



P.S. 62
THE ACADEMY FOR SUCCESS...
WHERE LEARNING COMES ALIVE

2009-10
SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)

SCHOOL: 08X062

ADDRESS: 660 FOX STREET, BRONX, 10464

TELEPHONE: 718-585-1617

FAX: 718-292-6327

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

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

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: 08X062 **SCHOOL NAME:** Inocensio Casanova

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 660 Fox Street

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 718-585-1617 **FAX:** 718-292-6327

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Lisa Manfredonia **EMAIL ADDRESS:** Lmanfre2@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON: Loren Holand/Martina Vargas

PRINCIPAL: Lisa Manfredonia

UFT CHAPTER LEADER: Robert Fernandez

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT: Guarena Vargas

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE:
(Required for high schools)

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL SUPPORT ORGANIZATION (SSO) INFORMATION

DISTRICT: 08 **SSO NAME:** CFN 10

SSO NETWORK LEADER: Maria Quail

SUPERINTENDENT: Tim Behr

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

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

Name	Position and Constituent Group Represented	Signature
Lisa Manfredonia	*Principal or Designee	
Robert Fernandez	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Guarena Vargas	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
	Student Representative <i>(optional for elementary and middle schools; a minimum of two members required for high schools)</i>	
	CBO Representative, if applicable	
Loren Holand	Member/Co- Chairperson/UFT	
Martina Vargas	Member/Co- Chairperson/Parent	
Camille Squitieri	Member/CSA	
Corrine Barros	Member/Co-Recorder/UFT	
Erica Morel	Member/Co-Recorder/Parent	
Rani Pendharkar	Member/Time Keeper/UFT	
Jadila Bonilla	Member/Parent	
Jolydia Sabur	Member/Parent	
Sasha Sanchez	Member/Parent	

--	--	--

- Core (mandatory) SLT members.

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

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

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

P.S. 62, The Inocencio Casanova School is a Pre-K through 5 Elementary school. Our school is comprised of two academies: **The Learning to Read Academy** (Pre-k to 2) and the **Reading to Learn Academy** (Grades 3 to 5). These two academies have been designed to provide a focus for instruction: establishing the parameters for each grade level while aligning the curriculum to the State Standards and NYC Learning Outcomes. It is through the curriculum that we incorporate the arts and technology appropriate to each academy, as well as crossing academies for celebrations, community service projects, Academic Intervention Services and Enrichment activities. It is the intention of this delineated approach to insure that all students' individual needs are met while fostering a community of learners and a shared responsibility for the P.S. 62 community as a whole.

In order to facilitate learning and teaching at P.S. 62 a myriad of programs are offered to our students. The core curriculum utilizes the Chancellor's Mathematics (EDM), Science (Harcourt Brace) and Social Studies (Scholastic Trade Books and/or Houghton Mifflin) programs as well as a balanced literacy approach for the Reader's Workshop. The Reader's Workshop is developmentally structured by grade with a primary focus on phonemic awareness and phonics in grades Pre-K through First grade, utilizing such programs as Land of the Letter People and Foundations, as well as guided reading. The primary focus in Grades 2-5 is comprehension, which is addressed through Strategies That Work and the Comprehension Toolkit. In addition to our core curriculum we offer our students additional support through our Extended Day and AIS programs.

The Extended Day program is embedded in our day schedule, with all students in grades 1-5 participating in an enrichment and/or academic support program. Our programs include but are not limited to: The Stock Market Game, Peer Mediation, Reader's Theatre, Imagine Learning, Wilson, Words Their Way as well as additional guided reading support. The AIS program also utilizes some of the extended day programs for students that need further assistance as well as Great Leaps for fluency. The AIS providers work with classroom teachers to assess and plan for individualized and/or small group instruction with a focus on the student's individual learning goals. These specialists also provide all classes with additional academic or social programs weekly.

Our "Specials" include Physical Education, Technology, Problem Solving, Art, Text Talk and a Science lab for each academy. The specialists and classroom teachers work together to insure that these additional programs are supporting the children both academically and emotionally. Finally, to further support our students the Morningside Center for Social Emotional Responsibility is working with all classroom teachers in Grades 2-5 to develop our students' conflict resolution skills, creating the safe and nurturing environment that is P.S. 62.

SECTION III – Cont'd

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

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

CEP Section III: School Profile

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT							
School Name:	P.S. 062 Inocensio Casanova						
District:	8	DBN:	08X062	School BEDS Code:	320800010062		
DEMOGRAPHICS							
Grades Served:	Pre-K	√	3	√	7		11
	K	√	4	√	8		12
	1	√	5	√	9		Ungraded
	2	√	6		10		
Enrollment				Attendance - % of days students attended:			
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08*	2008-09
Pre-K	36	36	36		91.7	91.2	91.9
Kindergarten	102	98	87	Student Stability - % of Enrollment:			
Grade 1	142	117	113	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 2	115	124	108		88.0	89.7	92.0
Grade 3	118	117	104	Poverty Rate - % of Enrollment:			
Grade 4	128	117	104	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 5	105	123	113		89.8	89.8	89.8
Grade 6	0	0	0	Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:			
Grade 7	0	0	0	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 8	0	0	0		36	9	36
Grade 9	0	0	0	Recent Immigrants - Total Number:			
Grade 10	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 11	0	0	0		9	3	8
Grade 12	0	0	0	Special Education Enrollment:			
Ungraded	2	4	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Total	748	723	676				
Special Education Enrollment:				Suspensions (OSYD Reporting) - Total Number:			
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
# in Self-Contained Classes	30	45	54	Principal Suspensions	0	0	2
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	57	56	48	Superintendent Suspensions	1	1	1
Number all others	35	37	32	Special High School Programs - Total Number:			
These students are included in the enrollment information above.				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:				CTE Program Participants	0	0	0
(BESIS Survey)				Early College HS Program Participants	0	0	0
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	Number of Staff - Includes all full-time staff:			
# in Transitional Bilingual Classes	101	105	50	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0				
# receiving ESL services only	29	37	73	Number of Teachers	57	65	66

CEP Section III: School Profile

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT							
# ELLs with IEPs	20	0	1	Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	8	13	13
These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.				Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	N/A	0	1
Overage Students (# entering students overage for grade)				Teacher Qualifications:			
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
(As of October 31)	0	0	0	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100.0	98.5	100.0
				% more than 2 years teaching in this school	56.1	58.5	66.7
				% more than 5 years teaching anywhere	38.6	38.5	39.4
Ethnicity and Gender - % of Enrollment:				% Masters Degree or higher	77.0	71.0	70.0
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	% core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	99.0	100.0	93.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.5	0.4	0.3				
Black or African American	15.9	15.5	15.7				
Hispanic or Latino	83.0	83.0	83.1				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	0.3	0.4	0.4				
White	0.3	0.7	0.4				
Male	50.9	50.9	52.7				
Female	49.1	49.1	47.3				
2009-10 TITLE I STATUS							
√	Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP)						
	Title I Targeted Assistance						
	Non-Title I						
Years the School Received Title I Part A Funding:				2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
				√	√	√	√
NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY							
SURR School (Yes/No)	If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:						
Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2008-09) Based on 2007-08 Performance:							
√	In Good Standing (IGS)						
	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1						
	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 2						
	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) – Year 1						
	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) – Year 2/Planning for Restructuring (PFR)						
	NCLB Restructuring – Year ____						
	School Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP) – Year ____						

CEP Section III: School Profile

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT

Individual Subject/Area Ratings:							
Elementary/Middle Level				Secondary Level			
ELA:	SINI 1			ELA:			
Math:	IGS			Math:			
Science:	IGS			Graduation 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	√SH	√	-			
Limited English Proficient	X	√	-			
Economically Disadvantaged	√	√	√			
Student groups making AYP in each subject	5	6	3	0	0	0

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results – 2008-09		Quality Review Results – 2008-09	
Overall Letter Grade:	A	Overall Evaluation:	NR
Overall Score:	78.1	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	
School Environment:	10.5	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	
<i>(Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)</i>		Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	
School Performance:	18.2	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	
<i>(Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)</i>		Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	
Student Progress:	38.9		
<i>(Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)</i>			
Additional Credit:	10.5		

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

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

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

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

An analysis of NYSTART data indicates that P.S. 62 is making moderate progress in all grade levels. Although, we did not make the same gains that we made in the previous year we are maintaining our level 3 and 4 students, as well as increasing the number of level 2 children in grade 4. This continuous trend in ELA affirms our efforts in all grades with a special emphasis on Grade 4.

