



P.S. 089 BRONX

2009-10

SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN

(CEP)

SCHOOL: P.S. 089 BRONX
ADDRESS: 980 MACE AVENUE, BRONX, NY, 10469
TELEPHONE: 718-653-0835
FAX: 718-231-2863

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE Error! Bookmark not defined.

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE Error! Bookmark not defined.

Part A. Narrative Description Error! Bookmark not defined.

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot Error! Bookmark not defined.

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT **10**

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS Error! Bookmark not defined.

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010 Error! Bookmark not defined.

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM Error! Bookmark not defined.

APPENDIX 2: PROGRAM DELIVERY FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELLs) ... Error! Bookmark not defined.

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION **24**

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL TITLE I SCHOOLS..... **26**

APPENDIX 5: NCLB/SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SINI AND SRAP SCHOOLS **30**

APPENDIX 6: SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS UNDER REGISTRATION REVIEW (SURRE)..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

APPENDIX 7: SCHOOL-LEVEL REFLECTION AND RESPONSE TO SYSTEMWIDE CURRICULUM AUDIT FINDINGS Error! Bookmark not defined.

Appendix 8: CONTRACTS FOR EXCELLENCE (C4E) SCHOOL-BASED EXPENDITURES FOR 2009-2010 Error! Bookmark not defined.

APPENDIX 9: TITLE I, PART A – SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS IN TEMPORARY HOUSING (STH) Error! Bookmark not defined.

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: 11X089 **SCHOOL NAME:** P.S. 089 Bronx

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 980 MACE AVENUE, BRONX, NY, 10469

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 718-653-0835 **FAX:** 718-231-2863

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Ronald Rivera **EMAIL ADDRESS:** rrivera25@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION / TITLE **PRINT/TYPE NAME**
SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON: Jared Kreiner

PRINCIPAL: Ronald Rivera

UFT CHAPTER LEADER: Robert Breitenbach

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT: Eleanor Vargas

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE:
(Required for high schools) NONE

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL SUPPORT ORGANIZATION (SSO) INFORMATION

DISTRICT: 11 **SSO NAME:** Partnership Support Organization

SSO NETWORK LEADER: Guarneri, Linda

SUPERINTENDENT: Elizabeth White

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

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

Name	Position and Constituent Group Represented	Signature
Ronald Rivera	Principal	
Caren Shapiro	Admin/CSA	
Robert Breitenbach	UFT Chapter Leader	
Jared Kreiner	UFT Member	
Kim Nieves	UFT Member	
Dominique Ferro	UFT Member	
Annette Caballero	UFT Member	
Eleanor Vargas	PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
Donna Stuart	PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
Luz Perez	Title I Parent Representative	Comments: Yes
Valori Rizzo	DC 37 Representative	
Francine Palmieri	Parent	Electronic Signature Approved.
Edwyn Stuart	Parent	
Annette Alvarado	Parent	

Candace Noonan	Parent	
Stephen Liebowitz	Parent	

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

* Core (mandatory) SLT members.

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

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

P.S. 89 has been serving the Williamsbridge community of the Bronx for the past 82 years. Conceived originally as a grammar school, it was truncated in 1953 to a K - 5, then in 1994 it returned to its original K - 8 organization. In 2007, a pre-Kindergarten was opened and we are currently set up as a Pre-K to Grade 8 school with a population of 1320. In March of 2002 the school was officially named "The Williamsbridge School".

The school is organized heterogeneously from Pre-kindergarten through Grade 8. Our demographics reflect 225 ELL students, 151 self-contained special education students, and 72 part-time special education students. In terms of ethnicity, we have 15% White students, 26% Black students, 46% Hispanic students, and 10% Asian students and others. The male-female comparison is 681 versus 616. 77.6 % of our students were eligible for free lunch in the 2008-2009 school year.

Our faculty is comprised of 104 teachers of which 100% are fully licensed and permanently assigned to our school.

Parents are encouraged to become involved in their child's learning in various ways. A parent resource library has been established to provide parents access to relevant literature dealing with child development. Additionally, workshops are offered in which parents can become familiar with the various academic programs in place at P.S. 89.

Two literacy staff developers are here to assist teachers in planning and implementing effective instructional practices. Through demonstration lessons, after school workshops, and one-to-one service support, the staff developers provide teachers with assistance in planning and delivering effective instruction.

In 2009-2010 we are using 4 math programs: Everyday Mathematics (K-5), Impact Mathematics (6-8), Accelerated Algebra in Grade 8 and SRA Mathematics in our Special Education classes in (6-8). We have one Math Staff Developer to assist teachers. We have one AIS person to assist upper grade "at-risk" students and one AIS person to assist lower grade "at-risk" students.

Our eighth graders are involved in preparing science and social studies Exit Projects which serve as criteria for promotion. Students in grade six and seven are also engaged in interdisciplinary learning activities designed to culminate in mock Exit Projects in preparation for attaining eighth grade goals.

A middle school intramural program, grades 6 - 8, will be offered (budget permitting) on an extended day basis for both boys and girls to provide sports on both a recreational and competitive basis. This will be accomplished through several intramural programs including basketball, track and field, soccer, badminton, baseball, football, etc.

Students identified for academic intervention services are given additional time on task tailored to their individual learning styles. The duration of AIS intervention is based on the students' level of need. A supplemental reading intervention model includes smaller grouping and more time on task. Everyday Mathematics and Impact Mathematics, will be used to boost achievement in mathematics. Budget permitting, we are planning on having an extended day and Saturday program that will give students an opportunity to take part in a test preparation program closer to the time of testing. NCLB federal legislation has provided Supplementary Education Services (SES) to at-risk students in Grades K - 8 in ELA and Math. These include IEP, BELL, BRAINFUSE, READ, LEARN IT and BRIENZA.

Our growing population of English Language Learners is serviced in a self-contained ESL program, as mentioned in our Language Allocation Policy. Presently we have 15 self-contained English as a Second Language classes (K-8), one Bilingual CTT class in Grade K and one Bilingual CTT in Grade 1.

Our special education classes consist of 9 collaborative team teaching classes on Grades K,1,2,3,4,6 and 7 and 8 self-contained classes throughout the grades. In addition two SETSS (Special Education Teacher Support Services) teachers will service children that are in general education with a need for resource room. Budget permitting, we will continue to have the services of an IEP teacher who will push-in to classrooms to provide instructional services for our IEP students. Related services, including speech, counseling, occupational therapy and physical therapy are provided.

The School Leadership Team, comprised of administrators, teachers, parents, a school aide and the UFT Chapter Leader, meets monthly to focus on collaborative planning to build upon the school's success in student achievement.

During the 2009-2010 school year, the fourth and fifth grade students participate in exploratory academies. All students participate in STEM (Science, Technology, Ecology and Mathematics) and in the Arts. In STEM, students are offered the opportunity to explore and develop their thinking and reasoning skills through project based learning and real life scientific and mathematical experiences.

Fifth grade students are also involved in a week long activity at Springbrook Farms in Vermont. In addition, there is an ambassador program at the farm involving previous farmers in Grades 5 - 8 who perform community service each year. Also the future farmers continue to participate in community service throughout the year.

Several classes receive instruction from professionals in their respective fields as well as their own teachers. LEAP is conducting classes that incorporate visual arts with environmental themes. Bronx Arts Ensemble will continue to work with our more experienced violin and clarinet players, funding permitted. Teachers will receive professional development from Lincoln Center, funding permitted. Several students and their parents will attend ABT Ballet at City Center, funding permitted. Finally our drama department is planning to perform an original interactive presentation, "Alice in Wonderland" (Broadway Junior), and "Once on This Island".

We have received a Century 21 grant which will enable us to offer our Grade 6, 7, 8 students programs in sports and arts. The grant also has an academic component for these grades in ELA and Mathematics.

