



**P.S. 75**

**2009-10**

**SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN**  
**(CEP)**

**SCHOOL: 08X075**

**ADDRESS: 984 FAILE STREET, BRONX, NEW YORK 10459**

**TELEPHONE: 718-860-1630**

**FAX: 718-860-4480**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

**SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE**

**SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE**

**SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE**

**Part A. Narrative Description**

**Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot**

**SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

**SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS**

**SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN**

**REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010**

**APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM**

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

**APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION**

**APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS**

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

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

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

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

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

**SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE**

SCHOOL NUMBER: PS 75 SCHOOL NAME: PS 75

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 984 Faile Street

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 718-860-1630 FAX: 718-860-4480

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Marines Arrieta-Cruz EMAIL ADDRESS: marriet@schools.nyc.gov

**POSITION/TITLE**

**PRINT/TYPE NAME**

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON: Dorothy Evans

PRINCIPAL: Marines Arrieta-Cruz

UFT CHAPTER LEADER: Phyllis Murray

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT: Tiffani Astwood

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

**DISTRICT AND SCHOOL SUPPORT ORGANIZATION (SSO) INFORMATION**

DISTRICT: 08 SSO NAME: CEI

SSO NETWORK LEADER: Linda Guarneri

SUPERINTENDENT: Timothy 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
<b>Marines Arrieta-Cruz</b>	*Principal or Designee	
Phyllis Murray	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Tiffani Astwood	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
Terry Lambert	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
<b>N/A</b>	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
N/A	Student Representative <i>(optional for elementary and middle schools; a minimum of two members required for high schools)</i>	
N/A	CBO Representative, if applicable	
Eileen Lowe	Member/SLT Parent	
Eva Lebron	Member/SLT Parent	
Selina Serrano	Member/SLT Parent	
Evangeline Mercado	Member/SLT Teacher/School	
Sharin Tirado	Member/SLT Co-Chair Teacher/School	
Dorothy Evans	Member/SLT Chair/School	
	Member/	

Members: Total number of parent members: 5 Total number of school members:5 Total number of SLT members 10.

\* 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. 75 is an up and coming school located in the Hunt's Point section of the South Bronx with over 600 students in grades Pre-K - 5. In addition to our Black and Latino students, we have a diversity of cultures represented in our school including Africa and the Middle East.

We pride ourselves in opening our school to serve the community. Our Parent Coordinator facilitates parent workshops in the content areas and a plethora of parent issues. Parents participate in art classes and trips to local museums and other cultural venues. We welcome the community through a variety of educational activities such as Saturday ESL, GED and weekly computer classes. Each year we open our school on Thanksgiving Day. Staff members proudly volunteer their time and donate meals to help feed the needier members of our school community.

We have instituted small class sizes in grades 1-5 in order to provide students with individualized attention and small group instruction. We expanded our same gender classes to every class in the fifth grade and two additional classes in the fourth grade. Our instructional program includes a rounded arts component: drama, music and visual arts. Every year our students participate in a holiday presentation and sing-along, a spring time drama production and for the first time this year, a string orchestra concert. As part of our 5<sup>th</sup> grade moving up, our students participate in a sleep-away camp trip where they participate in activities designed to build self-esteem. These opportunities have enabled us to build our students' experiences outside of their community. Our school is a community of learners. Collaborative planning time and inter-visitations are an integral part of programming which promotes our teachers' efforts to continually grow professionally. In addition, our teachers benefit from a variety of professional development opportunities including AUSSIE and Math Project, Literacy Coach, Math Staff Developer and in-house Mentor for new teachers.

In order to achieve the goal of helping students become life-long learners, we have built into our instructional program partnerships with the City Year Group, VH1 and an Art residency for parents. These partnerships continue to enhance our school environment as well as student achievement through clubs, activities, and tutoring services. Additionally, our school focuses on the whole child by partnering with Urban Health, a full-service medical office on site, and South Bronx Mental Health Clinic, a counseling and psychological care clinic with free services to our parents and students on site.

Our mission is to ensure success for all our students. It is through the dedication of our staff and the deliberate implementation of our programs and curriculum, that we have earned an A rating on our NYC Department of Education progress report for 2008-2009. The P.S. 75 community will continue to work towards achieving higher standards and improving student outcomes for all our students.

## 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							
<b>School Name:</b>	P.S. 075						
<b>District:</b>	8	<b>DBN:</b>	08X075	<b>School BEDS Code:</b>	320800010075		
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		90.3	89.9	91.2
Kindergarten	98	106	113	<b>Student Stability - % of Enrollment:</b>			
Grade 1	112	110	116	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 2	130	109	105		87.6	87.5	89.1
Grade 3	108	105	134	<b>Poverty Rate - % of Enrollment:</b>			
Grade 4	106	105	134	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 5	94	105	110		90.0	91.2	93.2
Grade 6	92	0	0	<b>Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:</b>			
Grade 7	0	0	0	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 8	0	0	0		36	18	60
Grade 9	0	0	0	<b>Recent Immigrants - Total Number:</b>			
Grade 10	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 11	0	0	0		18	12	13
Grade 12	0	0	0	<b>Special Education Enrollment:</b>			
Ungraded	2	7	4	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Total	778	703	711				
<b>Special Education Enrollment:</b>				<b>Suspensions (OSYD Reporting) - Total Number:</b>			
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
# in Self-Contained Classes	68	70	47	Principal Suspensions	4	2	6
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	22	25	50	Superintendent Suspensions	5	10	5
Number all others	19	21	34	<b>Special High School Programs - Total Number:</b>			
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
<b>English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:</b>				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	<b>Number of Staff - Includes all full-time staff:</b>			
# in Transitional Bilingual Classes	86	46	94	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0				
# receiving ESL services only	85	86	45	Number of Teachers	53	64	65

**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	22	12	1	Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	11	18	18
These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.				Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	N/A	5	4
<b>Overage Students (# entering students overage for grade)</b>				<b>Teacher Qualifications:</b>			
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
(As of October 31)	3	0	0	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100.0	100.0	100.0
				% more than 2 years teaching in this school	52.8	46.9	61.5
				% more than 5 years teaching anywhere	43.4	46.9	50.8
<b>Ethnicity and Gender - % of Enrollment:</b>				% Masters Degree or higher	74.0	73.0	85.0
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	% core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	91.6	98.4	97.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.8	1.1	1.0				
Black or African American	25.1	26.5	26.4				
Hispanic or Latino	72.9	70.1	69.5				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	0.4	0.7	0.7				
White	0.9	1.6	1.5				
<b>Male</b>	53.6	54.8	53.6				
<b>Female</b>	46.4	45.2	46.4				
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							
<b>SURR School (Yes/No)</b>	If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:						
<b>Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2008-09) Based on 2007-08 Performance:</b>							
	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 3						
	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							
<b>Individual Subject/Area Ratings:</b>							
<b>Elementary/Middle Level</b>				<b>Secondary Level</b>			
ELA:	Restructuring Y 3			ELA:			
Math:	IGS			Math:			
Science:	IGS			Graduation Rate:			
<b>This school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for each accountability measure:</b>							
		<b>Elementary/Middle Level</b>			<b>Secondary Level</b>		
<b>Student Groups</b>		ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad Rate
<b>All Students</b>		√	√	√			
<b>Ethnicity</b>							
American Indian or Alaska Native		-	-				
Black or African American		√	√	-			
Hispanic or Latino		√	√	√			
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander		-	-				
White		-	-	-			
<b>Other Groups</b>							
Students with Disabilities		√SH	√	-			
Limited English Proficient		√SH	√	-			
Economically Disadvantaged		√	√	√			
<b>Student groups making AYP in each subject</b>		6	6	3	0	0	0
<b>CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY</b>							
<b>Progress Report Results – 2008-09</b>				<b>Quality Review Results – 2008-09</b>			
<b>Overall Letter Grade:</b>	A	<b>Overall Evaluation:</b>		NR			
<b>Overall Score:</b>	83.2	<b>Quality Statement Scores:</b>					
<b>Category Scores:</b>		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data					
School Environment:	8.9	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:	20	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals					
<i>(Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)</i>		Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise					
Student Progress:	47.5						
<i>(Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)</i>							
Additional Credit:	6.8						
<b>KEY: AYP STATUS</b>				<b>KEY: QUALITY REVIEW SCORE</b>			
√ = Made AYP				Δ = Underdeveloped			
√ <sup>SH</sup> = 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.) 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 highlights 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?

---

### **Performance Trends**

#### **Data Source: Progress Report, State Report Card**

*Student Performance Progress for English Language Arts and Math as follows:*

- **ELA- 1 Year of Progress: 62.2%** of our students performed at levels 3&4. **67%** of our students made at least 1+ year of progress, which is **79.5%** of the way from the lowest (46.8%) to the highest (72.2%) score relative to our Peer Horizon and **80.1%** of the way relative to our City Horizon.
- **ELA-Average Change in Lowest 1/3 Students: 90.7%** of our students in the lowest 1/3 made at least one year of progress, which is **85.4%** of the way from the lowest (**58.6%**) to the highest (**96.2%**) relative to our Peer Horizon and **87.0%** of the way relative to our City Horizon.
- **MATH: 87.7%** of our students performed at levels 3 &4. **66.4%** of our total student population made 1 year of progress which is **83.2%** of the way from the lowest (**42.7%**) to the highest (**71.2%**) score relative to our Peer Horizon and **62.2%** of the way relative to the City Horizon.
- **Math-Average change in Lowest 1/3 students: 73.7%** of our students in the lowest 1/3 made at least one year of progress, which is **65.6%** of the way from the lowest (**46.3%**) to the highest (**88.1%**) relative to our Peer Horizon and 64% of the way relative to our City Horizon.

*The overall score for student progress in ELA was 47.5 out of 60. Additionally, the school received extra credit **(+6.75)** for closing the achievement gap for Special Education students, ELLs and for Hispanic students in the lowest third city wide. Our school was awarded a **grade letter of A** based on the progress of our students in ELA and MATH.*

## **PERFORMANCE TRENDS**

**Data Source: Comparison of Accountability Status Report from 2006-07 and 2008-09**

**ELA Performance Trends:** In 2009 five out of six subgroups made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). The Students with Disabilities subgroup did not make AYP. The All Student, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, Economically Disadvantaged and LEP student groups all made AYP. The student with disabilities subgroup achieved a 98 performance index which was short (-10 points) from making the safe harbor target of 108. As a result, our school P.S. 75 has been identified as a Title I School Improvement Status- Restructured Advanced. This group's performance trends if further analyzed in the next section. Additional instructional support in ELA remains a top priority for all of our students. Thus, the progress of the SWDs student group will be carefully monitored through the analysis of data from ARIS, the Progress Report and shared inquiry work.

**Math Performance Trends:** For the last two years, **all student groups (6 out of 6)** met AYP and participation rates in Mathematics. For the last two years all our students have made significant progress and the Safe Harbor was not required to make AYP. This data highlights the tremendous progress that we have made in the area of mathematics. In addition, we have made an increase of 8.3% in our level 4 students compared to last year's decrease of 2 points. The progress of our levels 3 and 4 students will continue to be closely monitored through the analysis of data from ARIS, the Progress Report, Test Simulations and Shared Inquiry Team work.

**Science Performance Trends:** Data from the 2006-2007; 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 accountability status reports, all our students met the participation rate as well as the AYP

### **THREE-YEAR TRENDS ANALYSIS OF ELA PERFORMANCE**

<b>TOTAL SCHOOL - ALL TESTED STUDENTS ELA PERFORMANCE ON STATE ASSESSMENTS</b>								
<b>Year</b>	<b>Level 1</b>		<b>Level 2</b>		<b>Level 3</b>		<b>Level 4</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>2009</b>	15	4.8	103	33	189	60.6	5	1.6
<b>2008</b>	30	9.4	129	40.6	154	48.4	5	1.6
<b>2007</b>	57	14.9	192	50.1	132	34.5	2	0.5

**Total School Trends:** Over a three-year period from 2007 –2009, the percentage of all-tested students scoring at Level 1 on the ELA assessment decreased from a high of 14.9 % to 4.8 **(-10.1%)**. The percentage of students scoring at Level 2 decreased from a high of 50.1% to 33% **(-17.1)**. Students scoring at Level 3 increased from a low of 34.5% to 60.6% **(+26.1)**. And there was a marginal increase in the percentage of students scoring at a Level 4 from 0.5% to 1.6% **(+1.1)**. An analysis of this three-year trend in ELA TOTAL SCHOOL performance for **all-tested students** indicates that the 27.2% increase in students scoring at Levels 3&4 is significant. Additionally, **10.5%** of students moved from Level 2 to Level 3 and 18.1% from Level 1 to Level 2. This positive trend in student achievement will be maintained by continuing activities and programs that strengthen the skills of students scoring at Levels 3 & 4. Additionally, targeted instructional initiatives that address the specific needs of students scoring at Levels 1 and 2 will be continued.