Reading Scores

<u>Grade 3</u>	<u>Level 1</u>	<u>Level 2</u>	<u>Level 3</u>	<u>Level 4</u>	<u>Total</u>
2007	(27) 23.3%	(48) 41.4%	(41) 35.3%	(0) 0.0%	(41) 35.3%
2008	(6) 6.1%	(37) 37.4%	(50) 50.5%	(6) 6.1%	(56) 56.6%
2009	(10) 9%	(40) 35%	(64) 56%	(1) 1%	(65) 57%
<u>Grade 4</u>	<u>Level 1</u>	<u>Level 2</u>	<u>Level 3</u>	<u>Level 4</u>	<u>Total</u>
2007	(15) 13.0%	(63) 54.8%	(34) 29.6%	(3) 2.6%	(40) 32.2%
2008	(22) 19.8%	(38) 34.2%	(49) 44.1%	(2) 1.8%	(51) 45.9%
2009	(7) 7%	(46) 45%	(47) 46%	(2) 2%	(49) 48%
<u>Grade 5</u>	<u>Level 1</u>	<u>Level 2</u>	<u>Level 3</u>	<u>Level 4</u>	<u>Total</u>
2007	(13) 13.4%	(43) 44.3%	(41) 42.3%	(0) 0.0%	(41) 42.3%
2008	(2) 1.7%	(33) 28.0%	(81) 68.6%	(2) 1.7%	(83) 70.3%
2009	(0) 0%	(33) 30%	(73) 66%	(5) 5%	(78) 70%

Further analysis of the School Report Card indicates that while our students are making progress, our students with disabilities did not make the AYP for 2008-2009. The data states that we received credit for AYP due to the formula 113 + 34 points indicating an area of concern for the 2009-2010 school year.

Additional data shows that P.S. 62 is an "A" school for student performance with students in all grades making gains in both ELA and Mathematics.

Mathematics:

<u>Grade 3</u>	<u>Level 1</u>	<u>Level 2</u>	<u>Level 3</u>	<u>Level 4</u>	<u>Total</u>
2007	(9) 7.8%	(18) 15.5%	(72) 62.1%	(17) 14.7%	(89) 76.7%
2008	(0) 0.0%	(13) 12.9%	(65) 64.4%	(23) 22.8%	(88) 87.1%
2009	(2) 2%	(9) 8%	(92) 77%	(16) 13%	(108) 91%

<u>Grade 4</u>	<u>Level 1</u>	<u>Level 2</u>	<u>Level 3</u>	<u>Level 4</u>	<u>Total</u>
2007	(19) 15.6%	(46) 37.7%	(48) 39.3%	(9) 7.4%	(57) 46.7%
2008	(9) 7.9%	(28) 24.6%	(70) 61.4%	(7) 6.1%	(77) 67.5%
2009	(4) 4%	(23) 23%	(56) 55%	(19) 19%	(74) 74%
<u>Grade 5</u>	<u>Level 1</u>	<u>Level 2</u>	<u>Level 3</u>	<u>Level 4</u>	<u>Total</u>
2007	(4) 4.1%	(26) 26.5%	(60) 61.2%	(8) 8.2%	(68) 69.4%
2008	(5) 4.1%	(21) 17.1%	(80) 65.0%	(17) 13.8%	(97) 78.9%
2009	(3) 3%	(14) 13%	(68) 62%	(24) 22%	(92) 84%

However, a “B” was achieved for student progress, with particular concern in mathematics, where a 2.4 % decrease in students making at least 1 year of progress and a 12.1% decrease in the lowest 1/3 making yearly progress was noted. Although, the overall test scores are increasing we are not maintaining the mean scale score, specifically in Grade 3. The mean scale score dropped from 686 to 676, a 10 point difference.

<u>Grade 3</u>	<u>Level 1</u>	<u>Level 2</u>	<u>Level 3</u>	<u>Level 4</u>	<u>Total</u>
2007	(9) 7.8%	(18) 15.5%	(72) 62.1%	(17) 14.7%	(89) 76.7%
2008	(0) 0.0%	(13) 12.9%	(65) 64.4%	(23) 22.8%	(88) 87.1%
2009	(2) 2.0%	(9) 8.0%	((92) 77%	(16) 13%	(119) 91%
<u>Grade 4</u>	<u>Level 1</u>	<u>Level 2</u>	<u>Level 3</u>	<u>Level 4</u>	<u>Total</u>
2007	(19) 15.6%	(46) 37.7%	(48) 39.3%	(9) 7.4%	(57) 46.7%
2008	(9) 7.9%	(28) 24.6%	(70) 61.4%	(7) 6.1%	(77) 67.5%
2009	(4) 4.0%	(23) 23%	(56) 55%	(19) 19%	(102) 74%
<u>Grade 5</u>	<u>Level 1</u>	<u>Level 2</u>	<u>Level 3</u>	<u>Level 4</u>	<u>Total</u>
2007	(4) 4.1%	(26) 26.5%	(60) 61.2%	(8) 8.2%	(68) 69.4%
2008	(5) 4.1%	(21) 17.1%	(80) 65.0%	(17) 13.8%	(97) 78.9%
2009	(3) 3.0%	(14) 13%	(68) 62%	(24) 22%	(109) 84%

In order to address these needs, the school will:

Identify students in both sub-groups, students with disabilities and the lowest 1/3 through data analysis and provide research-based programs to address the needs of these students.

The data indicates that students with disabilities are not performing at the level of their peers in ELA. Therefore, one of our goals is to provide research-based programs that accelerate student learning for students with disabilities such as Wilson Language Development in Grades 3-5 and Foundations in Grade 2. An additional goal is to provide professional development through the school based Special Education Team as well as identify outside professional development programs for teachers of special needs students to attend. In order to address the lowest 1/3 in mathematics, professional development on data analysis will be conducted for all staff members. Best practices in mathematics will be identified and utilized by classroom teachers and specialists.

The December 2007 Quality Review indicates that we should address the following concerns and our 2008-2009 school demographics report indicates that these are still areas of concern.

Ensure the quality of teaching and learning is consistently good across the school. As such we have reviewed the data and found that only 39.4% of our teachers have been teaching for more than 5 years. Therefore one of our goals is to provide on-going, embedded professional development on the qualities of an effective teacher (purpose, rigor, engagement, results) to strengthen teacher effectiveness, as well as professional development opportunities for best practices. Teachers will also participate in Professional Learning Community Meetings to

discuss student work and as such develop a better understanding of how to address the individual needs of students.

Encourage more frequent opportunities for teachers to observe each other's classroom instruction in order to share good practices across the school. This year we will continue to identify effective teaching practices and have our teachers view other teachers in the building with a particular focus on methodology and management. This is the basis of our professional development goals.

Finally, a review of the evening PTA and parent workshop attendance sheets indicate a significant decrease in participation as compared to daytime meetings. The parent coordinator has also reviewed her logs. The logs indicate an interest in parent workshops to support adult learning.

In order to address low attendance at parent meetings a needs assessment will be conducted to identify parent interests. This year we will continue to offer parent workshops, however they will be more inclusive of parent interests. We will also be consistent and proactive in establishing evening meetings to insure that all parents are aware of the activity in advance.

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

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

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

Academic Goals

1. *By June 2010, the school will close the achievement gap in the area of ELA by 10% between Students with Disabilities and all students as evidenced by the NYS ELA.*

This goal is intended to provide all students with disabilities who are performing below standard level 3, support services that will address each student's individual needs. In addition, special education teachers and support staff will meet together to plan for instruction utilizing the strategies in the Schools Attuned program, Wilson and Word Study programs. The special education teacher and general education working with students in collaborative team teaching settings will receive professional development to insure effective, rigorous learning and teaching takes place within the classroom. Finally, all teachers working directly or indirectly with students with disabilities will be provided with IEP training to insure that the identified student goals are being addressed.

