Minutes-extended day small group</p> <p>Push In / Pull Out- small group during the school day</p> <p>Harcourt Math - during school day (small group)</p>
Science:	<p>Push In / Pull Out- Small Group During the school day</p> <p>Extended Day 47 Minutes-Extended Day Small Group</p>

Social Studies:	Push In Pull Out During the school day Extended Day 47 Minutes- Extended Day Program
At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:	1:1 Counseling - Provide support through individualized counseling, and behavior modification. Group Counseling- Provide support with group counseling, peer relations, work on social skills, classroom management, positive reinforcement, and behavior modification.
At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	Counseling- In and out of class instruction based on needs of the class or student;ie., conflict resolution
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	Counseling- In and out of class instruction based on needs of the class or student;ie., conflict resolution Parental consultation for at -risk students Follow up for Chil Abuse situations
At-risk Health-related Services:	Open Airways (Asthma awareness program)

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.

Part I: School ELL Profile:

The Language Allocation Policy Team for PS 53 consists of: school administrators, parent coordinator, testing coordinator, ESL teacher, SETTS teacher, AIS teacher, Guidance Counselor and participating classroom teachers. Our ESL teacher is certified in Common Branch and Special Ed and is presently enrolled in the TESOL Program at Touro College.

P.S. 53 is located on the South Shore of Staten Island. It serves a population of 712 students in Pre K-5. About 2% of our population are English Language Learners.

Part II: ELL Identification Process:

Upon registering students, parents are given the New York City Department of Education's Parent/Guardian Home Language Identification Survey (HLIS). These forms are available in several languages, and assistance is available to those in need of it. If it seems that there is another language present in the home a teacher will sit and interview the child. It will then be determined, based on NYS requirements, if the child is eligible for LAB testing. The score of the LAB-R test will determine if the child will be provided with ELL services. A child who is placed in an ELL's Program may only be removed from it when they have been tested as Proficient on the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT).

This test is given to all eligible ELL's each year.

All students that are eligible for ESL services at our school are tested and placed within 10 school days, as per New York State requirements. Therefore it is very important that we provide our parents with the information necessary to choose the ELL's placement of their choice. Entitlement letters are sent home in the home language and a video on program choice is set up in the school for all new parents to watch, there are brochures available to them, and we offer several workshops, orientations and new parent meetings to inform them of their educational options and encourage parental involvement. These workshops are ongoing throughout the school year and parent involvement is always encouraged.

P.S. 53 has received a Translation and Interpretation Services allocation in which we utilize this funding to provide translation services for non-English speaking parents. We also have several bilingual staff members who assist in oral and written translation to parents to ensure that all parents are provided with appropriate and timely information in a language they can understand. Even though PS 53 only offers a free standing ESL program, all ELL's programs are explained. In tracking the existing ELL's the trend in program choice has been leaning toward ESL services. Of the 13 children receiving services 11 of them chose ESL, whereas only 2 chose Transitional Bilingual as their program choice. Therefore, the model offered at our school is in alignment with parent requests.

Part III: ELL Demographics:

The languages represented in our school are Spanish (5), Russian (4), Chinese (2), Arabic (1) and Albanian (1). Of the 13 ELL's, 11 are receiving service for less than 3 years, and 2 are receiving services for more than 3 years. There is 1 SIFE child and 2 special education children in the program. We offer only a freestanding English as a Second Language Program as a pull-out done by an F-status teacher. Each grade has one ESL group. We also have three 12:1:1 classes in the building, as well a CTT on every grade.

Number of ELL's by Grade in Each Language Group

Language	K	1	2	3	4	5
Spanish	0	2	1	0	1	1
Chinese	0	0	1	1	0	0
Russian	2	0	1	0	1	0
Arabic	0	0	0	0	1	0
Albanian	0	0	0	0	1	0
Totals	2	2	3	1	4	1

Planning and Scheduling:

At P.S. 53 our English Language Learners are serviced using a freestanding English as a second Language model. There is one group per grade serviced in a pull-out model two days a week by an F-status teacher. The remainder of the minutes, as per the NYS CR Part 154, is provided by the classroom teacher.