SECTION III - Cont'd

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT					
School Name:	P.S. 089 Bronx				
District:	11	DBN #:	11X089	School BEDS Code #:	11X089

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

Enrollment:				Attendance: - % of days students attended			
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Pre-K	0	32	30		90	90.1	91.0
Kindergarten	117	128	146				
Grade 1	124	119	138	Student Stability: - % of Enrollment			
Grade 2	120	132	116	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 3	124	117	132		92.4	92.6	93.26
Grade 4	143	117	117				
Grade 5	144	146	122	Poverty Rate: - % of Enrollment:			
Grade 6	176	164	186	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 7	200	170	164			92.4	92.6
Grade 8	182	187	162				
Grade 9	0	0	0	Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:			
Grade 10	0	0	0	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Grade 11	0	0	0		13	18	48
Grade 12	0	0	0				
Ungraded	0	4	0	Recent Immigrants: - Total Number			
Total	1330	1316	1313	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
					14.0	5.0	8

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

					07	08	
# in Self-Contained Classes	78	85	95				
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	58	45	61	Principal Suspensions	48	101	TBD
Number all others	56	83	79	Superintendent Suspensions	21	26	TBD
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>							
				Special High School Programs: - Total Number:			
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment (BESIS Survey)				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	CTE Program Participants	0	0	0
# in Trans. Bilingual Classes	0	0	0	Early College HS Participants	0	0	0
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0				
# receiving ESL services only	278	276	243	Number of Staff: - Includes all full-time staff:			
# ELLs with IEPs	2	0	5	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
<i>These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.</i>				Number of Teachers	102	109	108
				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	14	21	27
Overage Students: # entering students overage for grade							
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	N/A	15	13
	1	2	2				
				Teacher Qualifications:			
Ethnicity and Gender: % of Enrollment				(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100.0	100.0	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.4	0.6	0.7	Percent more than two years teaching in this school	67.6	71.6	83.3
Black or African American	28.4	28.0	26.7	Percent more than five years teaching anywhere	56.9	63.3	69.4
Hispanic or Latino	45.0	45.4	45.4				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	10.6	10.3	10.3	Percent Masters Degree or higher	91.0	89.0	94.0
White	15.6	15.7	14.9	Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	78.9	67.5	83.0
Multi-racial							
Male	52.9	52.2	54.2				
Female	47.1	47.8	45.8				

2009-10 TITLE I STATUS

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

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

SURR School: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:
Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2009-10 Based on 2008-09 Performance):	
<input type="checkbox"/>	In Good Standing (IGS)
<input type="checkbox"/>	School in Need of Improvement (SINI)Improvement - Year 1
<input type="checkbox"/>	School in Need of Improvement (SINI)Improvement - Year 2
<input type="checkbox"/>	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) - Year 1
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) - Year 2/Planning for Restructuring (PFR)
<input type="checkbox"/>	NCLB Restructuring - Year ____
<input type="checkbox"/>	School Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP) - Year ____

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

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

Student Groups	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
	ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad. Rate
All Students	√	√	√			
Ethnicity						
American Indian or Alaska Native	-	-	-			
Black or African American	√	√	√			
Hispanic or Latino	√	√	√			
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	√	√	-			
White	√	√	√			
Other Groups						
Students with Disabilities	X	√	√			
Limited English Proficient	√	√	√			
Economically Disadvantaged	√	√	√			
Student groups making AYP in each subject	7	8	7	0	0	0

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results - 2008-09		Quality Review Results - 2008-09	
Overall Letter Grade	A	Overall Evaluation:	√
Overall Score	76.3	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	√
School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)	5.0	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	√
School Performance (Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)	17.1	Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	√
Student Progress (Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)	43.7	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	√
Additional Credit	10.5	Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	√
<i>Note: Progress Report grades are not yet available for District 75 schools.</i>			

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

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

An overall analysis of student performance data reveals the relative strengths and weaknesses of our school, as well as the unique challenges we face in a Pre-K-8 setting. Identified barriers to the school's improvement include the following:

- overcrowding
- a large ELL population
- space limitations
- large IEP population
- diverse levels of ability

We have aligned our goals to help us move forward despite these challenges. We have also identified trends where they exist. Our student attendance rate has declined slightly over the past several years. In part, this can be attributed to an increasing number of students living in homeless shelters and unstable homes. We also have students who leave school to return to their homeland countries in the middle of the school year. We will be addressing our attendance concerns with a new attendance initiative.

Having a Pre-K -8 population presents the challenge of providing instructional facilities and initiatives which will meet the diverse demands of the school. Additionally, overcrowding, particularly in the middle school, continues to be an achievement barrier. This overcrowding is a result of new student enrollment from neighboring Pre-K-8 schools, as well as transfers from traditional middle schools. Because of space limitations, we need to find creative ways to enhance and improve existing facilities. In addition, we must increase ways to take advantage of cultural and academic offerings beyond our school walls. Within our school, we will continue to increase opportunities for our higher achieving students through Advanced Placement High School classes.

An analysis of our English Language Arts data serves as a good tool to monitor progress in English Language Arts, as well as all content areas impacted by literacy. Among all tested students our analysis indicates that between the years 2007 to 2009, there has been a steady decline in level 1 students and a substantial increase in level 3 and 4 students in every grade with the exception of grade three. This trend is particularly evident among our English Language Learner population,

regardless of grade level. In fact, there were no ELL students in grades 5-8 who scored in level 1 on the 2009 NYS ELA assessment. In addition, although there remain a significant percentage of IEP students who need to be moved into level 3 and 4, there was a 19.8% decline in the number of IEP students who scored in level 1 between 2007 and 2009. An area of concern this year is the 9% increase of grade 3 IEP students scoring level 1. In analyzing our student population based on student groups, no consistent performance trend was evident. However, it is apparent that the racial and ethnic achievement gap separating Black and Hispanic students from their white peers is narrowing in most grades.

An analysis based on gender indicated that females outperformed males in grades 3,4,6,7 and 8, while in grade 5 male performance exceeded female by 9 percent.

Although our gains between 2007 and 2009 have been substantial, we need to improve our efforts in moving students out of levels 1 and 2 and into levels that indicate they have met grade level expectations. Currently, between 32% and 50% of our grade 3-5 students have not met English Language Arts learning standards. In grades 6-8, between 30% and 41% of our middle school students remain at levels 1 or 2. This has impacted in other content areas as demonstrated by the New York State grade 4 and 8 Science Assessments and the grade 5 and 8 Social Studies State Assessment. In 2008-2009, 29% of our grade 4 and 57% of our grade 8 students scored a level 1 or 2 on the State Science Examination. Similarly, 23% of our grade 5 students and 70% of our grade 8 students scored a level 1 or 2 on the respective State Social Studies Exams. Clearly, we need to focus on improving nonfiction reading skills in order to meet our goals.

Over the past several years, we have successfully implemented courses and activities designed to meet the needs of our higher achieving students. However, we need to provide more challenging targets for these students, as demonstrated by the low percentage of students scoring at level 4 throughout the grades. Currently only 16 students across all grades were able to achieve a level 4 on the 2009 NYS ELA assessment.