2. *By June 2010, the school will increase the percentage of the lowest 1/3 of students achieving at least one year of progress in mathematics by 5% as measured by the School Progress Report.*

This goal is intended to provide all students in the lowest 1/3 of students achieving at least one year of progress in mathematics with the support services and best practices available. All classroom teachers and support staff will be provided with data analysis training to identify students' areas of weakness to inform classroom instruction. In addition, classroom teachers will be provided with additional training in the school wide Everyday Mathematics Program to insure that all components are utilized in the classroom. Finally, parent workshops to support students at home will be provided.

Professional Development Goal

3. *By June 2010, 85% of teachers will utilize differentiated instructional strategies 90% of the time as measured by supervisor/coach formal/informal observation logs.*

This goal is intended to provide all teachers from Pre-K to Fifth Grade, Out of Classroom Enrichment/Academic Intervention Specialists, and Support Staff with on going professional development during scheduled professional development days, as well as during Professional Learning Communities meetings, Inquiry Team meetings, Grade Conferences, Study Groups, Intra/Inter-visitations and Individual Conferences with Administrators and Support Staff in all core academic areas, including technology and behavior management.

4. By June 2010, all staff members will write learning goals for units and/or individual students for all content area subjects 3 times per year as measured by the tri-annual parent letter.

This goal is intended to insure that all students' individual needs are met by providing rigorous, effective and purposeful classroom instruction. All pedagogues will receive on-going professional development in data analysis as well as creating SMART goals for all students in all subject areas.

Parent Involvement Goal

5. By June 2010, parent involvement in school related activities will increase by 10% as evidenced by attendance documentation.

This goal is intended to provide the parents and families of P.S. 62 the opportunity to participate in educational activities to build strong home/school partnerships. Throughout the school year workshops to support student's academic and social-emotional development will be provided. Topics may include but are not limited to: Family Literacy Nights, Math, Science and Social Studies, Fire Prevention, Asthma, Domestic Violence, ARIS Parent Link Training and Partners in Print (pending funding).

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): ELA

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p><i>By June 2010, the school will close the achievement gap in the area of ELA by 10% between Students with Disabilities and all students as evidenced by the NYS ELA.</i></p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p><u>Strategies:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By September 2009-June 2010, a special Education Team comprised of special education teachers, SBST members and support staff, led by an administrator will meet monthly to address the needs of all students with disabilities. • By September 2009-June 2010 baseline assessments will be given to all students in both academies and a periodic assessment calendar will be provided to all staff members to insure progress analysis. • By October 2009-June 2010, an Inquiry Team will be established on each grade to identify patterns and trends in each grade. • By October 2009, all data will be analyzed to assess the needs of all students with disabilities. • By October 2009, all students identified as performing below standard will receive At-Risk services through small group instruction. • By October 2009, all teachers in grades 3-5 will receive Acuity training and TC Assessment training. • By October 2009, all teachers in grades Pre-K to 2 will receive TC Assessment and Words Their Way Spelling Inventory training to assess patterns and trends in the classroom. • By October 2009-June 2010, all staff will receive professional development in differentiated instruction to address the needs of the individual student. • By October 2009- June 2010, identified teachers will implement and assess Wilson, Foundations, as well as utilize best practices for small group instruction for identified students in both sub-groups <p><u>Responsible Staff:</u> Principal/ Assistant Principal, Curriculum Coaches, SLT, Parent Association, Parent Coordinator, PPC/EPC, School’s Attuned/Special Education Team, ELL Committee, SBST (School Based Support Team), and DIT (Data Inquiry Team), Empowerment Network Staff.</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><u>Resources/Timeline:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TL Fair Student Funding, Title 1 SWP, TL 09 C4E CTT, IDEA Mandated Speech Title 1 ARRA SWP, • AIS schedules • ESL teachers • AUSSIE consultants • SDE consultants • ProTraxx
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p><u>Assessment (Progress or Accomplishments):</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NYS 2009 ELA results 2. Sept. 2009 ELA baseline Grades 3-5 3. Dec. 2009/March 2010 ELA interim assessment Grades 3-5 7% growth 4. Acuity assessments October/March- 10% gain 5. Wilson: October, January, May 6. TC Assessments: Sept. Nov./Dec. (1 level), March (2-3 levels, May (1-2 levels) 7. Spelling Inventory

Subject/Area (where relevant): Mathematics

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p><i>By June 2010, the school will increase the percentage of the lowest 1/3 of students achieving at least one year of progress in mathematics by 5% as measured by the School Progress Report.</i></p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>Strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By September 2009-June 2010 baseline assessments will be given to all students in both academies and a periodic assessment calendar will be provided to all staff members to insure progress analysis. • By October 2009, all data will be analyzed to identify the lowest 1/3 in each grade in mathematics. • By October 2009, all classroom teachers will identify the mean scale score of individual students and identify those students at-risk of not making one’s year of progress. • By November 2009-June 2010, an Inquiry Team will be established on each grade to identify patterns and trends in each grade. • By November 2009 all classroom teachers will receive professional development in EDM. • By November 2009 all identified students will have a mathematics goal. <p>Responsible Staff: Principal/ Assistant Principal, Curriculum Coaches, SLT, Parent Association, Parent Coordinator, PPC/EPC, School’s Attuned/Special Education Team, ELL Committee, SBST (School Based Support Team), and DIT (Data Inquiry Team), Empowerment Network Staff.</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<p>Resources/Timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TL Fair Student Funding, Title 1 SWP, TL 09 C4E CTT, TL Childrens First , NYSTL, Title 1 ARRA SWP, • Preparation Schedules • Coaches • EDM consultant (pending funding) • ProTraxx
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<p>Assessment (Progress or Accomplishments):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. NYS 2009 Math results/NYS 2010 Math results 9. Sept. 2009 Math baseline Grades 2-5 10. Dec. 2009/March 2010 Math interim assessment Grades 3-5 11. Acuity assessments October/March 12. EDM Unit Tests 13. Student Learning Goals

Subject/Area (where relevant): Professional Development

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p><i>By June 2010, 85% of teachers will utilize differentiated instructional strategies 90% of the time as measured by supervisor/coach formal/informal observation logs.</i></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><u>Strategies/Activities:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• By September 2009, all staff will receive data analysis training in relation to the assessments utilized in their academy.• By November 2009-May 2010, an AUSSIE consultant will provide professional development, demonstrations and inter-visitations for classroom teachers and AIS providers in guided reading and literacy centers grades 2-5.• By October 2009-June 2010, selected teachers of ELL, Special Education and at-risk students will attend a variety of ProTraxx workshops to turnkey the information to their respective colleagues on best practices.• By October 2009- May 2010 teachers in grades 2-5 will receive Emotional-Social Program Training (ESR) from Morningside Center.• By October 2009- June 2010 3 coaches will meet with assigned grades, classroom teachers, AIS providers to provide demonstrations, inter-visitations, workshops, instructional strategies and data analysis.• By September 2009-June 2010, a schedule of formal observations will be established by Academy Administrators to assess teacher progress.• By Fall 2009 a series of Saturday Institutes will be scheduled to provide professional development for teachers in the areas of Learning Goals, Small Group Instruction, Tiered Activities (pending funding)• By September 2009-June 2010, grade conferences, individual teacher meetings and faculty conferences will be conducted by academy supervisors to address professional development needs which will facilitate differentiated instruction in the classroom.
<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">• TL Fair Student Funding, Title 1 SWP, Title III, C4Excellence , 5% Highly Qualified, EGCSR State and Federal Program, SINI Title 1• Substitute Classroom Teachers: Coverage for Training sessions• AUSSIE• Consultants (pending funding)• Coaches• Administrators

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Morningside Center • ProTraxx (pending funding) • All teachers, support staff and administrators
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal Observations: November 25%, January 45%, March 60%, June 85% • Professional Development attendance documentation