SAMPLE SCHEDULE INSERTED

Balanced Literacy

P.S. 53 uses a Balanced Literacy program which follows the *Teacher's College Workshop Model*. We have a comprehensive language and literacy framework designed to support young readers and writers. Implementing a quality literacy program begins with a commitment to serve all students. Readers who need extra help are not identical to one another. In fact they are very diverse. We as educators need to adjust our materials and teaching for individual learners, and the balanced literacy approach helps us to do just that. Although the content may vary by grade, the essential elements of the framework should remain constant:

- **Language:** Using oral language – *discussing, sharing, questioning and describing* is a key component to teaching reading and writing.
- **Literacy:** We can not overlook the strong connection between Reading and Writing. And should realize how they compliment one another when teaching.
- **Literature:** Recognizing the value of great literature in the classroom.

- **Content:** Learning in the content area is the basis for this program. Students read and write about topics related to science, social studies, math and other genres. Mixing the language arts curriculum with other genres increases the sophistication of the language students use.

Mathematics program

Our Mathematics program is *Everyday Math* in grades K-5. The *Everyday Math* program is a research based program created by the University of Chicago School Math Program. The program is designed to develop basic math skills through repeated exposure. Mathematical language is also developed through modeling, demonstrations and manipulatives. The program is also designed to support the ELL's by incorporating many strategies that are proven to help linguistically diverse students.

Differentiated Instruction for English Language Learners

At P.S. 53 our classrooms are being filled with a growing number of English Language Learners. Some are eligible for services, some are not, and some are former ELL's who may still need academic support in language. These facts just add to the need for all teachers to seek out effective strategies to reach all students. Therefore, at P.S. 53 we realize that the role of the classroom environment in supporting children's language acquisition at every stage is important and cannot be ignored. All teachers servicing ELL's are responsible for providing understandable language, along with whatever supports are necessary to convey meaning to the student(s). Using approaches and materials that add context to the language – props, gestures, pictures, etc. – all contribute to the child's acquisition and production of language. All activities should be structured so that English Language learners, at any instructional level, could participate at a level of comfort.

Our school offers our teachers the help and support so that they in turn can support their ELL's regardless of their stage of language development, or how many years they have been in the country. English Language Learners can successfully acquire language and content if they are given the appropriate scaffolding, and are assessed in ways that allow them to demonstrate understanding and knowledge.

P.S. 53 also offers a variety of Academic Intervention Services for ELA and Mathematics. In addition to the support services (Speech, Occupational Therapy, Counseling, Hearing, and Adaptive physical Education, SETTS, AIS, PPT and ESL), we also offer the following:

- **Extended Day Programs:** K-5
- **Reading Recovery:** Grade 1
- **Reading Volunteers:** Grades K-2
- **At Risk ELL's:** Grades K-5
- **At Risk Speech (SLIP):** Grades K-5
- **At Risk Counseling (ERSSA):** Grades K-5
- **At Risk (SETTS):** Grades K-5
- **Fundations:** Grade 1
- **Wilson Reading:** Grades 2-3
- **Tune Into Reading:** Grades 3-5
- **Inquiry Team:** Grades 1-5

- **Singapore Math**
- **Non-fiction Skill-builders:** A new on-line reading program for grades 3-5
- **Additional programs offered through the After School Center**

The above AIS services have been created to help **all** of our students in their weakness areas. These programs not only service many of our present ELL students, but also our former ELL students. They offer them added support that they may need to find success in school. Like the new *Non-fiction Skill Builders program* added this year, we are seeking to increase learning with technology in our building. All of our classrooms are equipped with computers and Smart Boards, and there are Lap Tap Computers available for use in the building. For the students who speak other languages there are software programs available to them in their native languages, as well as picture dictionaries, glossaries and trade books available throughout the building in various languages. We will continue to build on these native language libraries as more and more languages enter our school building.

It is our school policy toward the end of the school year to try to prepare all students for the grade that lies ahead of them. We not only plan stepping up and graduation ceremonies for students, but we offer visitations to other schools for the fifth graders, and tours of our rooms for the Pre-K and Kindergarteners. There are also several parent workshops done to prepare parents for the year to come.

Professional Development and Support for School Staff:

At P.S. 53 we have weekly grade meetings that are held on common prep periods to plan for instruction. In addition to these grade meetings we now have in house professional development and planning time every Wednesday afternoon from 2:35-3:30. These valuable planning times allow the teachers to collaborate to ensure best practices for all students, and allow the administration to plan professional development opportunities for teachers in the needed areas.