**DATA SOURCE: A THREE-YEAR ANALYSIS OF PERFORMANCE TRENDS IN ELA  
DISAGGREGATED BY TARGETED STUDENT GROUPS**

<b>GRADES 3-5 - STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ELA PERFORMANCE ON STATE ASSESSMENTS</b>								
Year	Level 1 #	Level 1 %	Level 2 #	Level 2 %	Level 3 #	Level 3 %	Level 4 #	Level 4%
2009	12	22.2	31	57.4	11	20.4	0	0
2008	17	23.9	39	54.9	15	21.1	0	0.0
2007	33	45.2	30	41.1	10	13.7	0	0.0

**Special Education Trend:** Over a three-year period from 2007–2009, the percentage of special education students scoring at Level 1 on the ELA assessment decreased from a high of 45.2% to 22.2% (-23%). The percentage of Level 2 students increased from a low of 41.1% to 57.4% (+16.3). The percentage of Level 3 students increased from a low of 13.7% to a high of 20.4% (+6.7). An analysis of the three-year trend for SWD students indicates a significant improvement in the percentage of students that moved from level 1 to levels 2 and 3. Overall, there is a positive trend in SWD performance as the percentage of students performing at Level 1 has been significantly reduced by 23%. However, since over 50% of SWD students remain at Level 2, effective differentiated instructional initiatives must continue to be identified in order ensure student progress to state proficiency at Levels 3/4. Although we have increased the number of students on level 3 there is a need to continue to move these students to level 4. Additionally, the expansion of collaborative team teaching classes provides self contained students with disabilities with the opportunity for education in a Less Restricted Environment (LRE). The performance of our SWD continues to be a challenge since this group has failed to make EAMO for the three years of data studied. We will be reviewing our programs, IEPs goals, objectives and accommodations to determine how to best serve this population. **Our school zoning report indicates that PS 75 has a disproportionate number of students with disabilities not zoned to our school and or district. In testing grades 28 out of 58 students or 48% of our 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and ,5<sup>th</sup> grade SWDs are not zoned to our school.**

**DATA SOURCE: A THREE-YEAR ANALYSIS OF PERFORMANCE TRENDS IN ELA  
DISAGGREGATED BY TARGETED STUDENT GROUPS**

<b>GRADES 3-5 – LEP ELA PERFORMANCE ON STATE ASSESSMENTS</b>								
Year	Level 1 #	Level 1 %	Level 2 #	Level 2 %	Level 3 #	Level 3 %	Level 4 #	Level 4%
2009**	4	6.7	30	50	25	41.7	1	1.7
2008**	10	20	30	60	9	18	1	2
2007**	28	33.3	45	53.6	11	13.1	0	0.0

**\*\*Changes in testing for ELLs**

**LEP Student trend:** Our upward trend in LEP students' scores has shown a 3 year gain in levels 3 and 4 from a low of 13.1% in 2007 to a high of 43.4 in 2009. For the last 2 years, our LEP students have made their safe harbor and or EAMO targets. We reduced the number of

LEP students in level 1 from a high of 33.3% in 2007 to a low of 6.7% in 2009. Even with the upward trend in scores, 50% of our ELLs are in level 2. This indicates the need for an accelerated curriculum reinforced with additional ESL methodologies that will assist our students' progress toward levels 3 and 4. The introduction of self contained ESL classes to instruct our LEP students has proven to be a successful strategy. Our school will continue to monitor this subgroup's progress in order to continue to increase its performance.

### THREE-YEAR TRENDS ANALYSIS OF MATH PERFORMANCE

TOTAL SCHOOL - ALL TESTED STUDENTS MATH PERFORMANCE ON STATE ASSESSMENTS								
Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
<b>2009</b>	11	3.5	27	8.5	219	69.3	59	18.7
<b>2008</b>	21	6.4	61	18.7	211	64.5	34	10.4
<b>2007</b>	40	10.4	102	26.6	195	50.9	46	12.0

**Total School Trend: 88%** of our students performed at levels 3&4 in 2009 which is a **13.1** point increase from our 2008 scores. We have consistently decreased our level 1 students as evidenced by the three year data above. Additionally, our percentage of level 2 students has decreased to 8.5% from a high of 18.7% in 2008. **This positive trend is also detected in the percentage of level 4 students which increased from 10.4% in 2008 to 18.7% in 2009.** Our performance in the **ALL TESTED** group is significant and we will continue to provide all our students with the strategies needed to continue to increase the performance of our level 1 and 2 students while continuing to differentiate instruction in order maintain and increase the percentages of students performing at levels 3 and 4.

### **SUMMARY OF DATA ANALYSIS/FINDINGS**

*The ELA performance data indicates our level 1 students at the lowest levels in the past three years. Our level 3 students also at highest levels with our total levels 3&4 at 62.2%. Although this is a positive trend that allowed the school to make our EAMO in the ALL Students, Black Students, Hispanic Students, LEP and Economically Disadvantaged Students groups; our SWD failed to make EAMO. We are currently a SINI Restructured - Advanced school based on the performance of this subgroup. Our school's demographics indicate a SWD population of nearly 17%. A review of this program revealed that many of our SWD were placed in self-contained classes with limited opportunity to interact in less restrictive environments such as Collaborative Team Teaching classes. Although our LEP students have made their State target over the last two years we continue to monitor and make instructional decisions that provide these students of the best opportunity to learn English. Math performance data for the past three years indicates a positive trend. Our students' performance in math is at the highest levels in 3 years, with 6 out of 6 subgroups making AYP. Based on our Acuity and simulation assessments our students are experiencing most difficulties in problem solving, measuring and graphing. We will utilize this data to develop professional development programs that assist teachers in improving our students; outcomes on these areas.*



## **Accomplishments**

### **Data Sources: Progress Report, Quality Review, State Report Card**

*Our school received an A designation in our Progress Report in 2008. Through the use and study of data derived from several systems including the Quality Review, State Report Card, Test Simulations, ARIS, Acuity Assessments and teacher made assessments our school has enhanced our ELA and Math programs. Teachers are learning to utilize this data to inform instruction, differentiate lessons and feel highly accountable for the progress of their students. As a result, our school made gains from 2007 of 27.2% increase of students performing at levels 3&4 to 62.2% of the total testing population. We are very proud of our math performance. 88% of our students are currently performing at levels 3&4; this is an increase of 25.1 points from our performance 3 years ago.*

*Our AIS program is monitored and revised to address the needs of our students based on the ongoing data in the various content areas. Teachers' feedback is an important component of our program's monitoring system. Our AIS teachers confer with classroom teachers via articulation meetings and reports. Academic Intervention Services are provided to all level 1 and 2 students including special education and ELL classes. The school currently has two READ 180 labs dedicated to the instruction of pushable level 2 and slippable level 3 students. An additional lab is used by teachers to provide students with additional time on task with the Acuity and other web based programs. Our SETSS program includes an at risk component that services students in K-5 grade. Our test preparation program includes the implementation of full simulations every 6 weeks. Once the students complete the simulations, the results are quickly tabulated and provided to teachers with an item skills analysis. The written response portion of the test is scored by the teachers during their common planning periods. This data is utilized by the teachers to adjust instruction.*

*Through the purchase of additional teachers, our school has been able to implement small class ratios in all grades. Additional ESL certified staff has also been hired in order to support an ESL self-contained model. These teachers will provide our ELLs with grade level curriculum utilizing ESL strategies as a support. Additional periods of literacy instruction have been added to our SWD in CTT and self-contained classes weekly.*

*Our professional development model include a Literacy Coach, Math Staff Developer, an in-house Mentor and Consultancies by the NYC Literacy and Math Project as well as a Read Well consultant. Teachers are provided with model lessons, common planning support, monitoring of program implementation and feedback sessions.*

*Attendance improvement is a priority for our school. To this end, we have a number of strategies in place. These include the celebration of attendance bulletin board, incentives such as popcorn and a movie, awards and assemblies.*

*We believe that the progress reflected in our school's Quality Review, Progress Report and State Report Card is due in great measure to the implementation of our AIS program, after-school and Saturday programs and the collaborative work of all our teachers. Our professional development program is an additional component that has contributed to the improvement of teacher skills in the implementation of curriculum and data analysis. The process of inquiry that commenced last year with our inquiry team will be expanded to include a variety of teachers in different grade levels in order to improve student outcomes for our students performing at the lowest third school wide.*

## **AIDS TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT**

### **Data Sources: Quality Review 2007, School Organization, Professional Development Plan**

According to the results of our last Quality Review, our school has made good progress in developing its capacity to collect data and to monitor student performance. Analyzing data and using data to meet the needs of individual students has certainly assisted in improving our student outcomes. In addition, the reviewer stated that our Principal (Mrs. Arrieta-Cruz) is highly focused on improving student outcomes and is well supported by her extended cabinet which includes three assistant principals, a literacy coach and math staff developer.

Practices that assist our school in meeting the needs of individual students are:

- A Literacy Coach and Math Staff Developer provide support for teachers with instruction by coordinating and conducting professional development. A part-time mentor will assist new teachers through our mentoring program.
- Professional Development is an integral part of our school program and provides opportunities for teachers to learn best practices. We enlist consultants from Read Well for our K-2 literacy program and NYC Math Project, AUSSIE for grades 3-5.
- A Data Specialist to compile all data from test simulations, interim assessments and other formal and informal assessments.
- Common planning for all grades to support collaboration and sharing of best practices. Teachers in grades K-5 have daily common planning periods. This program structure creates great opportunity for grade common meeting and planning.
- An F status person is used to provide additional professional development for teachers in science.
- Class size reduction in grades 1-5 maximizes instruction and helps teachers meet individual student needs.
- Drama, music and visual arts programs enhance the instructional programs and create experiences for our students in the arts.
- Data is analyzed and students are identified to form groups. Groups are reorganized as new data is analyzed. We have two Read 180 labs, two AIS small group teachers, and one open access computer lab.
- The school is providing appropriate services for those students in greatest need of improvement; Academic Intervention, At-Risk Counseling, At-Risk SETSS, etc.
- The school makes every effort to inform parents about their child's education and makes them feel welcome in the school.
- The school offers GED, ESL and basic computer classes to parents.
- Parent Coordinator coordinates parent workshops and activities.

### **BARRIERS to Continued improvement: Data Sources: Quality Review, State Report Card, ATS reports**

Our school consists of a high population of English Language Learners and a disproportionate percentage of students with disabilities. Eighteen percent of our students are English Language Learners and fifteen percent are student with disabilities. While most of our ELLs come from our own zoning boundaries, a careful review of our school's zoning report revealed that 40 out of our 98 students with disabilities (40%) are either zoned for another district or other schools in our district. These disproportionate numbers of special education students come to our school as a result of

district level decision making by the Office of Student Enrollment and the Committee of Special Education. We are a receiving school for many of neighboring schools who do not carry a full continuum of special education services, but still continue to refer students for services they can't provide. This practice has negatively impacted our school since most of these students come to our school with minimal literacy, and social skills. This burden further affects our performance since we are a SINI designated school due to the ELA scores of our SWDs.

Our Quality Review of 2007 revealed that we need to continue to improve our work in the following areas:

- Continue building on the good work in data collection to analyze and monitor student progress.
- Analysis of data needs to include data for all student sub-groups to identify students who need additional support.
- Data needs to be recorded so that it includes different assessments to enable comparison of student results.
- Our school needs to continue to work on developing an all inclusive data collection and management system to monitor student performance and progress.

## 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.

---

- **ELA: (1)** By June 2010 all students inclusive of students in the LEP and SWD subgroups will demonstrate progress towards achieving state standards as evidenced by a 3% increase in student scoring at level 3 and 4 on the New York State ELA assessment.
- **ELA: (2)** By June 2010 all students with level 1 inclusive of students in the LEP and SWD subgroups will decrease by 3% as evidenced by the New York State ELA assessment.
- **Math: (3)** By June 2010 all students inclusive of students in the LEP and SWD groups will demonstrate progress towards achieving state standards as evidenced by a 3% increase in student scoring at level 3 and 4, and decrease in the percentage of students on level 1 and 2 at least by 3% on the New York State Mathematics assessment.
- **Attendance: (4)** By June 2010, the school attendance rate will improve to 91% or above as indicated by the School's Attendance Report.
- **Parental Involvement: (5)** By June 2010, parental involvement will increase by 5% as evidenced by attendance to workshops, parent/teacher conferences and learning environment survey responses.