Subject/Area (where relevant): Professional Development

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>4. By June 2010, all staff members will write learning goals for units and/or individual students for all content area subjects 3 times per year as measured by the tri-annual parent letter.</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><u>Strategies/Activities:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• By October 2009, all staff will receive SMART Goal training.• By November 2009-May 2010, an AUSSIE consultant will provide professional development, demonstrations and inter-visitations for classroom teachers and AIS providers in guided reading and literacy centers grades 2-5.• By October 2008- June 2009 3 coaches will meet with assigned grades, classroom teachers, AIS providers to provide demonstrations and workshops to assist with creating, assessing and revising student goals throughout the year.• By November 2009 all classroom teachers will identify individual goals in ELA and math for at-risk students.• By September 2009-June 2010, a schedule of formal observations will be established by Academy Administrators to assess teacher progress.• By September 2009-June 2010, grade conferences, individual teacher meetings and faculty conferences will be conducted by academy supervisors to address professional development needs which will support teacher development of learning goals.• By October, January and March a parent letter indicating the individual student goals will be distributed.
<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">• TL Fair Student Funding, Title 1 SWP, Title III, C4Excellence , 5% Highly Qualified, EGCSR State and Federal Program,• Substitute Classroom Teachers: Coverage for Training sessions• AUSSIE• Coaches• CFN 10- SMART goal training• All teachers, support staff and administrators

<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal Observations: November 40%, January 65%, March 85%, June 100% • Professional Development attendance documentation • Evidence of written student goals • Evidence of ability of students to articulate goals • Evidence of signed parent articulation sheets in October, January and March
--	---

Subject/Area (where relevant): Parent Involvement

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p><i>By June 2010, parent involvement in school related activities will increase by 10% as evidenced by attendance documentation.</i></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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By September 2009, a parent needs assessment will be distributed by the Parents Association to determine parent concerns and topics for workshops. • By October 2009, a schedule of parent association workshops and meetings will be established. • By September 2009, a schedule of P.S. 62 sponsored parent workshops and activities will be established. • By September 2009, the P.S. 62 translation policy will be published. • By November 2010 the parent policy and compact will be distributed to all members • By September 2009-June 2010, all parent communications will be provided in both English and Spanish • By September 2009-June 2010, a monthly parent letter, addressing the areas of concern, state of the school and school policies will be distributed to all parents. • By September 2009-June 2010, reminders for Parent Association and School Sponsored Activities will be posted in the main lobby and front door 3 days prior to the activity. • By September 2009-June 2010, policies and procedures for addressing parent schools in the main office will be established

<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"> • TL Fair Student Funding, Title 1 SWP • Parents Association Members • Parent Coordinator • School Administrators • Office Staff • School Based Translators
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p><u>Assessment (Progress or Accomplishments):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning Environment Survey- 2008 and 2009 • PTA evening sheets 2% October, 4% December, 6% February, 8% April, 10% June

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENT FOR ALL TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

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

Grade	ELA	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	At-risk Services: Guidance Counselor	At-risk Services: School Psychologist	At-risk Services: Social Worker	At-risk Health-related Services
	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS				
K	0	0	N/A	N/A	0	0	3	0
1	104	104	N/A	N/A	0	1	10	0
2	121	121	N/A	N/A	0	0	10	0
3	116	116	N/A	N/A	0	0	10	0
4	110	110	110	0	0	1	10	0
5	101	101	0	101	0	0	10	0
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

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

Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services

<p>Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)</p>	<p>Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).</p>
<p>ELA:</p>	<p>Wilson,: small group, 5X per week, day program Foundations: small group 5X per week, day program Imagine Learning: 3-5X per week, day program/after-school program Guided Reading: 2-5X per week, day program, extended day Buckle Down: 5X per week, extended- day program (Winter) Words Their Way: 5X per week, extended day program (Fall-Spring) Princeton Review: 2x per week, after-school NESI: 3 x per week, after-school</p>
<p>Mathematics:</p>	<p>Princeton Review Math: 3X per week, after-school Buckle Down Math: 5x per week, extended day (Spring) Small Group Instruction: as needed, day program</p>
<p>Science:</p>	<p>Grade 4 Measuring Up 5X per week, extended day program (Spring) Foss Kits, 1X per week, day program Small group instruction: as needed, day program</p>
<p>Social Studies:</p>	<p>Scott-Foresman DBQ's: 5x per week, extended day program (Fall) Small group instruction: as needed, day program</p>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:</p>	<p>N/A (No Guidance Counselor)</p>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:</p>	<p>1 to 1 assistance as needed</p>
<p>At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:</p>	<p>Small group instruction: as needed, day program 1 to 1 counseling: as needed, day program</p>

At-risk Health-related Services:	
---	--

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

NCLB/SED requirement for all schools

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

***Language Allocation Policy
2009-2010***

The P.S. 62 Language Allocation Policy Team:

SSO/District: 08X062 CFN-10	School: P.S. 62 / Academy for Success
Lisa Manfredonia, Principal	Camille Squitieri, Assistant Principal
Jessica Russo, Instructional Coach	Lisa Eason, Instructional Coach
Diana Martin, Instructional Coach	Jose Camacho, ESL Teacher
Mary Luz Alvarez- Teacher	John Lawrence, ESL Teacher
Richard Rodriguez- Bilingual Teacher- Team Chairperson	Erika Medina- Bilingual Teacher
Johanna Sanchez- Bilingual Teacher	Caterina DiTillio- Network Deputy Leader/ELL Liaison
Maria Quail, Network Leader	Ms. Ramona Munoz, Parent Coordinator

Teacher Qualification:

Number of Certified ESL Teachers	Number of Content Area Teachers with Bilingual Extensions	Number of Certified General Education Bilingual Teachers	Number of Certified Bilingual Special Education Teachers	Number of Certified NLA/FL Teachers	Total Number of Students in School	Total Number of ELL's	ELL's as Share of Total Student Population
2	0	1	2	0	732	117	15.7%

P.S 62 is an urban Title 1 school located in the South Bronx in District 08, servicing students in Pre-K to 5. The student population is comprised of 83.1% Hispanic, 15.7% Black and 1.1% Caucasian /American Indian/Other. The large Hispanic population as well as a small number of African speaking students necessitates an English Language Learner (ELL) program. This year the ELL program consists of 1 Transitional Bilingual (Spanish) Education (TBE) class which is a first/second grade split, (1) 12:1 first, second / third grade Special Education Bilingual split, and (1) third/fourth grade 12:1:1 Special Education Bilingual split. In addition, a Free-Standing English as a Second Language (ESL) program is offered for students in grades K-5. This program is provided by (2) licensed ESL instructors. In order to provide high-quality instruction for all ELL's, the instructional programs, models and materials have been diversified.

All children entering into the New York City school system for the first time are given a Home Language Survey. This survey is completed by the parents with the aid of a pedagogue to ensure that it is properly completed. The Home Language Survey is then utilized to identify which students may require ELL services. The LAB-R is then administered within 10 days to the student by a certified bilingual or ESL teacher to

determine eligibility. An oral interview in English and/or Spanish is conducted during the LAB-R assessment to insure that students are given the correct program. Upon completion of the LAB-R students are identified for services. The parents of the eligible students are provided with an orientation to the various programs offered by New York City. These programs consist of Dual language, TBE and Free-standing ESL. Parents are given the option of which program to select and entitlement letters are distributed. In the event that a program is not offered; due to less than 15 students being eligible for the program, the parent may select to attend another school. The Parent is then sent to the Office of Youth Development. If the parent selects a program of choice at P.S. 62 the students are placed into their class immediately. Services are provided until the student reaches proficiency as measured by the New York State English as a Second Language Acquisition Test (NYSESLAT). In order to achieve this goal students are provided with specific programs to address their individual needs.

At P.S. 62 our specific programs have been created to target the needs of all ELL's. Students are identified as follows:

- ***New-Comers***- Students with 0-3 years of service;
- ***Long-Term ELL's***- Students who have completed 6 or more years of service;
- ***Former ELL's***- Students that achieved Proficiency on both strands (Listening/Speaking and Reading/Writing) of the NYSESLAT;
- ***Special Education***- Students with Individual Education Plans;
- ***SIFE's***- Students with Interrupted Formal Education;

In order to determine the ELL identification of students several reports and assessments are utilized. The LAB-R, as stated above is used to determine eligibility. All ELL students are entered into the ELL reporting system, BESIS. This report tracks the number of years students receive services, which determines if they are new-comers or long term ELL's. In addition, the A-11 report in ATS allows schools to request an extension of service for students that do not reach proficiency on the NYSESLAT after 3 years of service. ATS also provides a report to identify students that receive special education in addition to ELL services. Students that are in special education but no longer require ESL must still pass the NYSESLAT in order to be exempt from state testing. These children are identified in the CAP report in ATS as X-Coded. Finally, the NYSESLAT testing report (RLAT) provides each student's NYSESLAT level: beginner, intermediate, advanced and proficient, as well as the raw score for each strand tested. These levels determine the number of minutes per week that students must receive English Language instruction as mandated by Part 154. This report also identifies former ELL's by identifying which students received a proficiency level on the assessment. The new SIFE assessment is also provided if schools need to determine if a student has had interrupted formal education. The administration and review of these assessments and reports provide the foundation for developing and implementing the programs and materials at P.S. 62.