As for the required 7.5 hours of ESL training that all teachers are required to possess, we keep documentation and certificates on file for each teacher in the building. Any new teachers are required to either go to an outside workshop and bring back their certificate, or they will be provided with the training in-house as ongoing professional development throughout the school year. The training planned for this year will be geared to compliance issues, implementing appropriate ESL strategies in the classroom and setting up predictable routines and signals in the classrooms to reduce the anxiety of any students learning English.

Parent Involvement:

At P.S. 53 we encourage parental involvement. Our parent coordinator goes above and beyond to reach out to all families and encourage them to join in the school community. Our Home Language Survey along with teacher assessment and recommendations, and PTA information surveys allows us to reach to all families in their native language. Therefore, in addition to curriculum conferences and parent

teacher conferences we offer several opportunities for the parents to be in the building interacting with the children, other parents and staff members. Some of the things planned at P.S. 53 are:

- **Newcomer’s Tea**
- **ELL Orientation**
- **Book Fair**
- **Wonder Walk for The March of Dimes**
- **International Festival**
- **Misbehavior or Mistaken Behavior Workshop**
- **Empowering Your Child To Be Healthy & Safe Workshop**
- **Stress Reduction Workshop – Family Day at Petrides**
- **Holiday Fair**
- **Toy Drive**
- **ELL Workshops**
- **Literacy Night**
- **Family Math Workshop**
- **Bookmaking Workshop**
- **Science Fair**
- **I.S. 24 Orientation Workshop for P.S. 53 Students**

Assessment Analysis:

At P.S. 53 we use the Developmental Reading Assessment tool (DRA) to assess the early literacy skills of all students. The teacher will individually test each child on a range of skills (accuracy, comprehension, fluency). This test allows the teachers to match the scores with independent reading levels for each child.

	Guided Reading	Lexile	DRA
Range of Levels	A to Z	200 to 1700+	A, 1 to 44
How is level determined?	One-on-one evaluation: Teacher listens to child read, then child retells story or answers questions about text. Teacher maintains reading record.	Standardized reading or Scholastic Reading Inventory test	One-on-one evaluation: Teacher listens to child read. Child is scored as story is read and then retold.
How frequently are assessments?	Varies by school district from once a month to once per grading period; usually done less	At least one time per year	Varies by school district, but typically done at beginning, middle, and

	frequently in grades 5 and 6. Additional in-class evaluation ongoing in lower grades.		end of school year. Less frequently in grades 5 and 6.
What does the system measure?	Comprehension, accuracy, fluency	Comprehension	Comprehension, accuracy, fluency

After looking at all of the testing data that we have collected we feel that P.S. 53 is on the right track. In the Spring of 2009 seven out of fifteen students tested as proficient on the NYSESLAT exam, a significant improvement from the Spring of 2008 whereas we had no students test proficient out of thirteen. Last Spring we also had four out of the five students taking the ELA score a 3, and all six students that took the math test scored a 3. The one ELL student who scored a 2 on the ELA is participating in several of the academic intervention services offered at P.S. 53. As far as the two children who took the content NYS Social Studies and Science exams, both scored a 3.

Our school inquiry team uses all data, including the Periodic Assessments, to help drive instruction and to target the children in need of AIS services. The data patterns across NYSESLAT modalities will have an impact on instructional planning. The most significant pattern that we've seen that will directly impact instruction is writing. Based on previous scores from the NYSESLAT we can use more help in writing.

Overall the ELL students at P.S. 53 are finding success, even though research has proven freestanding ESL to be the least successful model for teaching English Language Learners. In collaboration with AIS programs and teachers using best practices, we have had success in moving students scores in an upward direction.

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)

None

Number of Students to be Served:

LEP 13

Non-LEP 2

Number of Teachers 1

Other Staff (Specify) 11

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.

N/A

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.

At P.S. 53, we have weekly grade meetings that are held during common preparation periods to plan for instruction. In addition to these grade meetings, we now have in-house professional development and planning time every Wednesday afternoon from 2:35-3:30 PM. These valuable planning times allow the teachers to collaborate to ensure best practices for all students, and allows administration to plan professional development opportunities for teachers in the needed areas.