The following data represents an analysis of progress in English Language Arts:

	Level	2009	2008	2007
All Tested Students	1	3%	4.6%	8.0%
	3/4	64%	51.7%	42.8%
ELL Students	1	4.3%	5.8%	16.9%
	3/4	51.4%	42.9%	24.7%
IEP Students	1	11.8%	21.6%	31.6%
	3/4	25.4%	13.1%	9.8%
General Ed. Students	1	1.3%	1.0%	4.0%
	3/4	73.3%	59.8%	48.3%

Among all tested students results indicate:

- In 2009, 3% of our 3-8 students scored a level 1, as compared to 4.6% and 8% respectively in 2008 and 2007.
- In 2009, 64% of our 3-8 students were able to achieve a level 3 or 4, as compared to 51.7% in 2008 and 42.8% in 2007.
- In 2009, 15.3% of our third graders scored a level 1, as compared to 6.8% in 2008 and 11.3% in 2007.
- 50% of third graders scored level 3 or 4 in 2009, as compared to 62.4% in 2008 and 50.4% in 2007.
- 4.4% of grade four students remained in level 1 in 2009, as compared to 8.8% in 2008 and 12.6% in 2007.
- 64.6% of our grade four students achieved a level 3 or 4 in 2009, as compared to 54% in 2008 and 46.7% in 2007.

- In 2009, 2.5% of our grade 5 students scored a level 1 as compared to 2.8% in 2008 and 4.3% in 2007.
- In 2009, 67.2% of our grade 5 students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 59.3% in 2008 and 52.2% in 2007.
- 0% of our grade 6 students scored a level 1 in 2009, as compared to 1.2% in 2008 and 4.1% in 2007.
- 71.7% of grade 6 students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 44.2% in 2008 and 40% in 2007.
- In 2009, 0% of our grade 7 students scored level 1, as compared to 0% in 2008 and 8.1% in 2007.
- In 2009, 67.9% of our grade 7 students scored a level 3 or 4, while 58.8% did so in 2008 and 40.3% in 2007.
- In 2009, 1.3% of our grade 8 students achieved a level 1, as compared to 7.5% in 2008 and 8.7% in 2007.
- 58.9% of our grade 8 students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2009, as compared to 39.7% in 2008 and 32.4% in 2007.

Among English Language Learners the data indicates the following:

- School wide, 4.3% of our ELL students scored a level 1 in 2009, as compared to 5.8% in 2008 and 16.9% in 2007
- School wide, 51.4% of our ELL students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2009, as compared to 42.9% in 2008 and 24.7% in 2007.
- In 2009, 11.8% of our grade 3 ELL students scored a level 1, as compared to 14.3% in 2008 and 15.6% in 2007.
- 61.8% of our ELL students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2009, as compared to 50% in 2008 and 46.9% in 2007.
- In grade 4, 8.7% of our students scored a level 1 in 2009, as compared to 6.7% in 2008.
- In 2009, 52.2% of our grade 4 students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 46.7% in 2008.
- In 2009, 0% of our grade 5 students scored a level 1, as compared to 0% and 5% in 2008 and 2007, respectively.
- In 2009, 65% of our students scored a level 3 or 4, while only 46.4% did so in 2008 and 26.1% in 2007.
- 0% of our grade 6 ELL students scored a level 1 in 2009, while 3.4% did so in 2008 and 8.7% in 2007.
- 43.3% of our grade 6 students scored level 3 or 4 in 2009, as compared to 34.5% in 2008 and 21.7% in 2007.
- In grade 7, 0% of our students scored a level 1 in 2009, as compared to 0% in 2008 and 17.2% in 2006.
- In 2009, 57.1% of our grade 7 ELL students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 59.1% in 2008 and 3.4% in 2007.
- In 2009, 0% of our grade 8 ELL students scored a level 1, as compared to 11.8% in 2008 and 20.8% in 2007.
- 8.3% of our grade 8 ELL students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 11.8% in 2008 and 4.2% in 2007.

The Data for our IEP students indicates the following:

- School wide in 2009, 11.8% of our IEP students scored a level 1, as compared to 21% in 2008 and 31.6% in 2007.
- School wide in 2009, 25.4% of our IEP students scored a level 3 or 4 ,as compared to 12.6% in 2008 and 9.8% in 2007.

- In 2009, 41.9% of our grade 3 students scored a level 1, as compared to 33.3% in 2008 and 47.1% in 2007.
- 19.4% of our grade 3 students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2009, as compared to 19% in 2008 and 0% in 2007.
- 13.3% of our grade 4 students scored a level 1 in 2009, as compared to 33.3% in 2008 and 48% in 2007.
- In 2009, 0% of our grade 4 students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 11.1% in 2008 and 20% in 2007.
- 13% of our grade 5 students scored a level 1 in 2009, as compared to 13.3% in 2008 and 0% in 2007.
- 21.7% of our grade 5 students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2009 while 20% did so in 2008 and 16.7% in 2007.
- In 2009, 0% of our grade 6 students scored a level 1, as compared to 0% in 2008 and 21.7% in 2007.
- In 2009, 35.6% of our grade 6 students scored a level 3 or 4 while 7.7% did so in 2008 and 8.7% in 2007.
- 0% of our grade 7 students scored a level 1 in 2009, as compared to 0% in 2008 and 31.3% in 2007.
- 37.1% of our grade 7 students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2009, as compared to 10% in 2008 and 9.4% in 2007.
- In 2009, 15% of our grade 8 students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 7.1% in 2008 and 4.2% in 2007.

Our General Education Students performed as follows:

- Schoolwide, 1.3% of our students scored a level 1 in 2009, as compared to 1.0% in 2008 and 4.0% in 2007.
- Schoolwide, 73.3% of our students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 59.9% in 2008 and 48.3% in 2007.
- In 2009, 6.5% of our grade 3 students scored in level 1 as compared to 1% in 2008 and 5.1% in 2007.
- In 2009, 60.2% of our grade 3 students scored in level 3 or 4, as compared to 71.9% in 2008 and 59.2% in 2007.
- 3.1% of our grade 4 students scored a level 1 in 2009, as compared to 4.2% in 2008 and 4.5% in 2007.
- 74.5% of our grade 4 students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2009, as compared to 62.1% in 2008 and 52.7% in 2007.
- In 2009, 0% of our grade 5 students scored a level 1, as compared to 0% in 2008 and 4.8% in 2007.
- In 2009, 77.8% of our grade 5 students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 70% in 2008, and 55.6% in 2007.
- 0% of our grade 6 students scored a level 1 in 2009, as compared to 1.5% in 2008 and 1.4% IN 2007.
- 83.7% of our grade 6 studnets scored a level 3 or 4 in 2009, as compared to 51.1% in 2008 and 44.9% in 2007.
- In 2009, 0% of our grade 7 students scored a level 1, as compared to 0% in 2008, and 3.2% in 2007.
- In 2009, 76.4% of our grade 7 students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 65.7% in 2008 and 46.8% in 2007.
- 0% of our grade 8 students scored level 1 in 2009, as compared to 0% in 2008 and 5.4% in 2007.
- 65.2% of our grade 8 students scored a lvel 3 or4 in 2009, as compared to 45.9% in 2008 and 36.9% in 2007.

An analysis of mathematics data between the years 2007 and 2009, reveals a schoolwide decline of approximately 50% in level one students. Additionally, there was a steady increase in the percentage of students meeting or exceeding grade level expectations with a 14.7% increase in the percent of students scoring in level 3/4 on the NYS mathematics assessment. Approximately, 75% of our students throughout the grades, with the exception of grade 8, scored in level 3/4. Although grade 8 students did not fit in this category, they did enjoy an 11.7% improvement in level 3/4 performance. Among our sub-group populations our ELL students demonstrated improvement in all grades. Students performing in levels 3/4 increased from 76.1% in 2008, to 81.1% in 2009. Among our IEP population there was a 19.8% decline in level 1 performance schoolwide, and a 15.6% increase in level 3/4 students. An analysis of group performance based on racial and ethnic criteria reveals no consistent trend. Although we were able to improve our performance by reducing our level 1 population by 50% between 2007 and 2009, there still remain a number of students, particularly in grades 4, 6, and 8 who need to be moved into a higher performance level. It appears that our grade 4 and 6 students are experiencing the most difficulty meeting grade level standards in mathematics. 4.5% of our grade 4 students, 4.3% of our grade 6 students and 3.7% of our grade 8 students are currently performing at level 1.