An analysis of the spring 2009 NYSESLAT results and the Fall 2009 LAB-R identified the following number of students eligible for services this year:

ELL Program Breakdown:

	Kindergarten	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Total
TBE/ Special Education	0	1	8	10	5	0	24
Dual	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TBE	0	7	15	0	0	0	22

Push-In Pull-Out	3	11	8	19	19	11	71
Total	3	19	31	29	24	11	117

Ells by Subgroup:

	ALL	SIFE	Special Ed	All	SIFE	Special Ed	ALL	SIF	Special Ed	TOTAL
TBE	22	0	20	0	0	4	0	0	0	46
Dual	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ESL	22	0	20	0	0	4	0	0	0	42
Total	22	0	20	0	0	4	0	0	0	46

Home Language Breakdown and ELL Programs: Transitional Bilingual Education

Language	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Spanish	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

**Freestanding English as a Second Language
Number of ELL's by Grade in Each Language**

Spanish	K	1	2	3	4	5	Total
	3	9	6	22	17	18	75
Other	0	1	2	1	0	0	4

LAB-R

Levels	Kindergarten	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth
Beginner/Intermediate	3	2	1	1	2	1
Advanced	0	1	0	1	0	0

Further analysis of the spring 2009 NYSESLAT results determined each student's English proficiency levels to ensure that students receive the appropriate amount of English Language Instruction as per Part 154 guidelines, as well as identify the strengths and weaknesses for each child.

Listening and Speaking

Grade	Beginner	Intermediate	Advanced	Proficient
-------	-----------------	---------------------	-----------------	-------------------

1	6	7	3	0
2	12	9	7	0
3	11	11	6	0
4	5	6	10	0
5	2	4	4	0

Reading and Writing

	Beginner	Intermediate	Advanced	Proficient
1	5	3	3	0
2	11	7	4	0
3	10	11	6	0
4	4	6	10	0
5	1	4	4	0

The 2009-2010 ELL programs are specific to the needs of the students. The analysis and review of the various reports and assessments have provided the necessary information to ensure that all students' individual needs are met. Therefore the following plans and programs are being utilized to address our ELL population:

New Comers:

New Comers are addressed by two distinct programs at P.S. 62. In the primary grades, K -2, as well as the self-contained special education classes, students have been placed in a first / second grade transitional bilingual bridge program based on the parent survey. These students receive native language instruction in all content areas as well as native language literacy instruction. ESL teachers also instruct new comers in literacy, totaling 360 minutes per week for students at the beginner and intermediate levels. Students at the advanced level require 180 minutes per week in ESL instruction. The following programs are utilized in these classrooms:

Literacy:

Reader's Workshop -**Native Language:**

Mini-lesson- 15-20 minutes

Guided/Independent Practice: 45-60 minutes

Share-Out- 5 minutes

English Second Language:

Mini-lesson- 15-20 minutes-**Second Language**

Guided/Independent Practice: 30 minutes

Rigby on Our Way to English, Computer Programs, Listening Centers

Share Out- 10 minutes

Mathematics:

Everyday Math: Native Language 60-75 minutes

Science/Social Studies:

Harcourt Brace/ Native Language 45 minutes

In addition, a 45 minute special provided in English is also included each day. The specials vary by class and may include; Art, Library, Science, Social Studies, Physical Education, Technology, The Writing Connection, Problem Solving and/or Text Talk. These classes employ ESL strategies such as TPR, repetition, vocabulary development and visual aids to insure that students are able to communicate and comprehend in English.

Students in K-5th grades are provided with a Free-standing ESL model. This program is serviced by 2 licensed ESL instructors. The ESL teachers push-in or pull-out students daily. The beginner and intermediate students are seen 5 times a week in small group, providing the 360 minutes as mandated by Part 154 in English Language Literacy Instruction. Students at the advanced level are seen for 180 minutes per week. These students are grouped according to NYSESLAT levels and/or grade level. The beginners, intermediate and advanced groups are provided with guided reading as well as writing instruction utilizing ESL strategies. The ESL instructors push-in to various classrooms to provide support for the advanced students in all content areas. Classroom teachers and ESL providers articulate weekly to ensure that the ESL teacher is working on the same literacy skills and strategies as the classroom teacher. In addition, students are utilizing Imagine Learning, a computerized program in the classroom daily. This program assesses each students English Acquisition level and provides explicit teaching and practice in all 4 strands of literacy; listening, speaking, reading and writing.

Support for ELL students in their native language is also provided for the Free-standing ESL student. All classroom libraries include Spanish reading materials as well as Spanish-English dictionaries. Beginner and intermediate students have been provided with Spanish content area reference books for use at home and school to scaffold content area instruction. The advanced and proficient students are given assistance during this time to support student learning by the ESL teacher (push-in). Students are also encouraged to work with partners (when available) proficient in English as well as Spanish to ensure that students have opportunities for clarification during the school day.

Finally, all ELL's are mandated to participate in the extended day program which utilizes Imagine Learning as the primary instruction for all TBE classes. The free-standing ESL students are placed in small groups and provided with additional support in listening, speaking, reading and writing. Depending on the students NYSESLAT level they may receive additional guided reading, phonics instruction- Foundations/Wilson, fluency practice- Great Leaps or Reader's Theatre as well as listening and speaking instruction through explicit vocabulary and role playing. In addition, an SES after-school program (NESI) is being offered to all ELL students in Grades 1-5 on-site.

Long Term ELL's:

The students that are in need of extended services are provided with specific instruction identified by the 4 strands of the NYSESLAT in addition to the programs that the new comers receive. Imagine Learning, NESI After-school program, and small guided reading instruction, and Academic Intervention based on need. The programs include the Wilson Language Program which addresses deficiencies in decoding or guided reading instruction for reading comprehension provided by AUSSIE trained specialists. The New York City Acuity program also provides additional support as it targets specific areas of concern and provides independent practice in the targeted area. All Long-Term ELL's are given mandated

support during the Extended Day program, utilizing a variety of programs, including Great Leaps and Readers Theatre to address fluency, Words Their Way and/or content area instruction.

Former ELL's:

Students that have achieved a Proficient Level in both Listening/Speaking and Reading/Writing on the Spring 2009 NYSESLAT are no longer required to receive ELL services. These students are considered former ELL's. Although, there is no mandate to provide services, P.S. 62 has opted to follow the progress of these students for one more year to insure that they do not have difficulty transitioning out of their previous programs. Therefore, all former ELL's are provided with extended day services, Imagine Learning, NESI After-school program, and small guided reading instruction provided by the classroom teacher. In addition, students in Grades 3-5 will continue to receive test modifications for all NYC and NYS Assessments as outlined by the New York State Testing Memorandum.

Special Education/ELL's:

Students in the transitional bilingual self-contained special education classes and the free-standing ESL special education students are included in the same programs as the monolingual general education students. However, they also receive all mandated services as per their Individual Educational Plan. The ESL instructor goes into the classroom to provide additional support for these students during the period in which the student's IEP identifies an area of weakness. These students are also mandated for extended services and after-school. In addition, they receive AIS 5 times per week to further support their deficiencies. The self-contained classroom teachers also employ special education strategies and small group instruction. The ESL providers have also created individual goals for the students based on the data which is discerned through the Imagine Learning Program. Special Education classroom teachers have also been trained in Schools Attuned, providing the teacher with a better understanding of how to deal with the different learning modalities of their students.