As for the required 7.5 hours of ESL training that all teachers are provided to possess, we keep documentation and certificates on file for each teacher in the building. Any new teachers are required to either go to an outside workshop and bring back their certificate, or they will be provided with the training in-house as ongoing professional development throughout the school year. The training planned for this year will be geared to compliance issues, implementing appropriate strategies in the classroom and setting up predictable routines and signals in the classrooms to reduce the anxiety of any student.

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

School: PS 53
 BEDS Code: 31R053

Title III LEP Program
 School Building Budget Summary

Allocation Amount:		
Budget Category	Budgeted Amount	Explanation of expenditures in this category as it relates to the program narrative for this title.
Professional salaries (schools must account for fringe benefits) - Per session - Per diem	26,067.00	Two days of ELL instruction is provided to all mandated ELL students. This is funded through the Fair Student Funding allocation.
Purchased services - High quality staff and curriculum development contracts	740.00	Translation services are provided mainly during Parent Teacher Conference Days for non-english speaking parents.
Supplies and materials - Must be supplemental. - Additional curricula, instructional materials. - Must be clearly listed.	562.00	This allocation allowed was utilized to purchase paper to send school information to non-english speaking parents in their native language.
Educational Software (Object Code 199)	0.00	N/A
Travel	0.00	N/A
Other	0.00	N/A
TOTAL	27,369.00	

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

Requirement under Chancellor's Regulations – for all schools

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

Part A: Needs Assessment Findings

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

Upon registering students, parents are given the New York City Department Of Education's Parent/ Guardian Home Language Identification Survey (HLIS). These forms are available in several languages. If "other" is indicated in two or more places for questions 1 through 4 and for questions 5 through 8, the student is eligible for LAB testing to determine if the student is in need of ELL services. An Interview process with the parent or translator then takes place to determine if the forms are correctly answered. We have received a translation and interpretation services allocation. We utilize this funding by purchasing supplies and materials for the ELL students, as well as provide translation services for non-English speaking parents during Parent / Teacher Conferences in the Spring and Fall.

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.

Based on the New York City Department of Education Parent/ Guardian HLIS forms findings show 4 Russian, 5 Spanish, 1 Arabic, 1 Albanian and 2 Chinese. The parent coordinator and classroom teachers were made aware of the findings. Pertinent information is sent home to the parents in their native language.

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 NYC Department of Education provides material in various languages at the start of the school year. As the need arises, Parent coordinator will provide translation services to parents through the use of the Parent Support Office and Translation and Interpretation Unit. We are fortunate that we have bilingual employees who work in the school. When necessary they provide translations.

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.

Language interpreters will be available during open school week, parent conferences, and IEP conferences to assist parents in need of language assistance services. As the need arises, staff members who are bilingual are willing to assist in oral communication.

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>.

Each parent who requires language assistance services will be provided with written notification of their rights regarding translation and interpretation services in the home language and instructions on how to attain such services. Posted in a conspicuous location at the entrance will be a sign in each of the targeted languages indicating the office where a copy of this written notification can be obtained. The school's safety plan will contain provisions for communicating with non-English speaking parents.

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:			0
2. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside for Parent Involvement:			
3. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside to Improve Parent Involvement (ARRA Language):			
4. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified:			
5. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect – HQ PD (ARRA Language):			
6. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Professional Development:			
7. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect (Professional Development) (ARRA Language):			

8. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2008-2009 school year:

9. If the percentage of high quality teachers during 2008-2009 is less than 100% describe activities and strategies the school is implementing in order to insure that the school will have 100% high quality teachers by the end of the coming school year.

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

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

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

PART C: TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM SCHOOLS

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

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

1. A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school that is based on information on the performance of children in relation to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards.
2. 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.
3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.
4. High-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals (and, where appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff) to enable all children in the Schoolwide Program to meet the State's student academic standards.

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

PART D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS

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

1. Use program resources to help participating children meet the State standards.
2. Ensure that planning for students served under this program is incorporated into existing school planning.
3. Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically based research that strengthens the core academic program of the school and that:
 - a. Give primary consideration to providing extended learning time, such as, extended school year, before/after school, and summer programs and opportunities;
 - b. Help provide an accelerated, high –quality curriculum, including applied learning; and
 - c. Minimize removing children from the regular classroom during regular school hours;

4. Coordinate with and support the regular educational program;
5. Provide instruction by highly qualified teachers;
6. Provide professional development opportunities for teachers, principals and paraprofessionals, including, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff;
7. Provide strategies to increase parental involvement; and
8. Coordinate and integrate Federal, State and local services and programs.