An analysis of our Mathematics performance is as follows :

	Level	2009	2008	2007
All Tested	1	2.8%	6.4%	8.1%
Students	3/4	79.7%	71.8%	65%_
ELL	1	3.8%	4.4%	10%
Students	3/4	81.1%	76.1%	63.3%_
IEP	1	12.5%	22.4%	8.8%
Students	3/4	55%	40.4%	33.1%_
General Ed.	1	1.4%	3%	4.5%
Students	3/4	87.6%	78.5%	0.7%_

Among all tested students results indicate:

- In 2009, 2.8% of all tested students scored level 1 as compared to 6.4% in 2008 and 8.1% in 2007. This represents a 3.6% decline.
- In 2009, 79.7% of our 3-8 students were able to achieve a level 3 or 4, as compared to 71.8% in 2008 and 65% in 2007.
- In 2009, 1.5% of our third graders scored a level 1, as compared to 1.7% in 2008 and 5.0% in 2007.
- 86.3% of our third graders scored levels 3 /4 in 2009, as compared to 85.3% in 2008 and 83.2% in 2007.
- 4.5% of grade 4 students remained in level 1 in 2009, as compared to 9.6% in 2008 and 5.3% in 2007.
- 80.4% of our grade 4 students achieved a level 3 or 4 in 2009, as compared to 71.9% in 2008 and 67.7% in 2007.
- In 2009, 2.4% of our grade 5 students scored a level 1, as compared to 3.5% in 2008 and 7.1% in 2007.
- In 2009, 86.4% of our grade 5 students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 76.2% in 2008 and 63.6% in 2007.
- 4.3% of our grade 6 students scored a level 1 in 2009, as compared to 2.5% in 2008 and 7.1% in 2007.
- 75.3% of our grade 6 students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 72.5% in 2008 and 68% in 2007.
- In 2009, 0.6% of our grade 7 students scored level 1, as compared to 4.3% in 2008 and 10.3% in 2007.
- In 2009, 83.8% of grade 7 students scored level 3 or 4, while 75.8% did so in 2008 and 62.7% in 2007.

- In 2009, 3.7% of grade 8 students achieved a level 1, as compared to 13.4% in 2008 and 12% in 2007.
- 69.8% of our grade 8 students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2009, as compared to 58.1% in 2008 and 51.4% in 2007.

Our English Language Learners performed as follows:

- School wide, 3.8% of our ELL students scored level 1 in 2009, as compared to 4.4% in 2008 and 10% in 2007.
- School wide, 81.1% of our ELL students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2009, as compared to 76.1% in 2008 and 63.4% in 2007.
- In 2009, 0% of our grade 3 ELL students scored a level 1, as compared to 3.7% in 2008 and 5.6% in 2007.
- 92.3% of grade 3 ELL students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2009, as compared to 77.8% in 2008 and 83.4% in 2007.
- In grade 4, 4.3% of students scored a level 1 in 2009, as compared to 6.7% in 2008, and 5.7% in 2007.
- In 2009, 78.3% of students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 76.7% in 2008 and 77.2% in 2007.
- In 2009, 0% of our grade 5 students scored a level 1, as compared to 3.3% in 2008 and 4% in 2007.
- In 2009, 95.2% of students scored a level 3 or 4, while only 83.4% did so in 2008 and 64% in 2007.
- 11.8% of our grade 6 ELL students scored a level 1 in 2009, while 3.4% did so in 2008 and 8.7% in 2007.
- 67.6% of our grade 6 ELL students scored level 3 or 4 in 2009, as compared to 69% in 2008 and 60.9% in 2007.
- In grade 7, 0% of our students scored level 1 in 2009, as compared to 0% in 2008 and 16.1% in 2007.
- In 2009, 77.8% of our grade 7 ELL students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to only 78.2% in 2008 and 51.6% in 2007.
- In 2009, 16.7% of our grade 8 ELL students scored level 1, as compared to 10% in 2008 and 20% in 2007.
- 73.3% of our grade 8 ELL students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2009, as compared to 70% in 2008 and 36.6% in 2007.

IEP Student results indicate:

- School wide in 2009, 9.9% of our IEP students scored a level 1, as compared to 22.1% in 2008 and 28.8% in 2007.
- School wide in 2009, 55.2% of IEP students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 40.7% in 2008 and 33.1% in 2007.
- In 2009, 6.5% of our grade 3 students scored a level 1, as compared to 10% in 2008 and 26.3% in 2007.
- In 2009, 64.5% of our grade 3 IEP students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 40% in 2008 and 52.6% in 2007. This represents a decline in this category.
- In 2009, 21.4% of our grade 4 students scored level 1, as compared to 38.9% in 2008 and 10.3% in 2007.
- In 2009, 50% of our grade 4 IEP students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 22.3% in 2008 and 48.3% in 2007.
- 12.5% of our grade 5 IEP students scored a level 1, as compared to 9.7% and 8.3% in 2008 and 2007, respectively.
- 50% of grade 5 students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2009, as compared to 61.3% and 41.7% in 2008 and 2007, respectively.
- In 2009, 10.4% of our grade 6 IEP students scored a level 1, as compared to 3.6% in 2008 and 37.8% in 2007.

- In 2009, 47.9% of our IEP students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 60.7% in 2008 and 26% in 2007.
- In 2009, 0% of our grade 7 IEP students scored a level 1, as compared to 30% in 2008 and 37.5% in 2007.
- In 2009, 75% of our grade 7 IEP students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 20% in 2008 and 21.9% in 2007.
- 21.1% of our grade 8 students scored a level 1 in 2009, as compared to 46.4% in 2008 and 45.8% in 2007.
- 31.6% of our grade 8 students scored a level 3 or 4 in 2009, as compared to 25% in 2008 and 16.7% in 2007.

General Education data is as follows:

- School wide, 1.1% of our General Education students scored a level 1 in 2009, as compared to 42.9% in 2008 and 4.5% in 2007.
- School wide, 85.6% of our students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 78.7% in 2008 and 70.7% in 2007.
- In grade 3, 0% of the students scored level 1 in 2009, as compared to 0% in 2008 and 1.0% in 2007.
- In 2009, 93% of students scored a level 3 or 4, as compared to 94.8% in 2008 and 89% in 2007.
- 42.0% of our grade 4 students scored level 1 in 2009, as compared to 4.2% in 2008 and 3.8% in 2007.
- 84.7% of our grade 4 students scored level 3 or 4 in 2009, as compared to 81.2% in 2008 and 73% in 2007.
- In 2009, 0% of our grade 5 students scored level 1, as compared to 1.8% in 2008 and 7% in 2007.
- In 2009, 95.1% of students scored level 3 or 4, as compared to 80.4% in 2008 and 65.7% in 2007.
- 2.2% of our grade 6 students scored a level 1 in 2009, as compared to 2.3% in 2008 and 2.7% in 2007.
- 84.8% of our grade 6 students scored level 3 or 4 in 2009, as compared to 75% in 2008 and 74.6% in 2007.
- In 2009, 0.8% of our grade 7 students scored level 1, as compared to 0.7% in 2008 and 4.6% in 2007.
- 86.3% of our grade 7 students scored level 3 or 4 in 2009, as compared to 83.7% in 2008 and 71.3% in 2007.
- 1.4% of our grade 8 students scored a level 1 in 2009, as compared to 7.3% in 2008 and 6.6% in 2007.
- 74.8% of our grade 8 students scored 3 or 4 in 2009, as compared to 64.2% in 2008 and 56.9% in 2007.
-