SIFE's:

Although there are no identified SIFE's at P.S. 62 at this time, we have developed a plan to address their needs. First, the new SIFE identification assessment would be utilized to determine student need. Once it has been determined that the student is in need of service, academic assessments such as Teacher's College Reading Assessment would be utilized to determine the students literacy level. A basic baseline as well as unit mathematics assessment would also be given to identify the students' strengths and weaknesses. These students while academically deficient are also unfamiliar with the social structure of formal education. Therefore, it will be necessary to provide at-risk counseling to help the student to transition into a formal school setting. The counselor after meeting with the student for several sessions would then discuss the child at the Child Study Committee to identify and implement any next steps. A parent meeting to review the child's social history would also be scheduled to better understand the student's background and open communication between the parent/guardian. Finally, each student would be given an individual plan for instruction since each case would be unique to the individual and his/her prior circumstances.

The above programs/models at P.S. 62 have been developed by the Language Allocation Team and are aligned with the individual needs of the students who are being serviced. These programs have been developed and are implemented with great care and concern for the individual student as well as the population as a whole. For the past two years, we have seen a trend in parent request for ESL services rather than bilingual

education. The Programs implemented at P.S. 62 are carefully monitored. Student progress is monitored by the classroom teacher, extended day teachers, AIS instructors as well as ESL teachers. All constituents are part of the PS.62 ELL Institute which was developed to drive instruction, develop teachers, and move the ELL students from Beginner to Proficient.

In order to insure that all pedagogues and support staff are equipped with the necessary skills to instruct the English Language Learner a series of professional development activities have been organized. The bilingual teachers and ESL teachers are core members of the ELL Institute. These teachers in collaboration with the instructional coaches, CFN 10 support staff and the administration meet bi-monthly to review student data, best practices and programs that address the needs of the ELL student. In addition, this team articulates with all staff members to insure that all pedagogues are familiar with the programs and needs of the students they service. The ESL teachers push-in to classrooms during the content area to model ESL strategies for the classroom teachers as well as provide support for the students. The ESL teachers are provided with additional professional development by attending monthly CFN 10 ELL workshops and turnkey this information to all staff members during faculty conferences and team meetings. These teams are inclusive of the special education teacher, SBST, speech teachers and SLT. Classroom teachers and all support staff will be also be provided with 7 ½ hours of mandated ESL strategies and methods during afterschool workshops in Winter 2010. Any staff member unable to attend these sessions will be given the opportunity during the school day to attend these sessions. These sessions will be conducted by a certified bilingual teacher. Attendance will be recorded and certificates of participation will be distributed at the completion of the 7 ½ hours. These records will be kept on file and a copy of the certificate will be placed in the personnel file for each staff member. Finally, 2 Saturday Institutes with a keynote speaker will be provided to support all staff members in the latest ESL strategies for instruction of ELL students.

While it is imperative to address student needs and the professional development of teachers it is also critical to address the needs of the parent/guardian. The Team has taken several steps to insure that the ELL parent is included in the school community. Although, it is not possible to meet the needs of all parents we have tried to accommodate the Spanish speaking parent/guardian since they represent a significant portion of our school population. All communication to the parents from the school and Parents Association is in both English and Spanish. Parents may request an oral translation over the phone or in person at any time. The parent coordinator, office staff and school personnel are happy to assist. In addition, parents/guardians of beginner and intermediate students in grades K-5 have been provided with native language content area books whenever possible so parents can work with their children at home. Finally, parents/guardians are directed to community resources by the Parent Coordinator to further assist families in bridging the gap as their children acquire the English language. Assisting the families of our English Language Learners has created an environment that is supportive and nurturing for all concerned and this collaboration eases the way for our students.

Grade Level(s) Pre-K - 5___

Number of Students to be Served: 117 LEP _____ Non-LEP

Number of Teachers _____ 61

Other Staff (Specify) SBST: 2, Paraprofessionals: 7, School Aides: 8, Social Workers: 2, Speech: 2

School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview

Title III, Part A LEP Program

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

P.S. 62 Title III Spending Plan 2009-2010

This year the ELL program at P.S. 62 has been revised. The following programs are being provided for our K-5 classes: a 1st / 2nd grade split General Education Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE), as well as 1 12:1 TBE special education class grades 2/3 and a 12:1:1 TBE Grade 3/4. General Education ELL students in grades K, 3, 4 and 5 will receive a freestanding ESL program only. In order to support our programs and our students we will use our Title III funding to provide after-school services, professional development, parent workshops and materials that will enhance English Acquisition for all ELL's.

P.S. 62 services 117 ELL students. The students have been identified as beginner, intermediate or advanced as per NYSESLAT and the LAB-R. The beginner and intermediate student's receive 360 minutes of weekly instruction in English. In order to support the ELL student an analysis of the NYSESLAT was conducted. The data revealed that oral language development must be further developed. Therefore, the following programs are being instituted:

- Imagine Learning, a computer based program that provides individual instruction for each child is being utilized. An additional 10 licenses are needed, as well as 25 headsets. This program is utilized throughout the day to support the freestanding ESL student.

- An after-school program for all intermediate and advanced ELL students taught by 3 licensed ESL and/or Bilingual teachers will be conducted 2 x per week for 2 hours per day for 10 weeks beginning January 2010, using the Text Talk vocabulary development program.
- A Saturday program for all beginner students and their parents taught by 2 licensed ESL and/or Bilingual teachers in grades K-2 will be provided January-May 2010 for oral language development in the content areas as well as conversational English. This program will employ the strategies outlined by Marie Caulderon. In addition, field trips to various cultural institutions will be held to further support student's oral language development. Parent participation will also be required.

Total Title III Budget: 19,760.00

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.

To further support the needs of our ELL students all staff members are provided with professional development opportunities in areas related to best practices for ELLs. In addition, an ELL Institute comprised of ESL and Bilingual teachers in collaboration with administrators and instructional coaches meet bi-monthly to address areas of concern and ELL instruction. In order to support the staff, teachers receive professional development opportunities through the Office of English Language Learners via (ProTraxx) in data analysis and best practices. A Saturday Institute for staff and parents will be conducted in January 2010 (Marie Caulderon pending availability) to address oral language development and listening skills for intermediate and advanced students.

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

School: 08X062 BEDS Code: 320800010062

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

Allocation Amount:		
Budget Category	Budgeted Amount	Explanation of expenditures in this category as it relates to the program narrative for this title.
Professional salaries (schools must account for fringe benefits) <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Per session- Per diem	Per Session: \$5,986.80 \$4789.44 Per Session: \$2506.08	After-School ESL program for intermediate and advanced students (3 teachers x 2 days x 2 hour per day x 10 weeks x \$ hours x \$49.89) Saturday Parents as Partners for beginners (8 days x 2 teachers x 6 hours x \$49.89) 1 Supervisor x \$52.21 x 8 days x 6 hours
Purchased services <ul style="list-style-type: none">- High quality staff and curriculum development contracts.	\$3,000.00	Marie Caulderon- Vocabulary Development: 1 Saturday Workshop for parents and staff (50 attendees)
Supplies and materials <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Must be supplemental.- Additional curricula, instructional materials.- Must be clearly listed.	\$1027.68	Headphones, Text Talk Grades 3-5, NYSESLAT preparation
Educational Software (Object Code 199)	\$1,500.00	10 Imagine Learning Software Licenses
Travel	\$700.00	Transportation: Pioneer Bus (2) Saturdays x \$350.00 for parent-student trips
Other	\$250.00	Refreshments: Saturday Parent Workshop 50 people
TOTAL	19,760.00	

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

Requirement under Chancellor's Regulations – for all schools

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

Part A: Needs Assessment Findings

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

The school data indicates that approximately 83% of our student population is Hispanic. At Parent Association meetings, the parents have requested that we speak in English and in Spanish.

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.

Through our Parents Association we reported the following:

It is school policy to ensure all letters and school communications are written in English and in Spanish.

Parent volunteers are given a stipend to translate during Parent Teacher Conferences.

Large items are translated by bilingual school staff.

If parents need a translator to speak to a teacher, a request is made in either of three places:

- (1) at the security desk
- (2) in the Parents' Room
- (3) in the main office

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.

It is school policy to ensure all letters and school communications are written in English and in Spanish.

Parent volunteers are given a stipend to translate during Parent Teacher Conferences.

Large items are translated by bilingual school staff.

If parents need a translator to speak to a teacher, a request is made in either of three places:

- (4) at the security desk
- (5) in the Parents' Room
- (6) in the main office

2. Describe the oral interpretation services the school will provide, and how they will meet identified needs indicated in Part A. Indicate whether oral interpretation services will be provided by an outside contractor, or in-house by school staff or parent volunteers.