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Background

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

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

CURRICULUM AUDIT FINDINGS

KEY FINDING 1: CURRICULUM

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

1A. English Language Arts

Background

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

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

ELA Alignment Issues:

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

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

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

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

-English Language Learners.

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

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

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

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

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

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.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?

PS 53 uses a standards-based Balanced/Comprehensive Literacy program of study for all students including those for whom English is not their first language and for students who have special learning needs. Balanced Literacy stresses the essential dimensions of reading through explicit teaching of phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency and expressiveness, vocabulary, and comprehension. Daily read-alouds, independent reading time, reading workshop, writing workshop, and systematic word study instruction are key features of the approach. Teachers demonstrate the habits and strategies of effective reading and writing through a variety of structures: read-aloud, guided reading, shared reading, interactive writing, and mini-lessons in reading and writing. By coaching students in individual or small-group conferences, teachers allow students to successfully and independently apply those strategies to their own reading and writing.

Classroom libraries are the centerpiece of Balanced Literacy. These libraries allow teachers to organize instruction around authentic literature. Extensive use of classroom libraries encourage students to read and write about a variety of topics they know and like. The libraries are designed so that each grade has a common core of books that span a range of reading levels and cover all kinds of literature from picture books, chapter books, and novels to poetry and nonfiction. Furthermore, on most recent ELA State scores we do show improvement with the number of students meeting and exceeding standards.

2006- 84.8%

2007-89.8%

2008-89.8%

2009- 91.4%

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.

N/A

1B. Mathematics

Background

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

Specific Math Alignment Issues:

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

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

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

- A 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.

PS 53 is an elementary school. The findings speak to gaps in middle school curriculum and, therefore, do not apply to our school.

- 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.

This school supplements the mathematics curriculum with constructivist problem solving opportunities for students on all grade levels. Regular and ongoing evaluations using problems that are aligned to the process strands allow the school to determine whether students have a conceptual understanding of mathematical content. Students' constructed responses are assessed using grade appropriate rubrics. Student work is discussed at grade meetings and the math program is adjusted, as necessary, based on students' ability/inability to problem solve. Furthermore, the New York State Curriculum Alignment Committee will review curriculum maps representing all grade levels to update content to include skills to be mastered, strategies to be utilized, and student outcomes to be attained

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

- Applicable Not Applicable

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

PS 53 uses *Everyday Mathematics*, which is a research-based curriculum developed by the University of Chicago School Mathematics Project. UCSMP was founded in 1983 during a time of growing consensus that our nation was failing to provide its students with an adequate mathematical education. The goal of this on-going project is to significantly improve the mathematics curriculum and instruction for all school children in the U.S.

Several basic principles that have guided the philosophy of *Everyday Mathematics* include:

- Students acquire knowledge and skills, and develop an understanding of mathematics from their own experience. Mathematics is more meaningful when it is rooted in real life contexts and situations, and when children are given the opportunity to become actively involved

in learning. Teachers and other adults play a very important role in providing children with rich and meaningful mathematical experiences.

- Children begin school with more mathematical knowledge and intuition than previously believed. A K-6 curriculum should build on this intuitive and concrete foundation, gradually helping children gain an understanding of the abstract and symbolic.
- Teachers, and their ability to provide excellent instruction, are the key factors in the success of any program. Previous efforts to reform mathematics instruction failed because they did not adequately consider the working lives of teachers.

The scope of the K-6 *Everyday Mathematics* curriculum includes the following mathematical strands which are aligned to the NYS standards:

- Algebra and Uses of Variables
- Data and Chance
- Geometry and Spatial Sense
- Measures and Measurement
- Numeration and Order
 - Patterns, Functions, and Sequences
 - Operations
 - Reference Frames

Furthermore, our most recent test results show growth in the number of students meeting or exceeding standards in mathematics:

- 2006- 93.1%
- 2007- 98.4%
- 2008- 97.8%
- 2009- 98.5%

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.

N/A

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.

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.