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

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

Annual Goal	Short Description
1. To provide instruction resulting in a 3-5% increase in the number of students achieving 1 year or more progress in English Language Arts, as demonstrated on the New York State Language Arts 2010 Assessment, Grades 3-8.	Although our students are making adequate progress in English Language Arts, our performance remained below our expectations. We will be using various strategies and models to differentiate instruction and improve performance.
2. To provide instruction resulting in a 3-5% increase in the number of students achieving one year or more progress in mathematics, as demonstrated on the New York State Mathematics 2010 Assessment, Grades 3-8.	Although our students performed comparably to Peer and City Horizon groups in mathematics, there still remain students who need to move into higher performance levels.
3. To provide appropriate instruction and opportunities for "hands-on" explorations in Science resulting in a 3-5% increase in the number of students scoring levels 3 and 4 as demonstrated by the New York State Science Assessment, Grades 4 and 8.	We will be providing instructional strategies to improve students' ability to interpret nonfiction text (Science and Social Studies) as well as providing students opportunities for "hands on" explorations in Science in our new Science lab and mobile unit.
4. To provide instructional strategies focused on developing and improving students' ability to interpret and evaluate informational text. This will result in a 3-5% increase in the number of students meeting grade level expectations, as measured by the New York State Social Studies Assessment, Grades 5 and 8.	We will be providing instructional strategies to improve students' ability to analyze and interpret nonfiction text (Science and Social Studies).
5. To continue to offer and implement a variety of advanced curriculum courses such as Regents Algebra, Living Environment Science, and Spanish Proficiency Exam classes which will result in at least 90% of the students passing the assessments as measured by the June, 2010 NYS Regents	To insure that our high achieving students are receiving appropriate instruction, we are offering high school courses in Integrated Algebra, Environmental Science, and advanced placement based on a Spanish Proficiency assessment. The P.S. 89 Truman Collaborative program is being offered to select students who will be able to earn high school credits while in grade seven. Our Project Boost program targets qualified upper elementary and middle school students who have demonstrated academic talent and come from disadvantaged backgrounds. This program also provides students with academic assistance and cultural enrichment, as well as community service opportunities.

6. To improve student attendance by continuing to implement strategies which will result in a 92% rate of attendance.

We have identified attendance as one of our goals because over the past three years the attendance rate has remained flat at 90% as reflected in the school profile data. When compared to the City Horizon, we fall below expectations.

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

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

**Subject Area
(where relevant) :**

English Language Arts

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>1. To provide instruction resulting in a 3-5% increase in the number of students achieving 1 year or more progress in English Language Arts, as demonstrated on the New York State Language Arts 2010 Assessment, Grades 3-8.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>Actions, Strategies and Activities</p> <p>To continue to provide the foundation for future learning by maintaining a successful Early Childhood program</p> <p>To further develop teacher effectiveness in all components of a comprehensive literacy model, K-8</p> <p>To continue to implement a curriculum map on each grade level focusing on teaching and providing coherence and consistency across the grades.</p> <p>Continue using leveled books for guided and independent reading as a tool for differentiating instruction.</p> <p>Continue to mandate a 90-120 minute literacy block, the use of active word walls to encompass all content areas, independent reading time, and daily read-aloud reading experiences during the instructional day</p> <p>To increase the amount of time students spend engaged in independent reading during the school day and across all grades.</p> <p>To stimulate enthusiasm for reading through book talks, literature circles and book clubs</p> <p>To increase the use of the collaborative team teaching</p>

	<p>model, where appropriate, as a placement for our Special Education students, funding permitting.</p> <p>To provide comprehensive, systematic instruction in word study for all students through the ongoing use of Words Their Way program in K-2.</p> <p>Provide Extended Day instructional opportunities for at risk students through the 37.5 minute block in the morning and the SES programs in the afternoon. (READ, Bell, Learn It, Brainfuse and IEP)</p> <p>To provide additional support for our ELL students through an on-going after school academy, funding permitting.</p> <p>To use ECLAS 2 to monitor student growth,K-3.</p> <p>Using Predictive, Acuity, DRA and Wrap assessments to gather relevant data to be used as a diagnostic tool to differentiate and inform instruction.</p> <p>Administration of practice tests to simulate testing conditions</p> <p>To focus on teaching strategies for reading, interpreting and evaluating nonfiction text during the literacy block in order to improve reading across the content areas.</p> <p>Continue to provide professional development opportunities to further an understanding of effective comprehensive literacy practices, supported by literacy consultants and inter-visitations to model classrooms.</p> <p>Continue to work with Literacy Support Services Consultants in grades PreK, Grade 2 and Special Ed to turnkey effective strategies and practices of differentiated instruction, budget permitting.</p> <p>Expand the use of writers notebook and literature response journals</p> <p>Train teachers in the interpretation of test data and the implications for instruction.</p> <p>Provide teachers with training in teaching literacy skills through all content areas, particularly as they impact on instruction in Social Studies and Science.</p> <p>To implement new Language Arts Intervention programs in</p>
--	---

	<p>grades 1-8 to help IEP students move to meeting grade level expectations (Macmillan Triumphs 1-5, AMP 6-8)</p> <p>Professional development utilizing the new programs</p> <p>LEAP-Grades 3,4,5- Literacy Through the Arts</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</p> <p><i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Title 1 money is spent on two in-house staff developers</p> <p>Professional Development- Reading Readiness and LEAP- Title 1 Schoolwide Programs, Tax Levy, Children First</p> <p>Literacy Support Services- Title 1 Schoolwide Programs</p> <p>Extended Day- Title 1 Schoolwide Programs</p> <p>Tax Levy funds, NYSTL funds-books and materials</p> <p>Extended Day- Title III funds</p> <p>Saturday Academy, materials- Title III funds</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</p> <p><i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Intervals of Periodic Review:</p> <p>Sept/Oct. Lab-R K-8 ECLAS2 Grades 1-3 DRA/Orbit Wrap Assessment Grades 4-8</p> <p>November ELA ITA 1 Grades 3-8 NYS Social Studies Grade 5</p> <p>January ECLAS 2 Grade K E-PAL- Grades 2,3 ELA Predictive Assessment Grades 3-8 ELA ITA 2 Grades 3-8 NYS ELA Simulation Grades 3-8</p> <p>April NYS ELA Grades 3-8</p> <p>April/May ECLAS 2 Grades 1-3 NYSESLAT K-8</p> <p>May/June NYS Science Performance and Written Grades 4 and 8</p>

	<p>DRA / Orbit Wrap Assessment Grades 4-8</p> <p>June NYS Social Studies Assessment Grade 8</p> <p>Instruments of Measure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acuity Assessments 2. On-going teacher designed assessments and activities 3. Student portfolios with representative reading/writing pieces 4. Qualitative assessments including observation, conferencing/checklists 5. NYS ELA assessment, grades, 3-8 6. NYS Social Studies Test, grades 5 and 8 7. NYS Science Test, grades 4 and 8 <p>Projected Gains:</p> <p>Student achievement on the standardized ELA tests, grades 3-8, will demonstrate a 3-5% increase from level 1 to level 2, and a 2-4% increase from level 2 to level 3, when compared to the previous academic year.</p> <p>There will be a 3-5% increase in the number of students scoring at or above grade level expectations on the NYS Social Studies and Science assessments, grades 5 and 8, and 4 and 8, respectively.</p> <p>Students will demonstrate an increased interest in reading and skills necessary for utilizing the renovated school library.</p> <p>Research and exit projects will be of a higher quality.</p>
--	---

**Subject Area
(where relevant) :**

Mathematics

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>2. To provide instruction resulting in a 3-5% increase in the number of students achieving one year or more progress in mathematics, as demonstrated on the New York State Mathematics 2010 Assessment, Grades 3-8.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>Target populations include 3-8 students, including general education, IEP student and ELL students. Actions, Strategies and Activities</p> <p>Incorporate a multi-sensory approach to address the various learning styles and developmental stages of our early childhood learners.</p>