**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><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p><b>1) By June 2010 all students inclusive of students in the LEP and SWD groups will demonstrate progress towards achieving state standards as evidenced by a 3% increase in student scoring at level 3 and 4, on the New York State ELA assessment.</b></p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p><b><u>Professional development:</u></b> On site Literacy Coach, mentor, consultants from Read Well in grades K-2 and Aussie Consultants in grades 3-5 will provide PD in the areas of literacy including: analyzing student data, comprehension strategies, differentiation, goal setting, collaborative team teaching and implementation of the reading and writing workshops. Opportunities for collaboration and inter-visitations will be provided. In order to improve writing instruction a Aussie consultant will provide PD to grades 3-5 by demonstrating best practices in third grade classrooms. Literacy coach will coordinate PD opportunities, provide demo lessons, meet with teachers during common planning, prepare schedules for consultant visits based on teachers’ professional needs and conduct debriefing sessions. Common preparation periods will be used for professional development, planning, data analysis and inquiry team studies. The Read Well consultant will provide professional development on Read Well 2 to second grade teachers.</p> <p><b><u>Academic intervention:</u></b> Small groups will be formed based on formal and informal assessments for students in grades 2-5. These groups will meet regularly and will be changed to meet the individual needs of our students. Read 180, a computer based literacy program, will be utilized for students in grades 3-5 who are approaching the standards. Our AIS push in/pull-out is designed for all level 1 and 2 students in grades 3-5 and at-risk students in grade 2. In addition, the SETTS teacher services at-risk students in K-5. SWDs and LEPs are included in the AIS pull out and Read 180 programs. ESL teachers provide additional small group instruction in test preparation and ELA skills to our LEP students.</p>

	<p><b><u>Inquiry Approach to Analyzing Data:</u></b>  All classroom teachers K-5 will identify one student, identify his/her strengths, weaknesses and create an individualized intervention plan. These students will be presented during shared inquiry meeting and common planning periods. Students progress will be monitored every two weeks in a shared inquiry format where teachers will share strategies and expertise in order to ensure each students progress.</p> <p><b><u>Early Childhood:</u></b>  Read Well, our reading program is utilized in grades K-2 to build a strong foundation in literacy including phonics, phonemic awareness, decoding and comprehension. The goal is for students in grades K-2 to learn how to read before they get to third grade. Selected teachers and City Year team members will be utilized to lower student to teacher ratio. The literacy Coach will provide on-site support and feedback. AIS will be provided to students at-risk of not mastering the early childhood standards as evidenced by teacher assessments and ECLAS-2 data. We will begin to review our second grade student data in order to determine alignment to state assessments and standards. Our second grade students will take English language arts baseline and end-term data to assess their progress. We will institute a second grade springtime small group instructional program to expand on our literacy program by including testing sophistication skills and strategies. An after school program will address more time on task in the areas of ELA and Math. 2<sup>nd</sup> grade will departmentalize for Read Well instruction. Readwell 2 will be implemented in selected groups.</p> <p><b><u>LEP and SWD:</u></b>  A Saturday Academy and after school program will provide additional instructional time for LEP and SWD students. LRE will be provided to SWD who will benefit from programs such as CTT. LEP and SWDs are included in our AIS program and will receive small group instruction by AIS and ESL teachers, coaches and other support personnel. Literacy Teacher focuses on teaching writing through reading using specific differentiated instruction to our SWD and LEP students ESL teachers will provide additional AIS and ELA instruction to our LEP students in testing and non-testing grades.</p>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b>  <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Literacy Coach is funded by Contract for Excellence  Educational Assistants are funded by Tax Levy Fair Student Funding (TLFSF), UPK; IDEA; IEP Para  City Year Volunteers are funded by Tax Levy One Time Allocation  Celebrate Learning Program funded by Title 1  Second grade after school program funded by Title 1  Extended day time on task funded by Title 1</p>

	<p>Assistant Principals are funded through Title 1 and TLFSF          Inquiry Team funded through Tax Levy Children First Inquiry          Consultants are funded by Title 1          Mentor is funded by <i>Tax Levy</i>/IEP Teacher          ESL teachers are funded by Contract for Excellence          Literacy Teacher funded by TLFSF          2- Read 180 Labs funded by Title 1          2 - AIS teachers funded by Title 1          SETSS teacher funded by IDEA funds</p>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b>  <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p><b><u>Initial indicator September 2009:</u></b>          Students in grades 3-5 will take a NYS standardized assessment as a baseline indicator. Student goals will be created based on these assessments and their scores on the 2008-2009 ELA. Students' goals are set to show one year's progress from the 2009 ELA score. K-2 students will set benchmarks based on the Early Childhood Literacy Standards.</p> <p><b><u>Midterm:</u></b>          Teachers will be asked to share case study students and how they are following the progress to the students based on multiple data sources. Students will take Acuity predictors and ELA simulations prior to State testing period. Goals are set to 75-85% correct responses in multiple choice section of the assessments.</p> <p><b><u>End-Term:</u></b>          Reevaluation of the process of using multiple data sources to evaluate the students in their case studies. Early Childhood Read Well and ECLAS 2 benchmarks will be utilized to assess our K-2 students. Evaluation of student actual performance and goal set in Fall. Goal setting will be adjusted and determined for September. Additionally, AIS groups will be determined in June based on actual student performance.</p>

Subject/Area (where relevant): ELA

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p><b>2) By June 2010 all level 1 students inclusive of students in the LEP and SWD groups will decrease by 3% as evidenced by the New York State ELA assessment for grades 3-5; Read Well and ECLASS 2 for K-2 students.</b></p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> <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><b><u>Professional development:</u></b> On site Literacy Coach, mentor, Read Well Trainers and Aussie consultants will provide PD in the areas of literacy including: analyzing student data, comprehension strategies, differentiation, goal setting, collaborative team teaching and implementation of the reading and writing workshops. Literacy coach will coordinate PD opportunities, provide demo lessons, meet with teachers during common planning, prepare schedules for consultants based on teachers' professional needs and conduct debriefing sessions. Common preparation periods will be used for professional development, planning, data analysis and shared inquiry study.</p> <p><b><u>Academic intervention:</u></b> Small groups will be formed based on formal and informal assessments. These groups will meet regularly and will be changed to meet the individual needs of our students. Read 180, a technology based program, will be utilized for all students in grades 3-5 who are approaching the standards. Our pull out AIS program will focus on small group instruction for our levels 1 and 2 students. The focus of this program will change to second grade in late Spring to prepare students for the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade. Our Celebrate Learning Saturday and After-School Programs are designed to extend time on task for all level 1 and 2 students in grades 3-5. In addition, the SETTS teacher services at-risk students in K-5. ESL teachers provide additional small group instruction in test preparation and ELA skills to our LEP student. SWDs receive an additional period daily of literacy in CTT classes in small group settings.</p> <p><b><u>Inquiry Approach to Analyzing Data:</u></b> All classroom teachers K-5 will identify one student, identify his/her strengths, weaknesses and create an individualized intervention plan. These students will be presented during shared inquiry meeting and common planning periods. Students progress will be monitored every two weeks in a shared inquiry format where teachers will share strategies and expertise in order to ensure each students progress.</p> <p><b><u>Early Childhood:</u></b> Read Well, our reading program is utilized in grades K-2 to build a strong foundation in literacy including phonics, phonemic awareness, decoding and comprehension. The goal is for</p>

	<p>students in grades K-2 to learn the mechanics of reading and become fluent before they get to 3<sup>rd</sup> grade. City Year team members, an organization that provides instructional volunteers to our school will be utilized to lower student to teacher ratio. A Read Well consultant will be hired to provide on-site support and feedback. AIS will be provided to students at-risk of not mastering the early childhood standards as evidenced by teacher assessments and ECLAS data.</p> <p><b><u>LEP and SWD:</u></b>  A Saturday Academy and after school program will provide additional instructional time for LEP and SWD students. Students in self contained classes will be considered for LRE programs such as CTT. LEP and SWDs are included in our AIS program and will receive small group instruction by AIS teachers, coaches and other support personnel. Literacy and Writing Teacher focuses on teaching writing through reading using specific differentiated instruction to our SWD and LEP students Our inquiry team has focused attention in our LEP population selecting testing grade students for our inquiry approach to analyzing data and providing additional instructional support. Our K-2 LEP students will receive additional AIS instruction in class. ESL teachers provide additional ELA/ESL academic intervention to our LEP students in testing grades. Literacy Teacher focuses on teaching writing through reading using specific differentiated instruction to our SWD and LEP students</p>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b>  <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Literacy Coach is funded by Contract for Excellence  Educational Assistants are funded by Tax Levy Fair Student Funding (TLFSF), UPK; IDEA; IEP  Para  City Year Volunteers are funded by Tax Levy One Time Allocation  Celebrate Learning Program funded by Title 1  Second grade after school program funded by Title 1  Extended day time on task funded by Title 1  Assistant Principals are funded through Title 1 and TLFSF  Inquiry Team funded through Tax Levy Children First Inquiry  Consultants are funded by Title 1  Mentor is funded by Tax Levy/IEP Teacher  ESL teachers are funded by Contract for Excellence  Literacy Teacher funded by TLFSF  2- Read 180 Labs funded by Title 1  2 - AIS teachers funded by Title 1  SETSS teacher funded by IDEA funds</p>

**Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment**

*Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains*

**Initial indicator September 2009:**

Students in grades 3-5 will take a simulation using the NYS standardized assessment as a baseline indicator. Student goals will be created based on these assessments and their scores on the 2008-2009 ELA. Students' goals are set to show one year's progress from the 2009 ELA score. K-2 students will have goals based on Read Well assessments and ECLAS 2 indicators.

**Midterm:**

Teachers will be asked to share case study students and how they are following the progress to the students based on multiple data sources. Students will take Acuity predictors and ELA simulations prior to State testing period.

**End-Term:**

Early Childhood Read Well and ECLAS 2 benchmarks will be utilized to assess our K-2 students. Evaluation of student actual performance and goal set in Fall. Goal setting will be adjusted and determined for September. Additionally AIS groups will be determined in June based on actual student performance on the ELA of Spring 2010.

**Subject/Area (where relevant):** Mathematics

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p><b>3) By June 2010 all students inclusive of students in the LEP and SWD groups will demonstrate progress towards achieving state standards as evidenced by a 3% increase in student scoring at levels 3 and 4, and a decrease in the percentage of students on levels 1 and 2 by 3% on the New York State Mathematics assessment.</b></p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p><b><u>Professional Development:</u></b> On site mathematics staff developer, mentor, and NYC Math Project consultant will provide PD in the areas of mathematics including delivery of instruction, analyzing student data, problem solving strategies, differentiation, goal setting, collaborative team teaching and implementation of the workshop model. Opportunities for collaboration and inter-visitations will be provided. Math Staff Developer will coordinate PD opportunities, prepare schedules for consultant visits based on teachers professional needs, provide demo lessons, order additional materials and meet individually with teachers. Common preparation periods will be used for professional development, analyzing data and planning.</p> <p><b><u>Academic intervention:</u></b> Small groups will be formed based on formal and informal assessments. These groups will meet regularly and will be changed to meet the individual needs of our students. Our AIS pull out/ push in program is designed for level 1 and 2 students in grades 2-5. In addition the SETTS teacher services at-risk students in K-5.</p> <p><b><u>Inquiry Approach:</u></b> All classroom teachers K-5 will identify one student, identify his/her strengths, weaknesses and create an individualized intervention plan. These students will be presented during shared inquiry meeting and common planning periods. Students progress will be monitored every two weeks in a shared inquiry format where teachers will share strategies and expertise in order to ensure each students progress.</p> <p><b><u>Early childhood:</u></b> Everyday Math will continue to be used in the Early childhood grades in order to prepare students for formalized assessments in grades 3 and up. A part time mentor will be hired to assist in the early childhood implementation of EDM.</p>