Formal and informal observation will be used to confirm that all teachers are using the workshop model of implementation for both reading and writing.

Informal observation will be used to assess student engagement.

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?

As stated, PS 53 employs a workshop model of instruction for English Language Arts instruction. The architecture of the mini lesson component of both the Reader’s and Writer’s Workshops includes:

Teacher directed mini lesson	10-15 minutes (20%)
Active engagement	5-10 minutes (13.3%)
Share	5 minutes (6.6%)
Independent practice	30-45 minutes (depending on grade level) (60%)

During this time, teachers are either conferring with individual students or working with groups of students for guided practice and/or small group strategy instruction. Student independent practice does not include “busy work.” At this time, students are reading independently from and responding to their “just-right” books. During writing, students are drafting or editing and revising their genre-specific pieces.

Student engagement is informally assessed using the following student engagement checklist:

**Student Engagement Checklist 2009-2010
School-wide Informal Observations**

Category	Observation	Comments
<p style="text-align: center;">Whole Class Instruction: Rug Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -All students are attentive and looking at teacher(s) -Students sit on rug in purposeful ways depending on task -Various students participate when questions are posed – not the same hands all the time -Student responses to queries are positively validated 	<p>_____ Yes to all</p> <p>_____ Yes to some</p> <p>_____ Not really</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Independent Work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -All students are working productively on assigned task -Students know what to do when “they are done” -Students seek the assistance of a teacher or a peer when they are confused or need direction -Students use environmental print for self-direction 	<p>_____ Yes to all</p> <p>_____ Yes to some</p>	

<p style="text-align: center;">Transitions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Are quick and smooth -Require little direction -Students go from point A to point B without interruption -Students are prepared with required materials 	<p style="text-align: center;">_____ Yes to all</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____ Yes to some</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____ Not really</p>		
<p style="text-align: center;">Organization of the Day</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Morning meeting sets the tone for the day: children are part of an interactive conversation concerning the flow of the day -Children know what they will be learning / what is being taught -Children know what is expected of them at all times -Children know why they are part of a small group experience 	<p style="text-align: center;">_____ Yes to all</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____ Yes to some</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____ Not really</p>		
<p style="text-align: center;">Student Accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Students are held to a high standard: good is not good enough -Students know what work that is good enough looks like -Students are given opportunities to improve their work -Students know the behavioral expectations in the room and act appropriately <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 25%; padding: 2px;"> <p style="text-align: center;">Student Accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Students are held to a high standard: good is not good enough -Students know what work that is good enough looks like -Students are given </td> <td style="width: 75%; padding: 2px;"> <p style="text-align: center;">_____ Yes to all</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____ Yes to some</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____ Not really</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p style="text-align: center;">Student Accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Students are held to a high standard: good is not good enough -Students know what work that is good enough looks like -Students are given 	<p style="text-align: center;">_____ Yes to all</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____ Yes to some</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____ Not really</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">_____ Yes to all</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____ Yes to some</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____ Not really</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Student Accountability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Students are held to a high standard: good is not good enough -Students know what work that is good enough looks like -Students are given 	<p style="text-align: center;">_____ Yes to all</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____ Yes to some</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____ Not really</p>		

<p>opportunities to improve their work -Students know the behavioral expectations in the room and act appropriately</p>	<p>_____ Not really</p>	
<p>Metacognition - Students are given opportunities to share their thinking -Students are held accountable for their learning – they are asked to articulate or write what they know and understand -Incorrect answers are not validated or simply ignored – being “right” is important and misunderstandings are discussed</p>	<p>_____ Yes to all _____ Yes to some _____ Not really</p>	
<p>Self Esteem – Building Toward Intrinsic Motivation - Children are self-directed and self-motivated -Children who need to be “pushed” are pushed in subtle, nurturing ways -Children do not sit next to peers who disrupt or interrupt learning (including friends) -Children feel good about their learning and are excited to share new experiences -Children who need behavioral plans have them and these are used in consistent ways -There is never a “why should I?” attitude – children perform because they understand that learning is important</p>	<p>_____ Yes to all _____ Yes to some _____ Not really</p>	

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.

Formal and informal observation will be used to confirm that all teachers are using the workshop model of implementation for mathematics instruction.

A student engagement checklist will be used to assess teachers' awareness of student intrinsic motivation and metacognition.