	<p>Expand thematic units in PreK-2 to include a mathematics component.</p> <p>Use of calendars to reinforce concepts such as before and after, more and less, measurement, sequencing, and number concepts.</p> <p>Provide activities that reinforce mathematical facts, processes and concepts.</p> <p>Hands-on activities such as math games embedded in the Everyday Math program.</p> <p>Greater alignment of enrichment teacher instruction to the needs of students as determined through articulation with classroom teachers.</p> <p>Embed mathematical concepts into instructional centers in K-2 classrooms focusing on skip-counting, recognizing and representing patterns and sequences.</p> <p>Extended Day programs for targeted at risk students. Encourage enrollment for after school programs for those students who are in need of extra instructional time.</p> <p>Connect Math and Writing through the use of Math Journals across the grades.</p> <p>Continuing analysis of test data to be used to identify areas of need and inform instruction.</p> <p>Train teachers in the interpretation of test data (i.e. Baseline assessment, Acuity ITAs and Predictives, Chapter/Unit Tests) and the implications for instruction.</p> <p>Ongoing staff development to share effective practices as they relate to the Everyday Math and Impact Math programs.</p> <p>Provide instructional math blocks to allow sufficient time on task for students to become actively involved in their instruction.</p> <p>Further integrate technology into math instruction through the use of computer software, Smart Boards, Graphing and Scientific calculators.</p> <p>Utilize software embedded in the Impact Math program to reinforce skills and provide an interactive opportunity for</p>
--	---

	<p>students.</p> <p>Adapt the Everyday Math program to the needs of our IEP and ELL students.</p> <p>Provide SRA program as an additional tool to address the specific needs of our IEP students in self-contained classrooms, budget permitting.</p> <p>Provide math specialists to teach curriculum and differentiate instruction.</p> <p>Provide advanced work for level 3 and 4 students.</p> <p>Establish a peer tutoring network to assist students.</p> <p>Administration of practice tests to simulate testing conditions.</p> <p>Continue to provide a Saturday Academy for students scoring in levels 1 and 2, budget permitting.</p> <p>Establish new inclusion classes on various grade levels, budget permitting.</p> <p>Differentiate instruction based on the specific educational needs of our ELL population.</p> <p>Continue to provide and expand our Integrated Algebra program for our level 3 and 4 students in grade 8.</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Title 1 money is spent on one in-house staff developer</p> <p>Extended Day- Title 1 Schoolwide Programs</p> <p>Tax Levy funds, NYSTL funds-books and materials</p> <p>Extended Day- Title III funds</p> <p>Saturday Academy, materials- Title III funds</p> <p>Professional Development- Title 1 Schoolwide Programs</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Intervals of Periodic Review:</p> <p>Sept/June</p> <p>Ongoing Everyday Math Unit assessments, Impact Math</p> <p>Chapter tests</p>

	<p>November Grades 3-8 Math ITA1</p> <p>January Grades 3-8 Math Predictive Assessments</p> <p>March Grades 3-8 ITA 2</p> <p>April NYS Simulation Grades 3-8</p> <p>May NYS Math Assessment Grades 3-8</p> <p>June NYS Algebra Regents</p> <p>Instruments of Measure: Acuity Assessments Ongoing chapter and unit tests Student portfolios with representative math work, including tasks Qualitative Assessments including observations, conferencing/checklists NYS Mathematics Assessments Grades 3-8 NYS Integrated Algebra Regents</p> <p>Projected Gains: Student achievement on the standardized Mathematics assessment, Grades 3-8 will demonstrate a 3-5% increase from level 1 to level 2, and a 2-4% increase from level 2 to level 3 when compared to the previous academic year. 85% of those students taking the Integrated Algebra Regents will achieve a passing grade. Greater student interest will result in placing a greater number of students in the accelerated math program.</p>
--	--

Subject Area
(where relevant) :

Science

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>3. To provide appropriate instruction and opportunities for "hands-on" explorations in Science resulting in a 3-5% increase in the number of students scoring levels 3 and 4 as demonstrated by the New York State Science Assessment, Grades 4 and 8.</p>
---	---

<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>Science</p> <p>To utilize the added technology of the new science lab and mobile science station in support of academic success.</p> <p>Provide “state of the art” equipment to support explorations in the lab.</p> <p>Provide opportunities for the “scientific method” to become alive</p> <p>Expand the science program to allow students to participate in ongoing laboratory experiments Plan a schedule that will provide maximum utilization of the lab throughout the school day.</p> <p>Inclusion of a mobile science lab, promised by outside political funding sources, to creatively address our building space limitations so that many more students benefit from upgraded science technology.</p> <p>Provide non fiction science libraries to support instruction.</p> <p>Provide professional development for teachers on fully utilizing the new facility</p>
<p>Aligning Resources:Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>A local congressman has promised funding for a mobile science laboratory.</p> <p>NYSTL money for books and materials</p> <p>Extended Day Program- Title I funds</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Intervals of periodic review/ Instruments of Measure:</p> <p>New York State Science and Written and Performance assessment, grades 4 and 8Unit and Chapter tests in Science</p> <p>Teacher observation of student proficiency in Science Lab Review of student science journals</p> <p>Greater interest in participating in the advanced Regents program</p> <p>Projected Gains:</p> <p>There will be a 3-5% increase in the number of students</p>

	<p>scoring level 3 and 4 on the written section of the NYS Science Assessment in Grades 4 and 8</p> <p>Students will become more proficient with hands on explorations as measured by the performance section of the NYS Science Assessment Grades 4 and 8.</p> <p>Lab notebooks will demonstrate a greater understanding of the scientific method</p> <p>Students will become more cognizant of science in the world around them.</p>
--	--

Subject Area
(where relevant) :

Social Studies

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>4. To provide instructional strategies focused on developing and improving students' ability to interpret and evaluate informational text. This will result in a 3-5% increase in the number of students meeting grade level expectations, as measured by the New York State Social Studies Assessment, Grades 5 and 8.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>Target populations include 3-8 students, including general education, IEP student and ELL students. Actions, Strategies and Activities Focus on teaching critical thinking strategies for reading, interpreting and evaluating nonfiction text during the literacy block, as well as during Social Studies classes.</p> <p>Implementation of the current New York City Social Studies curriculum and texts.</p> <p>Professional development to familiarize teachers with appropriate strategies and instructional practices in implementing the Social Studies curriculum.</p> <p>Provide hardware and appropriate software in our new Library/Media Center to assist students in research and “exit projects”.</p> <p>Vertical spiraling of Social Studies content to reinforce themes and concepts.</p> <p>Professional development to familiarize teachers in grades 4-7 on how to spiral content across the grades.</p> <p>Incorporate non-traditional learning experiences such as trips, debates, school elections, role playing and special</p>

	<p>assemblies dedicated to historical figures and events.</p> <p>Utilize current maps to integrate geography into Social Studies and Current Events.</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Professional Development on Literacy in Social Studies- Literacy coach- Title I Schoolwide Programs</p> <p>Tax Levy funds, NYSTL funds-books and materials</p> <p>Saturday Academy, materials- Title III funds</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Intervals of periodic review/Instruments of Measure:</p> <p>New York State Social Studies assessment grade 5, November, 2009.</p> <p>New York State Social Studies assessment, grade 8, June, 2010.</p> <p>Chapter assessments</p> <p>Exit Projects</p> <p>Research Reports</p> <p>Utilization of Library/Media Center</p> <p>Classroom participation</p> <p>Projected Gains:</p> <p>A 3-5% increase in the number of students meeting grade level expectations, as measured by the New York State Social Studies assessment, grades 5 and 8.</p> <p>Students will produce high quality Social Studies reports and exit projects in a timely manner.</p> <p>Students will demonstrate greater interest and achieve higher grades in Social Studies.</p>