<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b>  <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Math Staff Developer is funded by Contract for Excellence  Educational Assistants are funded by Tax Levy Fair Student Funding (TLFSF), UPK; IDEA; IEP Para  City Year Volunteers are funded by Tax Levy One Time Allocation  Celebrate Learning Program funded by Title 1  Second grade after school program funded by Title 1  Extended day time on task funded by Title 1  Assistant Principals are funded through Title 1 and TLFSF  Inquiry Team funded through Tax Levy Children First Inquiry  Consultants are funded by Title 1  Mentor is funded by <i>Tax Levy</i>/IEP Teacher  ESL teachers are funded by Contract for Excellence  SETSS teacher funded by IDEA funds</p>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b>  <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p><b><u>Initial indicator September 2009:</u></b>  Students in grades 3-5 will take a NYS standardized assessment as a baseline indicator. Student goals will be created based on these assessments and their scores on the 2008-2009 Math assessments.</p> <p><b><u>Midterm:</u></b>  Teachers will be asked to share case study students and how they are following the progress of the students based on multiple data sources.  Mid-Term Acuity and Simulations will be utilized to gauge progress toward goals</p> <p><b><u>End-Term:</u></b>  Reevaluation of the process of using multiple data sources to evaluate the students in their case studies. Actual score on Math assessments will reviewed to determine next year's goals and if AIS attention is required.</p>

**Subject/Area (where relevant):** Student Attendance

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p><b>4) By June 2010, attendance rate will improve to 91% or above as indicated by the School’s Attendance Report</b></p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>Attendance teacher will monitor student attendance and contact parents of students that demonstrate attendance issues. Attendance celebrations and incentives will be offered for students that have 90% or better attendance. Family assistant will monitor daily attendance and call families who demonstrate attendance issues A bulletin board will be dedicated to students with 90% or better attendance. The phone master messenger system will be programmed to maintain a contact log of parents with attendance issues Special reminders will be included in report cards for each marking period ATS generated cards will be mailed to parents of students with 6 or more absences The volunteer members of City Year will conduct special attendance assemblies</p>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b> Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<p>Attendance Teacher is funded by Central Incentives and Celebrations are funded by TLFSF Family Assistant is funded by Title I City Year Group is funded by Central through Tax Levy One Time Allocation</p>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b> Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<p><b><u>Initial indicator September 2009:</u></b> ATS attendance reports will be analyzed to identify trends <b><u>Midterm:</u></b> ATS attendance records will be analyzed to identify trends <b><u>End-Term:</u></b> ATS attendance records will be analyzed to identify trends</p>

**Subject/Area (where relevant):** Parent Involvement

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p><b>5) By June 2010, there will be an increase of 5% in parent involvement as evidenced by an increase in attendance for workshops, parent/teacher conferences and learning environment survey responses.</b></p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>We will increase parental involvement by providing workshops, meetings, classes and special activities as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parent coordinator will schedule workshops in literacy, math, and other content areas in collaboration with Coaches, administrators and teachers</li> <li>• workshops to explain school programs</li> <li>• ESL, GED, Art and computer classes for parents</li> <li>• Inviting parents to the annual Thanksgiving lunch</li> <li>• monthly workshops on a variety of topics</li> <li>• Parent Coordinator will be available during Saturday classes</li> <li>• Provide a parent room for meetings and PA business</li> <li>• Provide a parent information table on Parent/Teacher night</li> <li>• <b>Implementation timeline:</b></li> <li>• September- meeting with Principal, PC and staff developers to determine workshops and meetings to be held.</li> <li>• November- meeting with Principal, Parent Association and Parent Coordinator to assess progress evidenced by attendance to meetings thus far.</li> <li>• June- meeting with principal, staff developers, parent coordinator and parent association to determine if goal was met and re-evaluate process.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b> Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parent Coordinator is funded by Tax Levy</li> <li>• Literacy Coach is funded by Contract for Excellence</li> <li>• Math Staff Developer is funded by Title I</li> <li>• Administrators are funded by Title 1 and TLFSF</li> </ul>

**Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment**

*Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains*

- Attendance at workshops and other parent activities
- Attendance at Parent/Teacher conference
- Increase in Learning environment survey responses
- **Initial indicator:** November 2009 parent teacher conference attendance
- **Midterm:** March 2010 all attendance to meetings as reflected by Parent Coordinator's logs
- **End-Term:** June 2010- Total tally of parent involvement in all meetings, conferences and trainings held as reflected by parent coordinator's logs, attendance sheets and sign in sheets.

## **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	17	0	N/A	N/A	10	3	15	10
1	10	0	N/A	N/A	10	2	5	15
2	15	15	N/A	N/A	5	1	1	10
3	46	40	N/A	N/A	5	2	3	5
4	38	60	75	0	5	2	0	10
5	31	30	0	75	5	1	2	15
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**

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	<b>Description:</b> Provide a brief description of <b>each</b> 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.).
<b>ELA:</b>	<p><b>At Risk students including LEP and SWD:</b>  <b>AIS in ELA is being implemented in several different ways:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Five 50 minute periods per week per child</li> <li>• Differentiated ELA instruction in all classrooms – Tier 1 Intervention</li> <li>• Groups will be reorganized based on formal and informal assessments</li> <li>• Identified students will also receive intervention in a lab setting (Read 180)</li> </ul> <p><b>English Language Learners:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Differentiated instruction in all ESL classes – Tier 1 intervention</li> <li>• ESL teacher provides AIS to LEP students</li> <li>• Students will attend 3 hour sessions every Saturday from October 2009 to May 2010 focusing on reading comprehension and writing</li> <li>• Identified students receive enrichment during extended day</li> </ul> <p><b>SWD</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selected classrooms provide literacy instruction utilizing Read 180 literacy program</li> <li>• Great Leaps is used for instruction in fluency and phonics</li> </ul> <p>Read Well program is used to support instruction in basic reading skills</p>
<b>Mathematics:</b>	<p><b>At Risk students including LED and SWD:</b>  <b>AIS in Mathematics is being implemented in several different ways:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Five 50 minute periods per week</li> <li>• Differentiated Mathematics instruction in all classrooms – Tier 1 Intervention</li> <li>• Students will be identified for intervention based on content and skills assessment.</li> <li>• Groups will be reorganized based on formal and informal assessments</li> </ul> <p><b>English Language Learners:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Differentiated instruction in all ESL classes – Tier 1 intervention</li> <li>• ESL teacher provides AIS to LEP students following a pull out model of small group instruction</li> <li>• Students will attend 3 hour sessions every Saturday from January 2010 to May 2010 focusing on reading comprehension and writing</li> <li>• Identified students receive enrichment during extended day</li> </ul> <p><b>SWD</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Differentiated instruction for all special education students</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of manipulatives and other modalities to improve computation and problem solving</li> <li>• SWDs will be included in our small group AIS pull out program</li> </ul> <p>Saturday Academy and After School Celebrate Learning programs will focus on skills and strategies needed for problem solving</p>
<b>Science:</b>	<p>Starting in April fourth grade students receive Science instruction on Saturdays and twice a week after school to prepare for the NYS Science Test.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New curriculum implemented for grades 3, 4 and 5</li> <li>• Saturday Academy from April 2010 – June 2010</li> <li>• In addition to the State mandated periods of science instruction students will receive an additional lab period.</li> </ul>
<b>Social Studies:</b>	<p>Beginning October to November our 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade students attend after school two days a week and attend Saturday Academy designed to address content and skills.</p>
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:</b>	<p>School counselors will provide crisis counseling services during the school day on an as needed basis to all students.</p>
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:</b>	<p>The school psychologist will offer clinical services, agency referrals, and educational, social and personal services during the school day on an as needed basis to at risk students.</p>
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:</b>	<p>Social Workers will provide counseling services to at risk students especially students in the targeted subgroups of SWD and LEP.</p>
<b>At-risk Health-related Services:</b>	<p>Health related services are offered during the school day on an as needed basis to all students by the school-based health provider, Urban Health.</p>

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

*NCLB/SED requirement for all schools*

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

---

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

**Type of Program:**  Bilingual  ESL  Both      **Number of LEP (ELL) Students Served in 2006-07:** 138

I. **Instructional Program** (including brief description of program, # of classes per program, language(s) of instruction, instructional strategies, etc):

**P.S. 75** is a Pre-Kindergarten through Grade 5 School located in the Bronx. It is a school serving 656 students. There are six self-contained ESL classes (K, 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> grades) and two ESL teachers. The ESL teachers have a push in/pull out program serving students who opt for a regular education program. Teachers will participate in weekly grade meetings to plan collaboratively on the grade and will participate in all school-wide professional development initiatives.

P.S. 75 provides instruction to its ELL population using the balanced literacy/math program designed to maximize the time dedicated to teaching the non-English speaker the English language. Teachers of ELLs implement the readers and writers workshop through the Workshop Model. To ensure that ELL students meet the standards and pass the required state assessments, our ELL program is aligned to the core curriculum offered in our non-ELL program. Focusing on the development of cognitive and higher order thinking skills, vocabulary, as well as specific reading and comprehension strategies are taught. The school's transition plan for students who reach proficiency on the NYSESLAT and are transferred to monolingual classes is to provide an additional year of ESL support services from our ESL teachers.

Great effort is made to facilitate English language development. To complement these efforts, students are instructed in writing processes as well. In the ESL classes, teachers teach writing comparable to that of monolingual classes.

The goal of our program is for students to be mainstreamed after showing proficiency in the second language. If the student is determined to require services as per the LAB-R, the parent or guardian is immediately informed. ELL parents/guardians are then asked to make a program selection. Information is always presented to parents in both languages. Students who score the lowest on the Language Assessment Battery Revised Test are placed in ESL self-contained classes or mainstream classes with pullout ESL. Parents seem to be satisfied with the programs available to their children at P.S. 75.

Students who are experiencing a low proficiency level in the second language (based on the NYSESLAT, ELA Simulation Tests and ELL Interim Assessments) and have not made progress in the second language after two years may be recommended for At-Risk Academic Intervention Services and receive the following academic intervention services (AIS):

- I. Small group instruction
- II. Individualized instruction based on specific needs

III. Extended day and Saturday academies that focus primarily on literacy and mathematics Instruction is planned and implemented using the Workshop Model which ensures student engagement, student productivity, real world connections and multiple assessments. All components of the Workshop Model will include reading, writing, and discussion. The teacher will model, observe, and analyze student learning. The teacher will advise, coach, guide and monitor student understanding. They will also extend student learning to future study. An essential component is to develop an effective means of assessing student progress in meeting the standards.

**Extracurricular**

PS 75 Arts initiative takes offering ELL experience through illustration. The to display student’s poetry is the genre to express feelings. with words full of

In examining the results in the four modalities (listening, speaking, reading, and writing), there is a pattern across proficiency levels (Beginning, Intermediate, and Advanced), as well as grades, that indicate that ELL students scored low in the reading and writing modalities. Total scores also indicate that ELL students scored at proficient levels in the listening and speaking modalities.

**Program**

Literacy/Poetry through the place with the purpose of students an artistic literacy/poetry and main goal if this project is original poetry, since which serves as a vehicle It is another way to play color and imagination. At

the same time, students create illustrations according to their interpretations and the message of each poem. It is crucial to expose these young authors into the world to explore by developing a theme full of spontaneity, and revealing it through words and painting.

**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.

---

**II. Parent/community involvement:**

One of the ‘Essential Features’ that makes PS 75 unique is it’s parental/guardian compact and agreement to excellence. Our school relies on the commitment of PS 75 parents to ensure that students meet high expectations. In doing so, we provide consistent parent orientations and meetings to maintain a relationship between the school and home. Sessions are held with our parents of the ELL students to discuss State Standards, assessments and general program requirements for English Language Learners. The parent orientations are conducted every month if needed. This orientation will be provided by a school administrator, parent coordinator and the ESL Coordinators.

Parent workshop sessions such as Parent Association Meetings and School Leadership Team are some of the avenues to maintain consistent communication with our PS 75 parents. All of the information shared with parents will be disseminated in the language they understand other than English. Our school has a parent coordinator responsible for making additional outreach gestures to secure all the needs of our parents are attended to.

P.S. 75 parents are required to attend an Orientation for Parents of ELLs. During this orientation parents or guardians are informed through pamphlets and a Department of Education video of the various ELLs programs available for their children, especially those available at PS 75. Upon receiving the information on the various educational programs for ELLs, parents/guardians are then asked to make a program selection. After reviewing the Parent Survey and Program Selection forms for the past few years, there seems to be a trend indicating that

many parents are requesting that their children attend self-contained ESL classes or monolingual classes while receiving ESL services, if their child has not passed the NYSESLAT exam.

### **III. Programs and activities to assist newly enrolled LEP students:**

P.S. 75 provides newly enrolled students with a multitude of reading and writing strategies, using the 100 Book Challenge Reading Program and “On The Way To English” Balanced Literacy Program to provide remediation and enrichment in reading, writing processes, and comprehension skills. These initiatives are provided in both, bilingual and monolingual classes. In addition, there is an ESL resource center for staff and classes to use.