Oral translations will be provided by parent volunteers during all conferences

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>.

A. We will provide each parent whose primary language is a covered language and who require language assistance services with a copy of the Bill of Parent Rights and Responsibilities which includes their rights regarding translation and interpretation services.

B. We will post in a conspicuous location at or near the primary entrance to such school a sign in each of the covered languages, or most prominent covered languages, indicating the availability of interpretation services.

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:	690,828.00	183,174.00	874,002.00
2. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside for Parent Involvement:	6,908.00		6,908.00
3. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside to Improve Parent Involvement (ARRA Language):		1,832.00	1,832.00
4. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified:	34,541.00		34,541.00
5. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect – HQ PD (ARRA Language):		10,534.00	10,534.00
6. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Professional Development:	86,000.00		86,000.00
7. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect (Professional Development) (ARRA Language):		18,317.00	18,317.00

8. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2008-2009 school year: 93.8%
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.
Teachers without proper licensing are given the opportunity to take the required exams for licensing as well as courses to improve their identified area of weakness.

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

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

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

P.S. 62 Parent Involvement Policy

Parents and families of students in P.S. 62 will be provided with opportunities to participate in the Parent’s Association (PA), School Leadership Team (SLT) and P.S. 62 parent sponsored activities related to building a strong home/school partnership and fostering student success. The Parents as Partners relationship will be supported by activities related to academics, as well as the social/emotional welfare of the parents and students.

Monthly parent workshops will be provided for all parents to develop knowledge of instructional programs, school, city and state assessments, Chancellor’s promotional policy and discipline code.

Parents will be notified through a monthly calendar, flyers, and letters as to the time and date of meetings and workshops to address instructional programs and performance.

The P.S. 62 family worker, Parent Coordinator and Parent Association will facilitate the exchange of information among parents and encourage parent involvement and support by utilizing an “Open Door Policy” to insure that all parents are welcome.

They will:

- a. Offer Parent Training Workshops: Academic, Enrichment, Self-Improvement, Social/Emotional
- b. Communicate with parents about supporting student progress, both academically and socially
- c. Refer parents to outside resources as necessary
- d. Maintain a school bulletin board in both English and Spanish

- e. Support District, ISC and Network committees
- f. Participate in the School Leadership Team, Parents Association
- g. Conduct a yearly Parent's Association election for the executive board
- h. Conduct monthly day and evening parent association meetings
- i. Create Ad-Hoc Committees as needed
- j. Encourage parents to become classroom volunteers for trips, read-alouds, special projects, family nights
- k. Establish and maintain an inviting environment in the Parent Room for all parents
- l. Provide fund-raising opportunities for parents to support school wide activities to promote the concept of parents as partners, as well special student activities
- m. Maintain open communication with all staff members to insure the needs of the parents are being addressed

By May 2010 the Parent Policy will be reviewed by the PTA in conjunction with the SLT.

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

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

This Compact was created with the School Committee and our Parent Association. Please read this important agreement which states that the school and all parents will work cooperatively to provide for the successful education of our children and that we agree to adhere to this compact.

The School Agrees:

- to convene an annual meeting for Title I parents to inform them of the Title I program and their right to be involved.
- to offer a flexible number of meetings at various times.
- to actively involve parents in planning, reviewing and visiting, improving the Title I programs and the parental involvement policy.
- to provide parents with timely information about all programs.

- to provide progress reports and individual student assessment results for each child and other pertinent individual and school district education information.
- to provide high quality curriculum and instruction.
- to deal with communication issues between teachers and parents through:
 - “Meet The Teacher Week” early in the school year, parent-teacher conferences at least bi-annually, frequent reports to parents on their children’s progress (Good News grams) access to staff by appointment, opportunities to volunteer and participate in their child’s class and observation of classroom activities, providing each new parent with a “Welcome Packet”,
- to assure that parents may participate in professional development activities if the school determines that it is appropriate, i.e., literacy/ESL classes, workshops in curriculum areas and relevant parenting topics.
- to translate and interpret services in order to communicate effectively with the Department in accordance with Chancellor’s Regulation A-663.

The Parent/Guardian Agrees:

- to become involved in developing, implementing, evaluating and revising the school parent-involvement policy.
- to use or ask for technical assistance training that the school may offer on child rearing practices and teaching and learning strategies.
- to work with our child/children on their school work.
- to encourage your child to read for 15 to 30 minutes per day.
- to be an active member of “Parents as Reading Partners”.
- to monitor your child’s:
 - attendance (must be 95% throughout the year)
 - homework (cannot miss more than 3 per marking period)
 - television watching.
- to share the responsibility for improved student achievement.
- to communicate with your child’s teachers about their educational needs.
- to ask parents and parent groups to provide information to the school on what type of training or assistance you would like and/or need so that you are more effective in assisting your child in the educational process.
- to treat all school staff members with courtesy and respect.

We Encourage Parents To:

- Set high expectations for your children.
- Help out at school by volunteering time, skills or resources.
- Get involved in Parent Association or Parent-Teacher Association.
- Take part in school and community programs

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.

Please refer to pages 11, 12, 13 and 26

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.

Please refer to pages 16-28

3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.

Please refer to pages 14, 19-20

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.

Please refer to pages 14, 19-20

5. Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.
P.S. 62 has formed partnerships with Teach for America, as well as Mercy and Lehman College to support our efforts to reach out to qualified and motivated teachers.

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

Please refer to pages 22, 39-40, 42-44

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.

In order to support our preschool population transition into our kindergarten a series of parent-student meet and greets are established in early April/May. The parents and children are invited to spend an our in one of our kindergarten classes after meeting with the grade supervisor and parent coordinator.

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.

14, 16-21

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.

14, 16-22, 26-37

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

The students in temporary housing are supported by our family worker, parent coordinator and the NYC Temporary housing liaisons at each location. The school provides workshops in a variety of areas to support parents. In addition the school social workers are available to provide further supports as needed to the families and students.

Part D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS

N/A

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

1. Use program resources to help participating children meet the State standards.
2. Ensure that planning for students served under this program is incorporated into existing school planning.

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

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

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

NCLB/SED Status: SINI Basic- Year 1 **SURR¹ Phase/Group (If applicable):** _____

Part A: For All Schools Identified for Improvement

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

P.S. 62 was cited for SINI due to ELL- ELA participation only (94%)

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

Refer to Pages: 29-38

Part B: For Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

In order to address the needs of the school 10% of our Title 1 funding will be used to purchase an Instructional Coach. This coach will provide workshops in data analysis, aligning standards with the curriculum and student/unit learning goals. In addition. AIS and extended day service providers will receive professional development in guided reading, Wilson, Foundations and Great Leaps.

¹ School Under Registration Review (SURR)

2. Describe the teacher-mentoring program that will be incorporated as part of the school's strategy for providing high-quality professional development.

100% of the P.S. 62 staff is highly qualified. We do however, still provide professional development to insure effective classroom instruction. The 3 Instructional Coaches and the AUSSIE consultant meet with all staff members throughout the school year.

3. Describe how the school will notify parents about the school's identification for school improvement in an understandable and uniform format and to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand.

We will send the recommended Parent Notification letter home in both English and Spanish to notify parents of our current status.

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

All SURR schools must complete this appendix.

SURR Area(s) of Identification: _____

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

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

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

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Background

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

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

CURRICULUM AUDIT FINDINGS

KEY FINDING 1: CURRICULUM

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

1A. English Language Arts

Background

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

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

ELA Alignment Issues:

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

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

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

– **English Language Learners**

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

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

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

P.S. 62 engaged in an inquiry process to determine the relevance of the findings in relation to P.S. 62. Each of the key findings was reviewed and the specific evidence or data reviewed by the School Leadership Team.

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

X 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?

As we reviewed our curriculum maps and writing curriculum we identified areas in which the writing curriculum did not support the need to enhance students writing abilities. This was evident as we reviewed the results of Day 3 ELA Winter 2009 with grade 4 teachers and the coaches. Our 4th grade showed a significant decrease in proficiency from the year before.

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.