Subject Area
(where relevant) :

Enrichment

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART –</i></p>	<p>5. To continue to offer and implement a variety of advanced curriculum courses such as Regents Algebra,</p>
---	--

<p><i>Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>Living Environment Science, and Spanish Proficiency Exam classes which will result in at least 90% of the students passing the assessments as measured by the June, 2010 NYS Regents</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>High School Integrated Algebra course offered for those students who have demonstrated a high level of achievement in mathematics on NYS assessments, as well as by qualitative teacher assessment.</p> <p>A study of The Living Environment Science course leading to a High School Regents Examination for those students who have demonstrated achievement and a high level of interest in science. The expansion and renovations of the science lab will support this instruction.</p> <p>The Spanish Proficiency Examination will give selected students the opportunity to gain Advanced Placement credits for high school.</p> <p>A P.S. 89 Truman Collaborative Program is being offered to select students who will earn high school credits while in grade 7. Learning experiences “beyond school walls” play an integral part of this program.</p> <p>Project Boost targets upper elementary and middle school students who have demonstrated academic talents and come from disadvantaged backgrounds. It provides academic assistance and cultural enrichment, as well as community service opportunities, funding permitting.</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>Funding of the P.S. 89-Truman HS Collaborative Program is to shared by Truman High School and P.S 89 . Project Boost costs will be shouldered by our PSO – CEI-PEA</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Intervals of Review/ Instruments of Measure</p> <p>Monitoring of class work, as well as unit/chapter assessments to ensure ongoing progress.</p> <p>Ongoing qualitative assessment by teachers including conferencing, observations, portfolios and projects.</p> <p>Progress Reports</p> <p>Report Cards</p>

	<p>Results of Acuity assessments</p> <p>Project Boost students' progress will be measured by NYS assessments in ELA and Math.</p> <p>Tutorials to assist those students having difficulty.</p> <p>Projected Gains:</p> <p>90% of our level 3 and 4 students will pass the Regents Examinations in Integrated Algebra.</p> <p>In our second year offering the Living Environment Science course, we project that 75% of qualified students will achieve a passing grade.</p> <p>98% of qualified students will achieve a passing score on the Spanish Proficiency Examination.</p>
--	---

**Subject Area
(where relevant) :**

Attendance

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>6. To improve student attendance by continuing to implement strategies which will result in a 92% rate of attendance.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>Implementation of the “SchoolMessenger” system to deliver automated, recorded messages to homes for daily attendance and lateness.</p> <p>“SchoolMessenger” communication in multiple languages to meet the needs of ESL students.</p> <p>Continue a system of incentives which will reward individual students, as well as classes for improving attendance.</p> <p>Positive reinforcement for good attendance through congratulatory phone calls.</p> <p>Computerized system to track and record all calls, including those that were undelivered.</p> <p>Letter initiatives to parents advising them of the importance of good attendance.</p>

	<p>Formation of an Attendance Team to monitor progress in achieving good attendance.</p> <p>Public acknowledgment of those students/classes who maintain good attendance.</p> <p>Attendance Consultant</p> <p>Attendance teacher to make home visits when necessary.</p> <p>Follow up of “no shows” and clearing them from attendance rolls by October 31st, as well as clearing additional discharges promptly throughout the school year.</p> <p>Individualized incentives for students who demonstrate a chronic pattern of absence.</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p>The attendance consultant costs are to be paid by P.S. 89’s PSO – CEI-PEA</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Monthly analysis of attendance patterns to identify patterns of absences.</p> <p>Monthly review of class attendance will show improvement. “No shows” will be cleared in a timely fashion from school registers to minimize the negative impact on attendance data.</p> <p>By June 2010, there will be at least a 1% increase in attendance, from 90.9% in the 2008-9 school year.</p>

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010

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

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

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

Grade	ELA	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	At-risk Services: Guidance Counselor	At-risk Services: School Psychologist	At-risk Services: Social Worker	At-risk Health-related Services
	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS				
K	52	52	N/A	N/A	12	7	3	
1	73	73	N/A	N/A	9	8	4	
2	80	80	N/A	N/A	10	8	3	
3	68	68	N/A	N/A	9	9	3	
4	61	61	47		11	6	4	
5	42	42		34	9	5	6	1
6	66	66			8	7	7	
7	55	55			7	8	3	2
8	66	66	42	35	17	8	3	
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

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

Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).
ELA:	37.5 minute AIS morning program – K – 8 –Wilson Foundations , Words Their Way grades 1-2, Quick Reads (3-6), Step Up to Reading 7-8, Flocabulary. Small group intervention during the 37.5 minute morning program (groups 1:10, special Ed 1:5) Bell Program, IEP Program, Learn-It, (K – 8) after school, Brainfuse, and Champions (at home).
Mathematics:	37.5 minute AIS morning program K-5 – Everyday Math strategies, Math Games, Math Steps, Versatiles. 37.5 minute AIS morning program 6-8-Impact Math Intervention strategies, Differentiated Instruction Handbook for Impact Math, Math Handbook: Hot Words, Hot Topics, and Number Worlds (special ed). Bell Program, IEP Program, Learn It – K-8- after school.
Science:	Grades 3,4,5 – Harcourt Science including: Skills and Strategies for ELL students Skills and Strategies for Reading Nonfiction text embedded in the program Grades 6, 7, 8- Glencoe Science Interactive student textbook focusing on strategies for reading nonfiction text: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Using charts and graphs ▪ Reading and writing across content areas ▪ Embedded assessment ▪ ELL strategies <p>Science Lab Assistant teacher to reduce teacher/student ratio in grade 8 Test Ready Plus-grades 4 and 8 After school/ Saturday</p>
Social Studies:	Strategies for reading non-fiction texts Smart Board for interactive learning experiences Social Studies modules reflecting non-fiction and historical fiction Test Ready Plus Grades 5 and 8 After school/ Saturday New York State Coach-Document Based Questions – grades 5 and 8 Buckle Down for Social Studies
At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:	Students are provided with workshops on “good touch”, anger management, making friends, peer mediation, behavior management, self-esteem, conflict resolution and social skills development. Counseling one to one with students aimed at improving attendance.

At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	Children will ask questions regarding various concerns/ directions for implementing therapy, such as play therapy in a small group.
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	Temporary one-to-one counseling and at risk services for students to be picked up by Bronx Lebanon Hospital.
At-risk Health-related Services:	Diabetic and asthma assistance. Vision and hearing screenings.

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.

Public School 89
980 Mace Avenue
Bronx, N.Y. 10469-4699

Ronald Rivera, Principal
(718) 553-0835
(718) 231-2863 fax

Linda O'Carroll
Assistant Principal

Caren Shapiro
Assistant Principal

Language Allocation Policy 2009-10

Goals and Program Description

Goals and Program Description

In recent years, Public School 89 has had a large influx of non-English speaking students. We have a student population of 1307 students, of whom 292 are identified as ELLs. This number reflects about 21% of the total school population. When an ELL student is admitted into our school, the ESL Coordinator reviews the Home Language Information Survey to determine eligibility, as per the new regulations. The Language Assessment Battery(Revised test and /or Spanish LAB) are administered and entitlement is determined. Parents or guardians are invited to attend a parent workshop in which a DVD explaining the program is shown. Pamphlets in parents' native languages are distributed further clarifying the programs that are available. Parents or guardians sign the requesting letters (LAP kit) and appropriate placement is made. In cases where Spanish is the dominant language, parents are given the option of placing their children in a Transitional Bilingual Spanish class offered through the Regional office or in an ESL class at P.S. 89. In cases where the home language is other than Spanish, self-contained ESL classes are offered at P.S. 89, K-8. Our ELL classes are organized as follows:

- Kindergarten- 2 classes with registers of approximately 25 each.
- Grade 1- 2 classes with registers of approximately 24.
- Grade 2- 2 classes with registers of approximately 20.
- Grade 3- 2 classes with approximately 17 students in each.
- Grade 4- 2 classes with approximately 22 students in each.
- Grade 5 – 2 classes with approximately 17 students in each.
- Grades 6-8- 1 class on each level with registers ranging between 24 and 28 students.