### **IV. Staff Development (2009-2010 activities):**

Based on the patterns obtained from the data, P.S. 75 provides monthly staff development in reading and writing strategies, using the 100 Book Challenge Reading Program, Read 180 and “On The Way To English” Balanced Literacy Program to provide remediation and enrichment in reading, writing processes, and comprehension skills. These initiatives are provided in both, bilingual and monolingual classes. In addition, evidence of Academic Rigor is present in each of our ELL classrooms where the students participate in an instructional program that regularly ensures continuity of rigorous academic instruction. On-going informal observation, conferencing with teachers will take place to ensure that ELL students participate in small group, task oriented situation that guide the production of language both in verbal and written form. To provide ongoing assessment, monthly learning walks, professional development sessions to share ELL strategies with all classroom teachers, continuous data analysis and learning walks and research study groups are held to help plan for further staff development and training in the reading and writing of English.

**Title III, Part A: Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students**

**Form TIII – A (1)(a)**

Grade Level(s) 3-5                      Number of Students to be Served: 25 \_\_\_\_\_ LEP X \_\_\_\_\_ Non-LEP  
Number of Teachers 1                      Other Staff (Specify) ESL

**School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview**

**Title III, Part A LEP Program**

**Public School 75** is a Pre-Kindergarten through Grade 5 School located in the Hunts Points section of the South Bronx, a low socio-economic area. It is a school serving 656 students including Special Education students in grades K-5. The school climate is warm and inviting, catering to the aesthetic needs of early childhood students. The halls are brightly decorated and classrooms are rich in print and focus on children’s literature and content area instructional materials. There is an atmosphere of teamwork and mutual respect between staff members and students, making it a place where students are safe and happy.

P. S. 75 proposes the implementation of an extended day program and a Saturday Academy program for all ELL students at the beginning and Intermediate levels of language proficiency.

The goal of this program is to provide additional support with ESL, Literacy, math and Social Studies. These programs will also strengthen basic literacy skills in the native language.

The extended day program will serve approximately 25 ELL students in grades 3 - 5. The program will begin in April of 2010 for two hours daily two days a week (Wednesday, Thursday) ( 3-5PM). The program will end in June of 2010. The program will employ one ESL teacher. The primary language of instruction will be English.

Among the instructional material that will enhance our ESL program, we expect to purchase, ELL Oral Language Intervention Kits by Rourke Classroom Resources. This program has been developed based on scientific research in language acquisition and has been used in a standards based curriculum. The program is aligned with New York State standards and will provide opportunities to enhance and differentiate the ESL program. It augments the ESL and can support a balanced literacy program.

The Saturday Academy will primarily be aligned with the school-wide initiative for test preparation for ELA, NYSESLAT, MATH, SOCIAL STUDIES and SCIENCE. The Saturday Academy will be a 3 hour program from 9:00-12:00pm. The program will serve approximately 20 students in grades 3 -5. The program will begin in October 2009 and end in May 2010.

The program supervisor will need a bilingual parent coordinator who will coordinate the Art parental component of the program. The parent coordinator will monitor attendance and provide incentives for active participation in the Art program. There will be benchmark tests and a final display of student work for each group. One licensed and qualified artist will be needed to implement the instructional program.

The language instructions will be aligned with the student needs. The teacher will group the students to differentiate instruction. Materials from Continental Press will be purchased to support the preparation for the NYSESLAT. The Spanish Math practice materials will be use to prepare students for the MATH exam. ELA materials will be aligned with monolingual initiatives.

The Title III funds will help a staff and students develop greater self confidence as they enhance their skills in ESL reading, writing, and Math. Staff would use fundamental Bilingual strategies and methodologies to assure students build on their strength as they strive to meet and surpass standards set by the City and State.

### **Professional Development**

PS 75 proposes a professional development plan which includes pedagogical staff who works directly with ELL students. This staff includes Bilingual teachers, cluster teachers, Title I staff and support staff that impact on the quality of student performance. All interested staff will be provided the opportunity to become familiar with the elements of **ESL** and express interest in participating in the program.

An informal survey of our teachers this spring and our professional development survey indicated that teachers are interested in learning more about ESL models and how to implement these types of programs in our school. The school administrators and coaches will also support teachers in their instructional practice and help with team building and creating an environment which supports this new initiative.

PS 75 will provide professional development specifically to support the teaching and learning process for English Language Learners. We view professional development as a dynamic process of learning that leads to a new level of understanding and heightened awareness of the context in which teachers work that may compel them to examine accepted policies and routines. To complete the cycle, we will provide teachers with opportunities to reflect on these learning endeavors and teaching experiences with the intent of refining and extending our thinking and learning in education.

Teachers participate in monthly professional development activities to support activities to support the implementation of instructional programs for ELLs. In addition, teachers of ELLs are paid trainee rate to participate in study groups, content specific workshops that are geared to increase ELL achievement. These sessions will be conducted by teachers with specific expertise in L1 and L2. Those activities will be designed to develop the cognitive and linguistic skills of ELLs.

**Form TIII – A (1)(b)**

School: PS 75

BEDS Code: 320800010075

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

<b>Allocation Amount:</b>		
<b>Budget Category</b>	<b>Budgeted Amount</b>	<b>Explanation of expenditures in this category as it relates to the program narrative for this title.</b>
<b>Professional salaries (schools must account for fringe benefits)</b> - Per session	\$13,632.00	<b><u>After School</u></b> 1 Teacher – 52 hrs of per session x \$47.00 = \$2,244.00 1 Supervisor – 52 hrs of per session x \$49.00 = \$2,548.00 <b><u>Saturday Academy</u></b> 1 Teacher – 90 hrs of per session x \$47.00 = \$4,230.00 1 Supervisor – 90 hrs of per session x \$49.00 = \$4,410.00 <b>Total \$13,632.00</b>
<b>Purchased services</b> - High quality staff and curriculum development contracts.	\$2,500.00	Art Consultant, Ms. Ana Soto, working with Parents 5 Saturdays on developing appreciation for the arts.
<b>Supplies and materials</b> - Must be supplemental. - Additional curricula, instructional materials. - Must be clearly listed.	\$6,288.00	NYSELAT Materials and Reading Books
<b>Educational Software (Object Code 199)</b>		
<b>Travel</b>		
<b>Other</b>		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$22,420.00</b>	

### **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.

**Based on home language surveys and interaction with parents on a continuous basis, P.S. 75 recognizes the need at the present time to produce literature in both Spanish and English to ensure the dissemination of all information pertinent to the school community. Notices are sent out as far as advance as possible. In addition, our school safety officers, main office personnel, and parent coordinator are able to provide parents with information in both Spanish and English.**

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.

**Although P.S. 75 has the ability to provide written translation and oral interpretation services to the parents of its students, we find that regional and citywide communications are not always provided in alternate languages, leaving the school to interrupt the educational process to translate such information for dissemination to parents.**

#### **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.
  - **As in the past, P.S. 75 will continue to provide in-house written translation services and language assistance to our parents via school administrators and/or staff.**
  - **Notices will continue to be produced in both languages and sent home in advance with students and/or by mail.**
  - **School generated letters will be sent in English as well as in Spanish**
  - **Communicate information about the school's academic program and students' participation**
  - **Provide information about the students' academic performance and approaches to increasing achievement, for example during open school night.**
  - **Translate NCLB communications not available from central board.**

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.

**The Home language surveys were distributed to newly admitted students. School personnel provided assistance to parents in filling out the required forms. Based on this survey we have found that our school has a large population that speaks and reads in languages other than English. Principal and her cabinet met to discuss the translation needs of the school. Again, P.S. 75 will continue to provide in-house oral language assistance to our parents via school administrators and/or staff. The parent coordinator and/or school guidance counselor will assist at all parent meetings with oral language translation.**

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>.

**P.S. 75 will use school population data to determine the languages that are presently spoken by the students and parents of our school community. Using this information, we will produce information in English, as well as the other dominant language(s) when preparing written communications for parents. In addition, the same efforts will be made to secure and/or identify staff members or parent volunteers to assist in providing oral translation services in all necessary languages. P.S. 75 currently uses in-house staff and/or school administrators to provide these services.**

**BUDGET NARRATIVE:** What will you buy with the funds and how will you use your budget? **Translation Funds – Title I Translation Services \$1,493.00 and TL Translation Services \$595.00**

<b>Budget Category</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
Personnel such as teacher per session or paraprofessional (bulk jobs) <b>\$1,888.00</b>	<b>We will hire bilingual Spanish translators from within our staff to perform these duties as per session, 4- 8 hours per week.</b>
Purchased services such as contractual translation or interpretation services	N/A
Supplies and materials <b>\$200.00</b>	<b>We will purchase paper, ink for our copier, folders, pens, and any other pertinent materials to ensure that our Spanish speaking parent's need are met.</b>
Local travel for staff providing translation/interpretation services	N/A
TOTAL <b>\$2, 088.00 (without fringe subtracted)</b>	

**PUBLIC SCHOOL**



*"Spotlight On Excellence"*

**MARINES ARRIETA-CRUZ**  
Principal

EZRA NANTON  
RICHARD GUGLIOTTA  
YOKASTA PENA  
Assistant Principals

984 Faile Street, Bronx, NY 10459 Tel: (718) 860-1630

## **PUBLIC SCHOOL 75** **LANGUAGE ALLOCATION POLICY**

### **School Demographics**

Public School 75 is a Pre-Kindergarten through Grade 5 school located in the Hunts Points section of the South Bronx, a low socio-economic area. It is a school serving 650 students, including Special Education students in grades K-5. The ESL Program has six heterogeneous self-contained classes. Presently, the total ELL population at P.S. 75 is 133 students from culturally diverse background that constitute 20% of the school's population. Our student population is almost exclusively Hispanic and Black American. According to the latest available ethnic data 57.0% of the students are Hispanic; 18.3% of the students are Black American; .08% are American Indians; .05% of the students are Asian-Pacific Islander; and .09% of the students are White. Approximately 22% of the students have Individualized Education Plans (IEP) and receive the full continuum of the services, including Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS), instruction in a self contained class, and related services such as speech and language, and counseling. Additionally 16.1% of the students are English Language Learners (ELL), with Spanish as the dominant language among the majority. The majority of the students who attend P.S. 75 are from low-income families, and 100% qualify for free lunch.

### **ELL Identification Process**

Our LAP team is composed of the following key constituents: Marines Arrieta-Cruz, Principal; Yokasta Peña, Assistant Principal; Ezra Nanton, Assistant Principal, Richard Gugliotta, Assistant Principal; Evangeline Mercado, Literacy Coach; Sharin Tirado, Math Coach; Mabel Gonzalez, Parent Coordinator; Vanessa Veal, Writing Teacher; Maria Acosta, ESL/AIS Teacher; Rosemarie Parreno, ESL/AIS Teacher; Antonia Crespo-Battu, Guidance Counselor; Terry Lambert, Parent.

The process of identification begins upon registration. Preliminary screenings and interviews are conducted by the ESL teachers. Parents are asked to complete the Home Language Identification Survey (HLIS) which is given by a trained secretary or ESL Coordinators/Teachers. The ESL Coordinators/Teachers review the Home Language Identification Survey (HLIS) for eligibility.

Once eligibility is determined, the LAB-R is given within 10 days of registration. The results on the LAB-R will determine the following: 1) a student who speaks little or no English will be placed in a beginner category for ELLs; 2) students who are transferring from another school will many times already have results from the LAB-R. Eligible students who are transferring from a private or school outside of New York will have to be administered the LAB-R; 3) students who are eligible for bilingual education or whose parent selection is for a bilingual program are often referred to a nearby bilingual school.

If the student is determined to require services as per the LAB-R/English, the parent or guardian is immediately informed. They are then required to attend an Orientation for Parents of ELLs. There are three orientations conducted throughout the school year for entitled students. During these orientations, parents or guardians are informed through pamphlets and a Department of Education video of the various ELL programs available for their children, especially those available at P.S. 75 - Self-Contained and Free Standing ESL. Upon receiving the information on the various educational programs for ELLs, including the instructional process, parents/guardians are then asked to make a program selection. ESL Coordinators/Teachers distribute the ESL entitlement letters, Parent Survey, and Program Selection forms.

Parents are also notified about the NYSESLAT and how their child can exit out of the program by scoring at a certain level of proficiency. Parents are encouraged to join school community events, participate in the PTA, attend Parent/Teacher conferences, and volunteer as learning leaders. Information is always presented to parents in both languages (English/Spanish). Translators are also available for parents on site.