- P.S. 62 created a second Data Inquiry Team with particular focus on Grade 2. The original team addressed students in Grade 4. Both teams identified writing as an area in need of improvement. In order to address this issue, The Reading To Learn Data Inquiry team reviewed the state writing standards, analyzed NYS ELA Grade 4, Day 2 and Day 3 writing samples, aligned the existing Lucy Calkins Writing program to the standards as well as addressed the rubrics utilized at P.S. 62 to assess student writing. Particular emphasis was placed on creating tasks aligned to the standards and the performance indicators. The Learning to Read Data

Inquiry Team analyzed the 2008 EPAL to determine areas in need of improvement. The team also reviewed the state standards and performance indicators to align the writing curriculum. The Lucy Calkins writing program is the foundation of the writing program, however the research based Literacy Lessons program. The success of the program will be evaluated using the 2009 E-PAL results.

- P.S. 62 has recognized the need to align the curriculum to the state standards. Therefore, Grade Level meetings with the coaches have been on-going to determine the effectiveness of the current curriculum maps. The curriculum maps will be revised in May to reflect any changes to the existing programs and once the effectiveness of a unit has been determined.
- The materials at P.S. 62 are expansive, however based on a review of the quality review and analysis of Acuity and TC assessments, new materials were purchased. The findings suggested the following needs: a variety of independent materials with high interest for boys, high interest-low readability for students with disabilities and native language reading materials for all classrooms with ELL students. In addition, materials to address students with decoding deficiencies were addressed by adding the Wilson program and Foundations, as well as the Words Their Way Program by Donald Bear. Finally, books at levels P-Z were purchased for the Teacher's Resource room to provide a greater selection of materials to address the comprehension needs of students without decoding issues.
- The ELL Institute has enabled classroom teachers and support staff to analyze student data and address each ELL standard. The team has created goals for individual students to insure effective classroom instruction. As such, research based materials such as Imagine Learning and Magherita Calderon's approach to vocabulary instruction have been utilized this year.

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.

We reviewed students Acuity and unit tests to determine student progress throughout the year. Teacher teams utilized an inquiry model to review student work to identify trends and patterns. Grade levels determined that the student work showed progress.

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?

A review of student work and the results of grades 3-5 Spring mathematics exams indicates that the students at P.S. 62 are making gains in student proficiency levels.

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

KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION

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

2A – ELA Instruction

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

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

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

Learning Walks and classroom visits were conducted throughout the year to assess the level of direct teacher instruction

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

- Professional Development opportunities for ELA instruction across the grades have been provided this year to insure differentiated classroom instruction. The Learning to Read Academy with the support of the coaches and AUSSIE consultant have focused on

the development of literacy centers in grades K and 1, as well as an extended independent reading block in grade 2 with follow up activities to insure that students are held accountable. The Reading to Learn Academy also utilized AUSSIE and the coaches to create more opportunities for independent and small group ELA instruction. Guided Reading and independent reading begins daily at 9:15 to insure that all students are engaged in reading activities. The workshop model also directs the amount of time spent on direct instruction delineating approximate times for whole class, independent/ guided reading and share out activities. In addition, 2 Saturday Workshops on Differentiated Instructional Strategies have been provided to give teachers a broader knowledge base to effectively design classroom opportunities that foster independent student work. Finally, all formal ELA observations conducted by school administrators reflect on the amount of time teachers spend on whole class instruction.

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

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.

- In order to determine the relevance of this key finding mathematics observations were conducted with a focus on technology use and differentiated instructional strategies.

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

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?

- P.S. 62 utilizes technology throughout the day as observed by administrators and coaches. The purchase of SMART boards and laptops for all grade 3-5 classrooms has positively impacted the classroom. All classroom teachers in these grades are incorporating technology into their instruction. Additionally, at least 2 classrooms per grade in K-2 have received SMART boards. Training for effective use of this technology took place in late May. The Professional Development from the Lehman Project in Grades 2-5 also emphasizes the use of manipulatives and the EDM games in the classroom to support a more hands-on approach to concept development in the classroom.

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

KEY FINDING 3: TEACHER EXPERIENCE AND STABILITY

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 3:

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

- A review of teacher status and the BEDS survey indicates that a small percentage of teachers were not highly qualified 6.2% and 100% of teachers were regularly appointed.

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?

- P.S. 62 began the 2009-2010 school year with 100% of the previous year's staff returning.

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

KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

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

- The ELL Institute conducted a needs assessment for the teachers of ELLs at the beginning of the school year and utilized these findings to address teacher 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?

- The P.S. 62 ELL Institute was created specifically to address the needs of teachers of ELL's. This team meets bi-weekly to discuss student progress as well as current research regarding effective instruction. In addition, all teachers have had an opportunity to attend workshops through ProTraxx in the areas of data analysis and effective teaching strategies. Two team members attend the monthly Network meetings and turnkey all pertinent information. Our ESL and instructional coaches have attended BETAC training and turn key the information to staff members. Finally, all staff members have been provided with data and articulation periods to discuss the progress of the ELL child in their classrooms.

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.

- The ELL Institute team members articulated with selected staff members to report ELL student achievement data. In addition, an inquiry model in which team members followed the progress of 2 selected students was also utilized to support data use and monitoring for ELL students.
-

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?

The ESL teachers, coach, administrator and selected ELL team members have attended the Professional Development workshop provided by NYC OELL: Demystifying ELL Data. In addition, the ELL Institute has spent several sessions disaggregating the NYSESLAT data to form ESL groups to provide differentiated instruction based on the 4 strands as well as proficiency levels. All ESL teachers have articulated with the classroom teachers regarding their respective students baseline data as well as progress. Finally, Imagine Learning assesses, instructs and measures student progress throughout the year, providing reports for teachers

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

KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

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

- A review of the state ELA indicated that our special education students are not performing at the level of the general education student. Through a needs assessment and discussions with staff members it was determined that teachers are not fluent with the instructional approaches necessary to scaffold and/or modify grade level curriculum.

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?

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.

- This year The Special Education Team, Child Study Team and SBST have been provided with a variety of professional development workshops addressing how to write quality SMART goals for IEPs, differentiate instruction for students as well as looking at State Standards to insure that there is an alignment between the curriculum and IEP. In addition, articulation between the general education teacher and the Special Education teacher has taken place prior to each report card to assess student progress. All general education have been provided with a copy of the students IEP. Test modifications are implemented for all assessments to insure that students with disabilities are provided with optimum assessment conditions prior to taking all state exams.

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

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

- The Special Education team through discussion and articulation with the general education teachers identified the need to align student IEPs.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

7.3: Based on your response to Question 7.2, what evidence supports (or dispels) the relevance of this finding to your school's educational program?

- The IEPs that were reviewed demonstrated a lack of alignment between the goals, objectives, modifications and promotional criteria.

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

- All students are provided with their appropriate test modifications throughout the school year by both general education and special education teachers. The Child Study Team and the Special Education Team are providing more articulation opportunities this year to meet the needs of their students as well as make classroom accommodations for instruction. In addition, professional development opportunities addressing SMART goals and IEP alignment are provided to teachers of special needs students.

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

This appendix will not be required for 2009-10.

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

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

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:

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

Supporting Students in Temporary Housing (STH)

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

Part A: FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

P.S. 62 currently serves 48 students in temporary housing.

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

P.S. 62 is fortunate to have the support of three family workers, 1 housed at P.S. 62 and 2 servicing the two main shelters in our area. These 3 family workers provide workshops for parents at P.S. 62 and attend the McKinney-Vento workshops each year to keep abreast of current information regarding STH regulations and support programs. In addition, the family workers provide outreach for both the academic and social emotional needs of the students and their parents. Finally, our Parent Coordinator works collaboratively with the family workers to assist with the needs of the students and their families.

Part B: FOR NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

1. Please identify the number of Students in Temporary Housing who are currently attending your school (please note that your STH population may change over the course of the year).
2. Please describe the services you are planning to provide to the STH population with the Title I set-aside funds.

3. Some Non-Title I schools receive a specific allocation based on the reported number of students living in temporary housing. If your school received an allocation (please refer to the current Title I Funds Summary of School Allocation Memorandum), include the amount your school received in this question. If your school did not receive an allocation and needs assistance in identifying resources to assist STH students, please contact an STH liaison in the borough Integrated Service Center (ISC) or Children First Network.