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?

This finding is not relevant to PS 53 for the following reasons:

PS 53 employs a workshop model of instruction for Mathematics instruction. The architecture of the mini lesson component of the Math Workshop includes:

Teacher directed mini lesson	10-15 minutes (20%)
Active engagement	5-10 minutes (13.3%)

Share
Independent practice

5 minutes (6.6%)

30-45 minutes (depending on grade level) (60%)

During this time, teachers are either conferring with individual students or working with groups of students for guided practice and/or small group strategy instruction. Student independent practice does not include “busy work.” At this time, students are working alone, in partnerships or in groups to practice their computation and/or conceptual skills.

Formal and informal observation will be used to confirm that all teachers are using the workshop model of implementation for mathematics instruction.

At this school, SMART boards are often used for demonstration during the mini lesson.

Student engagement is informally assessed using the following student engagement checklist:

**Student Engagement Checklist 2009-2010
School-wide Informal Observations**

Category	Observation	Comments
Whole Class Instruction: Rug Area -All students are attentive and looking at teacher(s) -Students sit on rug in purposeful ways depending on task -Various students participate when questions are posed – not the same hands all the time -Student responses to queries are positively validated	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes to all <input type="checkbox"/> Yes to some <input type="checkbox"/> Not really	

Whole Class Instruction: Rug Area -All students are attentive and looking at teacher(s) -Students sit on rug in purposeful ways depending on task -Various students participate when questions are posed – not the same hands all the time -Student responses to queries are positively validated	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes to all <input type="checkbox"/> Yes to some <input type="checkbox"/> Not really	
Independent Work	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes to all	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -All students are working productively on assigned task -Students know what to do when “they are done” -Students seek the assistance of a teacher or a peer when they are confused or need direction -Students use environmental print for self-direction 	<p>_____ Yes to some</p> <p>_____ Not really</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Transitions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Are quick and smooth -Require little direction -Students go from point A to point B without interruption -Students are prepared with required materials 	<p>_____ Yes to all</p> <p>_____ Yes to some</p> <p>_____ Not really</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Organization of the Day</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Morning meeting sets the tone for the day: children are part of an interactive conversation concerning the flow of the day -Children know what they will be learning / what is being taught -Children know what is expected of them at all times -Children know why they are part of a small group experience 	<p>_____ Yes to all</p> <p>_____ Yes to some</p> <p>_____ Not really</p>	

<p style="text-align: center;">Organization of the Day</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Morning meeting sets the tone for the day: children are part of an interactive conversation concerning the flow of the day -Children know what they will be learning / what is being taught -Children know what is expected of them at all times 	<p>_____ Yes to all</p> <p>_____ Yes to some</p>
---	--

<p>-Children know why they are part of a small group experience</p>	<p>_____ Not really</p>
<p>Student Accountability</p> <p>-Students are held to a high standard: good is not good enough</p> <p>-Students know what work that is good enough looks like</p> <p>-Students are given opportunities to improve their work</p> <p>-Students know the behavioral expectations in the room and act appropriately</p>	<p>_____ Yes to all</p> <p>_____ Yes to some</p> <p>_____ Not really</p>
<p>Metacognition</p> <p>- Students are given opportunities to share their thinking</p> <p>-Students are held accountable for their learning – they are asked to articulate or write what they know and understand</p> <p>-Incorrect answers are not validated or simply ignored – being “right” is important and misunderstandings are discussed</p>	<p>_____ Yes to all</p> <p>_____ Yes to some</p> <p>_____ Not really</p>

<p>Metacognition</p> <p>- Students are given opportunities to share their thinking</p> <p>-Students are held accountable for their learning – they are asked to articulate or write what they know and understand</p> <p>-Incorrect answers are not validated or simply ignored – being “right” is important and misunderstandings are discussed</p>	<p>_____ Yes to all</p> <p>_____ Yes to some</p> <p>_____ Not really</p>
<p>Self Esteem – Building Toward Intrinsic Motivation</p> <p>- Children are self-directed and self-motivated</p> <p>-Children who need to be “pushed” are pushed in subtle, nurturing ways</p>	<p>_____ Yes to all</p> <p>_____ Yes to some</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Children do not sit next to peers who disrupt or interrupt learning (including friends) -Children feel good about their learning and are excited to share new experiences -Children who need behavioral plans have them and these are used in consistent ways -There is never a “why should I?” attitude – children perform because they understand that learning is important 	<p>_____ Not really</p>
--	-------------------------

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

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

KEY FINDING 3: TEACHER EXPERIENCE AND STABILITY

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 3:

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

Year-to-year teacher turnover rate is evaluated by the school's administrative Cabinet. To date, this school does not have a high turnover rate with a minimal number/percentage of new teachers joining the school's organization each year.