After reviewing the Parent Survey and Program Selection forms for the past several years, parents' first choice of selection has been the Self-Contained and Free Standing ESL program. Presently, PS 75 does not have a bilingual program. Parents seem to be satisfied with the programs available to their children at P.S. 75.

Most parents opt to ESL, mainly because they prefer to teach their children their native language at home. Many of our students speak a language other than English and Spanish.

There are currently fifteen SIFE students receiving daily Academic Intervention services to develop their academic language skills. Newcomers, SIFE students and long-term ELLs are classified according to their English language proficiency in a timely manner, and their ESL instructional program is designed to accommodate their learning on the basis of their proficiency. Parents receive information and orientation related to the Language Allocation Policy (LAP) and how it affects the delivery of the chosen instructional model.

**ELL Demographics**

	<b>K</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Self-Contained ESL</b>	23	12	20	18	14	22
<b>Freestanding ESL</b>	9	11	5	6	4	6

Over the past years, a student's English language proficiency has been measured through the NYSESLAT. In general, students in grades K through five achieved at higher English proficiency levels in the speaking and the listening modality of the exam. Students scored lower in the

reading modality. The writing modality throughout all grades illustrated an even lowered proficiency gain. It is evident that rigorous instruction in Reading and Writing is a necessary improvement in order to make meaningful gains in English language proficiency.

Students in grades K-1 are in the beginning level in the four modalities. However, when ELL students are promoted to grades 2-5, they follow the regular pattern on increasing a proficiency level per year with few exceptions. Based on the data, most of the upper grades achieved the advanced level in the four modalities. For the advanced level across grades, there are students based on their total NYSESLAT scores who increase their proficiency levels from the intermediate to the advanced levels. Their average reading and writing raw scores increase an average of 1-10 points.

The greatest difference between the intermediate and the advanced students are reflected in the reading and writing raw scores. For the beginning and the intermediate levels, there are students across the grades that increase their reading and writing levels with average of 1-10 points. Few students remained in the same language proficiency levels while most of the students move two levels of proficiency from the beginning to the advanced levels across the grades.

Those students who took the NYSESLAT assessment for first time mostly scored at intermediate and advanced levels. As a result, some of those students achieved the proficiency level in the NYSESLAT. Despite the increase in the four modalities, we observe that reading and writing seem to be the most difficult skills to be mastered.

The ELL program at P.S. 75 continues to strive to move students in making one proficiency level gain by the end of the school year. This year, nine of our ELL students became proficient enough to exit the program while many of the students at the beginning proficiency levels made significant gains. Based on NYSESLAT, Interim Assessment, and ELA data, focus areas of need reflect a strong emphasis for instruction in the areas of Reading Comprehension and Writing.

These assessments drive instruction and remediation. This is necessary in order to move our Intermediate and Advanced students and ultimately help them to reach the proficiency levels needed to exit the program. Lessons and assessments are aligned with performance standards. Based on the LAB-R and NYSESLAT data, students receive the mandated minutes; beginners and intermediate receive 360 minutes. Advanced level students receive 180 minutes.

The following is a representation of the existing levels at the school:

<b>Proficiency Levels</b>	<b>Total # of students</b>	<b>Minutes</b>
Beginning	44	360 minutes
Intermediate	40	180 minutes
Advanced	48	180 minutes

There are a total of 66 ELL students who are mandated to take the ELA test in April 2010. ELL students have a choice to take the content area examination in Mathematics, Social Studies, and Science in their native language, or use English and native language editions simultaneously, or use bilingual dictionaries and glossaries.

We strive to provide solid and effective preparation in English Language Arts and other content areas for students. The greatest increase in the total number of students in the testing grades is at the intermediate proficiency level. Many of our beginning students are newcomers.

Newcomers receive intensive instruction in ESL. This is done to ease their transition to a new environment. During orientation meetings, the ESL teachers meet with parents to discuss future plans. Explicit and small group instruction is essential for our Beginning ELLs. These students are provided with daily and extended services in basic competency skills. Advanced students receive additional instruction during the extended day academy.

### **Instructional Program**

In an effort to develop the language skills and fluency of our ELL's population at P.S. 75, we use the Workshop Model which follows all the balanced literacy components, such as, Read Aloud, Shared Reading/Writing, Independent Reading/Writing and Guided Reading/Writing. In addition to the model, we incorporate audio/visuals, listening centers, big books, charts, graphic organizers, and manipulative.

The content areas in the Self-Contained ESL classes are taught using the following scientific based approaches: Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS); Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP), by Commins (1984), and the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA), by A. Chamot and M. O'Malley. In every classroom at P.S. 75, you will find differentiated instruction in order to meet the varying needs of the ELL's population.

Teaching strategies used to meet the different needs of our ELL's students are: modeling, total physical response, repetition, hands-on-instruction, small group instruction, and individual instruction and pairing. Reading strategies such as Reciprocal Teaching are done to help students construct their understanding of literacy. Teachers are encouraged to work on thematic units to help students learn holistically which research has proven to be the most effective for English Language Learners. In addition, leveled libraries exist in all classrooms and bilingual books are visible for ELL students. Ongoing assessments are done in monthly learning walks, professional development, and research study groups.

Since Writing and Reading are still the focus for this academic year, strong emphasis is on the Reading and Writing workshop. The workshop model relies heavily on intensive forms of writing. The instructional materials being utilized for reading are Land of the Letter People (PreK-K), Read Well (K-2), 100 Book Challenge (K-2), Comprehension Strategies Kit (3-5), Chapter Books (3-5), Read 180 (3-5 technology), Junior Great Books (3-5), and Extensions in Reading Paired Passages (3-5 Test Prep) and Skill Bridge (3-5 Test Prep). The instructional material being utilized for writing is WRITE!, a comprehensive writing program designed to help students with special needs. Teachers are also trained on working with students on the writing process, which is another approach to writing proficiency. ELL students who are at risk receive instruction through the Breakthrough to Literacy program. ELL instructors are also trained in Breakthrough to Literacy. The instructional materials being

utilized for math are Everyday Math (PreK-5), Math Steps (PreK-5), New York State Coach (3-5 Test Prep), Comprehensive Math Assessments (2-5 Test Prep), and Elements of Daily Mathematics (3-5 Extended Day).

In addition, our ELL and Special Education students participate in the Out-of-Class Writing Workshop. This program provides struggling writers with the skills necessary to become competent and independent writers. Although an eclectic approach is used, one of the approaches that seem to work well with certain students is the self-regulated strategy development (SRSD). This approach uses explicit and extensive instruction in writing strategies; instruction is individualized to the student's needs and abilities using feedback and support; students are self-paced, but must meet certain criteria before moving from one stage of instruction to the next. In an effort to differentiate instruction, other students are guided through the writing process and receive direct instruction. Students also use graphic organizers to help them organize their writing. In terms of differentiation, certain students are also encouraged to revise as they write, which takes away their frustration of having to rewrite repeatedly. The extent of the Out-of-Class Writing Workshop has been on informational expository writing. However, once per month, students are invited to free write a piece, which is used to assess how well they are using the strategies.

Furthermore, during the school year, our school provides ongoing small group instruction to all of our students. Our English Language Learners actively participate in the After-school and Saturday programs. In these programs, students are serviced as follows: two hours of English as a Second Language, two hours of Literacy and two hours of NYSESLAT test preparation. At-Risk services teachers provide ELLs reading language, and math instructions in English for 50 minutes daily.

The patterns across the four modalities affect instruction in our school due to the results of the NYSESLAT assessment. The majority of our ELLs scored advanced in this assessment. Therefore, a Push-in ESL Program instead of the Pull-out ESL Program is applicable, especially in grades 3-5. This pattern paves the way for the General Education teacher and the ESL teacher to work collaboratively in teaching the content areas in English. For ELLs at the beginning and intermediate levels, both the Push-in and Pull-out Programs of ESL instruction are recommended to comply with the CR Part 154 instructional unit requirement of 360 minutes per week, and to reinforce the lessons that they need the most help in within a small group setting. In grades K-2, the ESL Freestanding Pull-out Program is used because ELLs belong to different classrooms and the number of students in each grade is convenient for small group instruction. The ESL teacher employs both push-in and pull-out, teaching the same lesson and using different materials as the General Education teacher. Our school strongly recommends ESL Freestanding Push-in and Self-Contained Programs.

Native Language Arts builds a foundation in literacy and academic content that will facilitate English language and academic development as students acquire the new language. Students have a range of developed and prior knowledge experiences. These levels of skills in the native language are considered when preparing lesson plans in order to implement scaffolding strategies and activities to help build on literacy and academic concepts. Academic language development is achieved in a collaborative setting, where ELLs and teachers are partners in learning. Teachers provide scaffolding support that is responsive to the students' needs in developing academic language.

Our ELL instructional program is aligned with ELA/ESL content learning standards and core curriculum. Academic rigor is incorporated in all lessons to improve Reading and Writing skills. Accountable talk is the primary focus for our Beginning level students who are still at the Basic

Interpersonal Communicative Skills level of oral proficiency. The Workshop Model of instruction and the components of Balanced Literacy are implemented to enhance comprehension and language development. Students are grouped homogeneously for targeted areas of instruction and are also placed in small differentiated groups for more systematic, explicit instruction. Teachers utilize ongoing assessment in order to: plan, modify and augment instruction; continuously group students according to their linguistic and academic needs; and utilize pertinent strategies to meet individual needs. Teachers group students in homogeneous and heterogeneous groups strategically to meet learning goals and address student needs and growth.

The school leadership team and teachers are using the NYSESLAT, ECLAS-2, Read Well Assessments, E-PAL, ELA Simulation Tests, and ELL Interim Assessments to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the ELLs in the four modalities (listening, speaking, reading and writing). The Academic Intervention Team (AIS) and the ESL teachers make a comparative analysis of the scores of the ELL Interim Assessments, NYSESLAT, and the ELA Simulation Tests to determine the specific needs of ELLs based on their results in these tests. Therefore, targeted instruction on the four modalities is addressed and different groups are formed based on the level of the students. ELLs are encouraged to attend the after school and Saturday programs for enrichment. Classroom teachers, coaches, consultants, AIS staff, and the administration have frequent dialogues with the ESL teachers to ensure that ELLs are monitored to ensure their success. Teachers of ELL students receive additional training in ESL methodologies and strategies. These teachers have also been trained in using Tier levels of Response to Intervention. In addition, they receive professional development to teach metacognitive strategies as a way of scaffolding instruction for students.

The school's transition plan for ESL students (including the special education students) who reach proficiency on the NYSESLAT and are transferred to monolingual classes is to provide an additional year of ESL support services. In addition, they participate in P.S. 75 Academic Intervention Programs to insure that they reach the highest academic achievement.

At P.S. 75, there are nine ESL certified teachers. The ESL classes consist of beginning, intermediate and advanced English proficient level students. Students in the beginning and intermediate level of English of proficiency receive weekly 8 periods (360 minutes) of instruction in ESL. Advanced students receive 4 periods (180 minutes) of instruction in ESL and 4 periods (180 minutes) of instruction in ELA. The same is applicable to the special education students respectively.

At P.S.75 we support the initial adjustment of immigrant students who are newcomers in our school to the language, culture, and schooling of their new country. We emphasize the integration of academic and personal-social support to help students adjust. Our plan for integrating newcomers into our classrooms is based on Maslow's hierarchy of human needs which are safety, security, and a sense of belongingness (Maslow, 1968). To address these needs the following recommendations are helpful: 1) assign a "personal buddy" to each newcomer who speaks his/her language, knows the school, and is comfortable here; 2) the teacher should set predictable routines and schedule which creates a sense of security for new students; 3) newcomers should be assigned to a "home-group" that remains unchanged for a long time which maybe defined by table; 4) The teacher should seat newcomers toward the middle or in front of the classroom so they can observe experienced students; 5) repetition of classroom routines provide newcomers with language learning opportunities; 6) integrate newcomers into cooperative groups for further social and academic language learning activities through the following phases: get along, developing relationships, production and autonomy. Cooperative groups may be homogeneous or heterogeneous.

Upon examining the grade 3-5 New York State ELA (Spring 2008) test, the following results are illustrated for grade 3 ELLs: 95.5% scored levels 2-4 and 61% scored levels 3-4. In grade 4; 91% scored levels 2-4; and 60.7% levels 3 and 4. In grade 5; 100% scored levels 2-4 and 64.7% scored levels 3-4. In addition, all students who took the NYS ELA NYSAA scored levels 4. Therefore, the implications are for ELLs and instructors of ELLs to continue to use instructional time blocks, on-going professional development to teach effective reading/writing practices, Comprehension Strategies, Junior Great Books, Chapter books, funded pull-out ELA teachers, and small group instruction.

Upon examining the grade 3-5 New York State Math (Spring 2008) test, the following results are illustrated for grade 3 ELLs: 58% scored levels 2-4 and 38% scored levels 3-4. In grade 4; 81% scored levels 2-4; and 44% levels 3 and 4. In grade 5; 84% scored levels 2-4 and 20% scored levels 3-4. In addition, all students who took the NYS Math NYSAA scored levels 4. Therefore, the implications are for ELLs and instructors of ELLs to continue to use instructional time blocks, on-going professional development to teach effective math practices, Princeton Review, Everyday Math and Impact Math Assessment, funded pull-out math teachers, and small group instruction.

Upon examining the grade 4<sup>th</sup> New York State Science (Spring 2006) Assessment, the following results are illustrated for grade 4 ELLs: 94% scored levels 2-4; and 50% level 3 and 4. In addition, all students who took the NYS Science NYSAA scored levels 4. Therefore, the implications are for ELLs and instructors of ELLs to continue to use instructional time blocks, on-going professional development to teach effective science practices and hands-on activities, teacher made assessments, and small group instruction. Students have the opportunity enhance their abilities and knowledge in science through Science Fair projects.

English Language Learners are held accountable to the same grade expectations and standards as monolingual students. The following goals and objectives have been made to improve instruction in English Language Arts and other content areas for English Language Learners:

- To improve scores in Mathematics and English Language Arts for students mandated to take standardized tests. The majority of ELL students are school at Level 2/3 in ELA and Level 3 in Mathematics (Grade 4 & 5).
- To increase proficiency level performance on the NYSESLAT, English Language Arts, and Mathematics. The majority of students in the testing grades are at the Intermediate level of proficiency.
- To provide AIS in literacy and language development for ELLs and students at risk and long term ELL students who score at levels 1 and 2 on standardized tests.
- To improve written proficiency at all levels.

In order to provide maximum learning conditions for ELLs and meet compliance with the NYC Department of Education, modifications are in place during simulated and actual testing. ELLs students are provided with necessary assistance (dictionaries and alternate language copies with translations). Students also receive extended time, special location, and are assigned proctors during testing. Training is provided to all teachers to learn about approaches used in assessing ELLs. ELLs who are in Special Education classes or have specific Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) receive accommodations stated in the IEP. X-Coded ESL students do not receive services but receive preparations and modifications for all examinations.

### **Extended Day Program**

Before school tutoring is available to all ESL students in grades 2-5. This program is instructed by a license ESL teacher. In addition, Academic Intervention Service is provided to our ELL population. These students receive explicit instruction by a licensed ESL teacher. Advanced students are also given the opportunity to be involved in our academic enrichment extended day program. Long-term ELLs, Holdovers and students are at-risk will also receive special instruction by the ESL teacher. This program is specially designed in collaboration with the ESL coordinators and the school Administrators. These students are serviced during the day and after school. The program provides basic instruction in English which includes phonemic awareness and basic mathematical skills in an effort to help students make progress in their academic studies. We have also included newcomer students in our before/after school academic programs, as well as providing additional AIS to these students.

### **Professional Development**

Professional development opportunities throughout the course of the school year are offered to all personnel who work with ELLs including assistant principals, teachers, paraprofessionals, guidance counselor, social worker, psychologist, occupational/physical therapists, speech therapists, secretaries and school aides. Professional development is designed to engage faculty in professional discourse and provide support for our ELL population. P.S. 75 provides ongoing staff development in reading and writing strategies, using the 100 Book Challenge Program for independent reading and “On the Way to English” K-5 Balanced Literacy Program, and the Read 180 Program to provide remediation and enrichment in reading and writing processes, and comprehension skills. In addition, our professional development includes training for teachers in ESL strategies/methodologies, language acquisition, and the mandated 10 hour training in ESL. These staff development sessions are offered to both ESL and monolingual teachers. Training in ESL is provided to teachers by specialized personnel. Presently, writing workshops are focused on strategies that assist in scaffolding language and learning.

Every month our school has a genre which covers the standards, the star theme and skill using the Kagan Structure in grouping and the Bloom’s Taxonomy in asking questions. Some of the monthly themes are Non-Fiction-Biography, Fiction, Folktales, Poetry, Narrative Procedure, Realistic Fiction, Editorials, and Drama. In addition, children’s literary work on the bulletin board reflects the monthly theme. In conclusion, at P.S. 75, teachers have the monthly theme incorporated with their literacy lessons.

ESL and ELA teachers at P.S. 75 work collaboratively. There are scheduled common preparation periods and grade conferences during which they do common planning, inter-visitation, learning walks, and plan for future professional development according to the school’s needs of assessment.

During the school year, evidence of academic rigor is presented in each of our ELL classrooms where the students participate in an instructional program that regularly ensures continuity of rigorous academic instruction. The administrators, teachers, parents and support staff will be conducting monthly learning walks to assess instruction aligned with the mandated ESL/ELA, content learning standards and the core curriculum. On-going informal observation, conferencing with teachers will take place to ensure that ELL students participate in small group, task oriented situation that guide the production of language both in verbal and written form.

In addition, the implementation of this Language Allocation Policy is sustained with on-going principal’s cabinet meetings, professional development sessions to share ELL strategies with all classroom teachers, continuous data analysis, and learning walks.

### **Parent/community involvement**

One of the 'Essential Features' that makes PS 75 unique is its parental/guardian compact and agreement to excellence. Our school relies on the commitment of PS 75 parents to ensure that students meet high expectations. In doing so, we provide consistent parent orientations and meetings to maintain a relationship between the school and home. Sessions are held with our parents of the ELL students to discuss State Standards, assessments, and general program requirements for English Language Learners

Workshops are available for parents. Monthly parent workshops are conducted by ESL faculty. The parent coordinator along with the ESL teachers provide workshops geared for parents of ELLs.

Public School 75 offers parent workshops based on specific, identified needs of ELL parents, using translators, as necessary. We maintain linkages with external resources to provide the services that are not available at the school. Parent coordinator facilitates contacts with external resources and helps parents negotiate school-related issues in parents' language of preference. In addition, the school provides resources for parents who need support services such as healthcare and bilingual counseling. P.S. 75 offers ESL, Computer, and GED classes for parents.

Parent workshop sessions such as Parent Association Meetings and School Leadership Team are some of the avenues to maintain consistent communication with our PS 75 parents. All of the information shared with parents will be disseminated in the language they understand other than English. Public School 75 provides in-house written translation services and language assistance to our parents via school staff and/or parent volunteers. Notices are produced in both languages and sent home in advance with students and/or by mail. School generated letters for parents are sent in English, as well as in Spanish. They are also informed about the school's academic programs, students' participation, students' academic performance, and approaches to increase achievement, during open school night and parent/teacher conferences.

Our school has a parent coordinator responsible for making additional outreach gestures to secure all the needs of our parents are attended to. The school parent coordinator works regularly and skillfully to diffuse school problems and conflicts with parents of ELLs as they arise.

P.S. 75 parents are required to attend an Orientation for Parents of ELLs. The parent orientations are conducted every month if needed. This orientation will be provided by a school administrator, school parent coordinator, and the ESL Coordinators. During this orientation, parents or guardians are informed through pamphlets and a Department of Education video of the various ELLs programs available for their children, especially those available at PS 75. Upon receiving the information on the various educational programs for ELLs, parents/guardians are then asked to make a program selection. After reviewing the Parent Survey and Program Selection forms for the past few years, there seems to be a trend indicating that many parents are requesting that their children attend self-contained ESL classes or monolingual classes while receiving ESL services, if their child has not passed the NYSESLAT exam.

### **Implications for Instruction**

The implications for Language Allocation Policy and instruction at P.S. 75 are for students to be encouraged to speak through task-oriented situations in order to interact and communicate with peers and adults. Listening activities (note-taking, following spoken instruction), flexible groupings, instructional features (theme studies, scaffolding, language sensitive lessons modifications), multidimensional assessments (formal, informal, portfolios, running records, anecdotal observations) and other sources such as videos and audios (book on tape) will continue to be utilized. Reading and writing strategies for developing and improving English proficiency levels include guided, shared, and independent reading and writing (small groups, peer grouping, student-teachers conferencing) in order to develop and enhance language proficiency.

In addition, the implications for instruction will involve continued staff development for teachers of ELLs in the use of ESL scaffolding strategies to teach content area materials, the use of oral and written language, the use of disciplinary discourse with students, push-in and pull-out support, and extended day program for extra help.

Teachers will expect students to achieve at high performance levels and use a variety of instructional strategies to challenge them. Students will be engaged in projects that enhance and ensure creativity and critical thinking. They will take responsibility for student success by employing methods to meet the needs of students. P.S. 75 teachers will be facilitators of students' academic and personal growth, guiding them to be independent thinkers. Also, they will encourage students to take ownership of their own learning as evidenced by creative student work, rigorous lesson planning and student interactions.

To ensure meeting the needs of our ELL population, we will continue providing them the following services: Academic Intervention Services, Extended Day, Differentiated Instruction, Push-in Model of Instruction, Pull-out Model, Tutoring, Out of Classroom Writing Workshop, After School Instruction, and Saturday Instruction.

**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:	716,519	209,980	926,499
2. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside for Parent Involvement:	7,165		7,165
3. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside to Improve Parent Involvement (ARRA Language):		2,099	2,099
4. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified:	35,825		35,825
5. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect – HQ PD (ARRA Language):		10,499	10,499
6. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Professional Development:	71,651		71,651
7. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect (Professional Development) (ARRA Language):		20,998	20,998

8. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2008-2009 school year: 97.9%
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.
  - In house professional development provided by Literacy Coach, Math Coach, mentorand consultants
  - Assistance offered in completing licensing requirements.

## **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.

### **PS 75 Parent Involvement Policy**

PS 75 parents will be included in the planning implementation, evaluation and continuous improvement of school level programs funded by Title I funds in the following manner:

- Parent members will be included in the School Leadership Team and participate in all monthly meetings. During these meetings programs, materials and school initiatives will be discussed, evaluated and planned.
- In the fall a meeting will be scheduled where all parents will be informed of all programs funded through Title I.
- Parents will be informed of their children’s progress toward achieving State and City standards and will be encouraged to meet with teachers to discuss ways in which they can assist their children.
- PS 75 will provide parents with many opportunities to participate in several workshops aimed at providing information and strategies in content areas, parenting skills, social issues. PS 75 will provide parents with classes aimed at improving their own academic skills in order to facilitate their efforts in enhancing their children’s education at home.
- Parents will be provided with information regarding SES programs in a timely manner. A meeting will be scheduled where providers will be available to explain their programs so that parents can make an informed decision when choosing programs.
- Parent communications will be available in Spanish and translations in other languages will be provided.
- The Parent Compact will be developed in collaboration with parents and will be distributed to the PS 75 community in order to strengthen parental participation in our students’ education.

- The annual review to the parent compact will take place in December 2009 and will be distributed to SLT Title I parents in February 2010.

## 2. School-Parent Compact - Attach a copy of the school’s Parent Involvement Policy.

**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 at the NYCDOE website link provided above.

## PS 75 PARENT COMPACT

### Our school’s mission:

It is the mission the PS 75 Parent Compact to work collaboratively with parents, teachers, administrators, staff and community agencies in making PS 75 the “Spotlight on Excellence” school. With this collaboration we will provide our students with high quality curriculum and instruction in a supportive and effective learning environment that enables students to meet State and City standards.