If the turnover rate becomes high, i.e., more than 10%, over a three-year period, the school will contact staffing pools such as Teach for America and/or NYC Teaching Fellows in order to recruit teachers with greater sustainability.

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?

Over the past three years, the school has welcomed the following number and percent of new teachers:

2009	1	.02
2008	2	.04
2007	2	.04

These numbers are insignificant. New teachers at this school receive professional development and support from the school's Literacy Coach, external staff developers, and UFT mentors.

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

N/A

KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT - ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

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

This school engages in teacher goal setting. When meeting with teachers who work with students for whom English is a second language, the administration will develop professional development plans aligned to those teacher's expressed and anticipated needs.

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?

PS 53 is an Empowerment Support Organization School. In addition to the professional development each teacher receives in the school from internal and external coaches, the ESO also customizes 1:1 PD for all ELL teachers. These sessions are planned and facilitated by the Network's Special Services Manager and delivered either at the school or in a venue for Network collaboration. Finally, last school year, the ESO contracted an ELL Specialist, Catherine Brown, from *Accelerating Minds with Language*. Ms. Brown conducted five full-day workshops for the Network's ELL and bi-lingual teachers.

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.

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

KEY FINDING 5: DATA USE AND MONITORING - ELL INSTRUCTION

Data from district and teacher interviews indicate that there is very little specific monitoring of ELLs' academic progress or English language development. Testing data, where they do exist (for example, the NYSESLAT yearly scores) either are not reported to all teachers involved in

instructing ELLs or are not provided in a timely manner useful for informing instruction. If and when testing data are provided, the data are not disaggregated by proficiency level of ELL student, students' time in the United States, or type of program in which the ELL is enrolled (i.e., ESL, TBE, Dual Language, or general education).

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

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

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. The same process is used for all ELL students in addition to the NYSESLAT to evaluate instructional needs.

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?

P.S. 53 received an overall score of well developed on SQ 1: "School Leaders consistently gather and generate data, and use it to understand what each student knows and is able to do and to monitor the students progress over time".

A score of well developed for sub criteria 1.3:" School leaders and faculty provide an objective, consistently updated understanding of the performance and progress of English Language Learners"

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.

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. All Special education students are treated the same as general education and offered all IEP mandated modifications as indicated on their individual plans.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

PS 53 received an overall score of well-developed for SQ3: "The school aligns its academic work, strategic decisions, and resources to effectively engage students around its plans and goals for accelerating student learning, and an overall score of well developed for sub criteria 3.4: "The school ensures that teachers use school, class and student data to plan for and provide differentiated instruction that meets the specific needs of all students in their charge."

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.

N/A

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.

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.

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?

PS 53 teachers have received extensive professional development in the area of student goal setting and writing correct, appropriate and educationally sound IEPs. This training has been provided to them at the school level by the Empowerment Support Organization's Special Services Manager. Teachers at this school use the NYS standards when making promotional decisions prior to writing an IEP at annual review. All students with special needs at this school have promotional goals that clearly reflect a percentage of their current grade level's performance outcomes. We aspire to have each classified student achieve proficiency in both ELA and mathematics.

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.

N/A

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

This appendix will not be required for 2009-10.

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

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

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:

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

Supporting Students in Temporary Housing (STH)

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

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

Part A: For Title I Schools

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

0
2. Please describe the services you are planning to provide to the STH population.

Any students identified to be in temporary housing will have the services of all Guidance personnel available to the child as well as the family. All supplies needed to educate the child will be provided. The parent coordintaor will reach out to the community for additional support.

Part B:
For Non-Title I Schools

1. Please identify the number of Students in Temporary Housing who are currently attending your school (please note that your STH population may change over the course of the year).

0

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

Any student identified to be in temporary housing will have the services of all Guidance personnel available to the child as well as the family.

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.

N/A