### Our parents’ mission:

- To support our children by:
- Making sure they come prepared to school
- Providing an environment at home that will help to support the education of our children
- Recognizing their individual strengths and build upon them
- Providing opportunities at home whereby a sense of family support is experienced
- Participating in school’s activities, meetings and workshops aimed at improving our skills at providing our children with a continuation of educational experiences at home

The School will...	The parents will...
Provide a learning environment that promotes and sets high standards for all children	Set aside a place at home where children can sit and complete school related assignments, read with

	our children on a daily basis and participate in school offered workshops aimed at improving our involvement at home.
Continue to schedule monthly PA meetings to inform parents of all programs offered at the school	Attend, give feedback and discuss the effectiveness of the programs offered
Schedule meetings throughout the year on specific topics that affect our students' achievement. (housing, social issues, domestic violence, etc.)	Seek help and assistance from social workers, guidance counselors, health providers and parent coordinator problems arise that will prevent our children's achievement in school.
Provide parents with the school's accountability system used to determine progress and students performance. (student academic progress report, student report card, assessments, etc.)	Attend scheduled conferences to discuss our children's progress and possible assistance if needed.
Provide parents with the results of standardized tests and other data pertinent to the academic performance of students (State School Report Card, NYC Progress Report, Quality Review, etc.)	Attend the school's meeting where this information is discussed and data is interpreted and explained to parents. Assist the school in implanting initiatives designed to improve data.
Provide parents with the opportunity to give feedback through Parent Surveys and questionnaires.	Actively participate in completing the Parent Survey and questionnaires from the School Leadership Team

### 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.**  
 Teachers will be provided opportunity to meet during common planning to review and analyze assessment performance results. Once these meetings take place we will provide our teachers with our School Assessment of Instructional program questionnaire. On this document, teachers are encouraged to give administrators and members of the SLT with valuable feedback regarding our existing instructional programs, materials and professional development needed in order to improve our student outcomes. The SLT in collaboration with administrators and coaches will review the responses and re-evaluate and make the necessary changes to our educational programs based on this data.
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:**

- **Increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as extended school year, before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities.**
- **Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.**
- **Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.**
- **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.**
- **Are consistent with and are designed to implement State and local improvement, if any.**

Please see AIS and ELA goals in response to this question.

**3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.**

Our hiring committee will evaluate the credentials of all candidates seeking positions at our school to ensure that they are fully certified in the content area they will teach. Any teachers who are missing credentials will receive professional development from our coaches and mentor in order to address their deficiencies.

**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.**

- Ongoing PD during grade conferences and faculty conferences
- Push-In Staff Development by Literacy Coach, Math Staff Developer, New Teacher Mentor, AIS Specialist
- Curriculum Mapping for Literacy
- Assessment Workshop for scoring and diagnostics
- Study groups and partnerships with consultants and universities to ensure quality professional development
- Professional Development focuses on the needs of students, teachers, as well as paraprofessionals working with students

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

- School-Based Organization Hiring Committee to provide and informative interview process that ensures school-wide support
- Principal and Assistant Principals will attend hiring halls and career fairs hosted at area universities
- Principal and Assistant Principals will foster an ongoing relationship with area universities and provide opportunities for their student teachers

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

- Partners in Print
- Learning Leaders
- Hands on Activities during Workshop and Family Nights
- GED Classes

- ESL Classes
- Computer Classes
- Art Classes
- Translation services available
- Parent Coordinator

**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.**

- Hold Parent orientation with Head Start and UPK programs not located at our school.
- Parent coordinator attends spring meetings at Head Start sites
- At the beginning of the school year parents are invited for a full week of orientation
- The P.S. 75 Math program is the same as the Kindergarten Math Program (Every Day Math)
- Balanced literacy is introduced in Pre-K and continues in Kindergarten
- Pre-K students participate in the same independent reading program as kindergarten (100 Book Challenge)
- Pre-K students spend a student orientation day in kindergarten classes
- A moving up ceremony is held for Pre-K students to celebrate moving up to kindergarten
- Pre-K students receive kindergarten reading list
- A big book of Pre-K memories is created for students to read in Kindergarten

**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.**

- Grade Leader and School Support Staff will participate at school meetings in order to provide feedback between administrators and staff
- Grade Leaders and the School Support Staff will have opportunities to meet with and raise question to vendors of various assessments
- Use of Running Records
- Analysis of Student Profiles
- Workshops on how to use tests diagnostically
- PIP folders for at risk students

**9. Activities to ensure that students who experience difficulty mastering the proficient or advanced levels of the academic achievement standards are provided with effective, timely additional assistance. The additional assistance must include measures to ensure that students' difficulties are identified on a timely basis and to provide sufficient information on which to base effective assistance.**

- AIS Interventions will be provided to those students who have been identified as at risk for failing state and local assessments
- Classroom teachers will identify the AIS students and services will be provided in a pullout/Push-in model by the AIS Instructional Team
- Extended Day and Saturday Academies

- SETSS at risk services
- 37.5 Tutoring – Extended Day
- ESL-AIS Interventions
- Child Study Team referral
- Push-In Services

**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.**

- SES Provider Fair
- AIS Services
- Career Day
- Character Development
- Episcopal Social Services After School Programs
- Parent Coordinator Workshops
- GED Classes
- ESL Classes
- Computer Classes
- Fire Prevention and Safety Assemblies
- Health Department Assemblies
- Free Health Services in collaboration with Urban Health Center
- Library Services and enrollment

**APPENDIX 5: NCLB/SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS IN NEED OF IMPROVEMENT (SINI) AND SCHOOLS REQUIRING ACADEMIC PROGRESS (SRAP)**

*This appendix must be completed by all Title I Schools in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1 and Year 2, Title I Corrective Action (CA) Schools, NCLB Planning for Restructuring Schools (PFR), NCLB Restructured, Schools, Schools Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP), and SURR schools that have also been identified as SINI or SRAP.*

**NCLB/SED Status:** Restructured Advanced      **SURR<sup>1</sup> Phase/Group (If applicable):** N/A

**Part A: For All School Improvement Schools (SINI and SRAP)**

- 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.**

**ELA-SWD sub-group:** Our SWD group failed to make AYP for the past three years. We have identified the need to focus on differentiated instruction, academic interventions, more time on task for this sub-group. Additionally, we have determined that our SWD would benefit from Read Well and Read 180 literacy programs. This subgroup will receive additional instruction in ELA strategies and test preparation.

- 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.**

- Five 50 minute periods per week
- Differentiate ELA instruction in all classrooms – Tier 1 Intervention
- Students will be identified for intervention based on content and skills assessment. Groups will be reorganized based on formal and informal assessments
- Groups will also be reorganized for content area based on upcoming standardized assessments
- Identified students will also receive intervention in a lab setting (Read 180)
- Students will attend 3 hour sessions every Saturday from October 2009 to May 2010 focusing on reading comprehension and writing
- Identified students receive enrichment during extended day
- Selected classrooms provide literacy instruction utilizing a lab component (Read 180)
- Read Well program is used to support instruction in basic reading skills

**Part B: For Title I Schools that Have Been Identified for School Improvement (SINI)**

---

<sup>1</sup> School Under Registration Review (SURR)

**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.**

(a) Provide the following information: 2009-10 anticipated Title I allocation = \$ 716,519 ; 10% of Title I allocation = \$ 71,651 .

(b) Describe how the 10 percent of the Title I funds for professional development will be used to remove the school from school improvement.

Funds will be used to pay for a full time Math Staff Developer/Data Specialist.

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

Teachers will be mentored weekly by our Teacher/Mentor, an in-house full time experienced teacher who meets regularly with new teachers. In addition we have peer mentoring program where more experienced teachers provide classroom support to new teachers. Teachers who fall under "not highly qualified" category will receive professional development from our full time Literacy and Math coaches, mentor and peers. This mentoring will include assistance in incorporating teaching strategies to support all students in those classes.

**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.**

Our school will disseminate letters in both English and Spanish with translations available to lower incidence languages. This format letter is available at the DOE website and will be customized to include our schools exact information.

**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)<sup>2</sup> 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

---

<sup>2</sup> 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 has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.**

We formed a committee with members representing teachers, administrators, parents and members of the SLT committee to study the outcomes of this audit and to determine how these findings are relevant to our school community. This information was just released and our committee was only able to meet once before the timeline to submit these responses, a preliminary view at these findings yielded our first impressions of the curriculum audit. We will continue to meet to discuss these finding throughout the year to plan activities and professional development necessary to address our deficiencies.

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

Applicable    Not Applicable

At first glance, the findings seem to be applicable to the extent that our ELA curriculum may not be completely aligned with state standards. We concede that following a curriculum map is not a full spectrum of what the State is requiring in an ELA curriculum. The committee will further explore how to align our resources, materials and syllabus to determine where the gaps exist and how to incorporate or expand on the missing areas.

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

We looked at our Curriculum Map and ELA materials. We found that the K-2 grade ELA curriculum was more in alignment with State standards than the 3-5 curriculum. Our curriculum map was found to be more of a pacing calendar and although it addresses skills and strategies per month, it does not go deeper to address every area that a student should be able to master in terms of benchmarks.

**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.**

Our teachers will receive these findings and will be asked to engage in grade level discussions to determine how we can review and revise our current curriculum in order to be in full alignment with the State. Professional development activities will focus in providing students and teacher with a deeper understanding of the ELA and Math curriculum.

## **1B. Mathematics**

### **Background**

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

### **Specific Math Alignment Issues:**

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

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

1B.1: Describe the process your school engaged in, during the 2008-09 school year, to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program. **We formed a committee with members representing teachers, administrators, parents and members**

**of the SLT committee to study the outcomes of this audit and to determine how these findings are relevant to our school community.**

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

Applicable   x Not Applicable

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

Our student scores reflect 88% of our students are levels 3 and 4. A careful review of our EDM curriculum indicates that this program is fully aligned with state standards. We are currently exploring further aligning the school curriculum with the process strands.

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 has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.**

We formed a committee with members representing teachers, administrators, parents and members of the SLT committee to study the outcomes of this audit and to determine how these findings are relevant to our school community.

**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?**

We determined that this finding does not correspond to our school's practice of utilizing the workshop model to provide ELA 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 (SOM<sup>3</sup>)* and SEC results also shed light on some of the instructional practices in the mathematics classroom. The SOM noted that direct instruction in K-8 mathematics classes was frequently or extensively seen 75 percent of the time in Grades K–8 (and 65 percent of the time in Grades 9–12). Student activities other than independent seatwork and hands-on learning in the elementary grades were rarely if ever observed. Technology use in mathematics classes also was very low.

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

**2B.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.**

We formed a committee with members representing teachers, administrators, parents and members of the SLT committee to study the outcomes of this audit and to determine how these findings are relevant to our school community.

---

<sup>3</sup> 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? We observed our delivery of the EDM curriculum in our K-5 grade classes and determine that this finding is not applicable to our school. We agree with the auditors finding which revealed high level of engagement and focused time spent on the curriculum.

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.

We reviewed our teacher turnover rate in the last year and there is no indication that this finding is applicable to our school due to our high retention rate.

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

Applicable  Not Applicable

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

The percentage of teacher turnover has continued to decrease to the lowest levels in our school's history.

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

---

### **KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS**

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

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

We formed a committee with members representing teachers, administrators, parents and members of the SLT committee to study the outcomes of this audit and to determine how these findings are relevant to our school community.

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

Applicable    Not Applicable

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

Our teachers revealed that these PD opportunities that are offered city-wide are not readily available to them in a timely manner.

**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. We will research available professional development opportunities for our teachers to attend. We will reach out to our local BETAC and ELL compliance officer.**

**KEY FINDING 5: DATA USE AND MONITORING—ELL INSTRUCTION**

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

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

We formed a committee with members representing teachers, administrators, parents and members of the SLT committee to study the outcomes of this audit and to determine how these findings are relevant to our school community.

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

Applicable  Not Applicable

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

Our teacher receive data regarding all our ELLs assessments and this data is disaggregated for their use in the classrooms.

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

---

### **KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SPECIAL EDUCATION**

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

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

We formed a committee with members representing teachers, administrators, parents and members of the SLT committee to study the outcomes of this audit and to determine how these findings are relevant to our school community.

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?**

Teachers feel that although they have an understanding of special education compliance issues there is still a lot of work to be done in understanding how to teach reading to our SWD in the grey area (normal IQ but extreme language difficulties). Much frustration has been expressed at the lack of differentiated state assessments available for our students to demonstrate progress as evidenced by their IEP goals and objectives.

**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.** We will create in-house professional development opportunities led by our mentor to address issues related to planning, instruction and behavior. We will also reach out to our special education support staff from our SSO.

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

---

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

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

We formed a committee with members representing teachers, administrators, parents and members of the SLT committee to study the outcomes of this audit and to determine how these findings are relevant to our school community.

**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?**

A preliminary review of our IEPs revealed some inconsistencies between students' current academic performance and goals and objectives.

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

We will provide teachers with additional professional development and support in writing IEP goals and objectives that are aligned to students' present performance and needs.

**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.)  
Currently we have 21 students in Temporary Housing.
2. Please describe the services you are planning to provide to the STH population.  
The following services are available and provided to STH student population as needed.
  - At risk guidance- to provide students with coping skills
  - AIS services- to ensure students' progress towards the different standards
  - South Bronx Mental Health Clinic- free individual and family counseling
  - Urban Health provides medical care
  - Universal feeding program- free meals are provided daily
  - After school and Saturday programs- to provide more time on task
  - Parent Coordinator- to assist parents in providing positive experiences outside of the school setting

### **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.