According to the New York State recommendations, our students may remain in ESL classes for three years. Once proficiency is achieved, students may remain for an additional 2 years as

transitional students. Students are then moved into monolingual classes the following year and may receive services through our Title I program, if needed. Students identified as SIFE, newcomers and long-term ELLs are offered the opportunity to participate in additional programs such as: ELL after-school, Morning school (37 ½ minutes), and NYC Chancellor's programs. Students identified with special needs are offered the same programs with an addition of an Individual Educational Program. Each program uses small group instruction in all content areas. Instruction is delivered systematically: structured to develop cognitive skills, achieve comprehensive learning and maximize students' English acquisition. Multiple task-oriented projects are assigned with teachers modeling strategies and analyzing students' learning reflecting standards.

Teachers are provided with copies of the Learning Standards in English as a Second Language (ESL), English Lang Arts (ELA), Native Language Arts and all content areas. The standards are used as a framework and are displayed throughout the classroom to guide instruction and assessment.

Presently there are 90 students at the Beginning level of language acquisition, 93 at the Intermediate level and 109 at the Advanced level. According to the HLIS, the range of languages spoken by our students include, from most to least: Spanish, Albanian, Urdu, Arabic, Bengali, Chinese, Filipino, Vietnamese, French, Korean, Ga, Italian and Greek.

Models: Self-Contained and Push-in Pull-out ESL

In our self-contained and push-in and pull-out models, ELLs at the beginning and intermediate levels of language proficiency as assessed by the LAB-R and NYSESLAT, receive two units of ESL instruction (360 minutes) per week. The advanced students receive one unit of ESL instruction (180 minutes) per week. All classes are taught in English with classroom and enrichment teachers using ESL methodologies throughout the day in all content areas. In addition, all students receive the mandatory 4 periods of ELA instruction.

All classrooms have libraries with some books in the students' native languages clearly labeled. Every classroom reflects a print-rich environment. All instructional materials are targeted for students' needs and are easily accessible. Teachers compile individual student portfolios with reading, writing and math samples to assess student growth.

ELL Special Education and CTT Programs

Students who are serviced through the Special Education Program receive the mandated ESL units required based on their performance on the NYSESLAT assessment. The IEPs of these students are reviewed by the IEP, SETTS and ESL teachers to ensure that IEP goals are current and appropriate. The Transitional Bilingual CTT class receives 4 periods per week of Native Language Arts, as well as ESL instructional periods. Also, to enhance instruction, lessons are translated into the students' native language (Spanish). The 75:25 model is used for language acquisition. A Bilingual Spanish guidance counselor, social worker and psychologist are available if needed. Workshops provided by our Parent Coordinator allow parents of Special Needs students opportunities to learn strategies to enhance language acquisition.

Quality Teaching for ELL

Instruction is supported using English instructional materials in the self-contained classes, as well as in the pull-out/push in model. In the Bilingual CTT class, both English and

Spanish materials are used. English at your Command, On Our Way To English (K classes) Leapfrog, and Taking the High Road by Hampton Brown, are used by all ESL classes to enhance language acquisition for newcomers as well as SIFE students. Members of the ESL department collaborate to research and order new materials, budget permitting.

Students are grouped homogeneously for differentiated instruction in targeted areas. Our students are challenged to produce work in English, both verbally and in written form.. This is accomplished by focusing on spoken language followed by note-taking. All ESL teachers provide guided reading utilizing strategies which enable students to perform at their independent reading levels.

Teachers scaffold academic language and complex content to support students' participation in content areas. This helps students overcome linguistic, cultural and conceptual difficulties and activate prior knowledge. Visual aids and objects are used to support their understanding of the content areas. Every ESL teacher maintains a print rich classroom which includes, but is not limited to graphic organizers, posters, charts, and pictures that are designed to promote English language proficiency.

Assessments

An analysis of the 2009 NYS ELA assessment for the ELLs revealed the following information:

- School-wide, 51.4% of ELL students scored at level 3 or 4.
- In grade 3, 61.8% of ELL students scored at level 3 or 4.
- In grade 4, 52.2% of ELL students scored at level 3 or 4.
- In grade 5, 65% of ELL students scored at level 3 or 4.
- In grade 6, 43.3% of ELL students scored at level 3 or 4.
- In grade 7, 57.1% of ELL students scored at level 3 or 4.
- In grade 8, 8.3% of ELL students scored at level 3 or 4.

In comparing data, 51.4% of our current ELL students scored a level 3 or 4, while 71% of our former ELL students improved and were able to score a level 3 or 4. Analysis of the different modalities of the NYSESLAT assessment reveals that in the areas of Listening and Speaking, 78% of our ELL students scored at the Advanced and Proficient levels, while 47% scored Advanced or Proficient on the Reading/Writing part of the exam.

A similar analysis of the 2009 NYS Mathematics assessment for the ELLs revealed the following:

- School-wide, 81.1% of ELL students scored at level 3 or 4.
- In grade 3, 92.3% of ELL students scored at level 3 or 4.
- In grade 4, 78.3% of ELL students scored at level 3 or 4.
- In grade 5, 95.2% of ELL students scored at level 3 or 4.
- In grade 6, 67.6% of ELL students scored at level 3 or 4.
- In grade 7, 77.8 of ELL students scored at level 3 or 4.
- In grade 8, 73.3% of ELL students scored at level 3 or 4.

In comparing performance of current ELL students with former ELL students, 80% of our current ELLs were able to achieve a level 3 or 4, as compared to 84% of our former ELL students. They outperformed our General Education population by 2-6 percentage points.

At P.S. 89, ongoing assessments are used to determine movement toward achieving content standards. These assessments include, but are not limited to: ELA and MATH ITA assessments, ECLAS, E-PAL, NYSESLAT, NYS Math and ELA, NYS Science and social Studies, R-LAB, Spanish LAB, DRA and teacher assessments and observations. Data is analyzed and interpreted for student placement as well as to differentiate instruction. Student work is evaluated on an ongoing basis by teams consisting of teachers, AP's, the Literacy Coach, Staff Developers in a collaborative effort to assess student progress. The Administration team, LAP team, Inquiry team and SL team review the data and make informed decisions about the effectiveness of current instructional programs.

Upon reviewing all the data, P.S. 89 uses this information to determine the level of services needed for the ELLs, especially the SIFE students. Various after school programs, such as ELL After-school, BELL, IEP, Learn It, Brain-fuse, Century 21, Urban Advantage, BOOST and Leap can provide additional support for the ELL population.

Professional Requirements

There are sixteen teachers at P.S. 89 who service the ELL students in our self contained and Transitional Bilingual CTT classes. Among that group, 75% hold the appropriate teaching certification while the remaining 25% are currently enrolled in programs leading to certification. All ELLS placed in monolingual classes are serviced by teachers who have met the mandated hours of QTEL (Quality Teaching Training for English Learners) training. ESL, Special Education, and Bilingual teachers are made aware of current research in the fields of special needs, bilingual and ESL education. They attend both off and on-site workshops reflecting theory-based learning and proven effective practices. They are encouraged to work collaboratively in developing and refining their instructional skills. Grade conferences keep staff members abreast of ongoing changes in the Language Allocation Policy document.

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

Form TIII - A (1)(a)

Grade Level(s)

Grades 3 - 8

Number of Students to be Served:

LEP At least 75 students (SIFE and SE also included)

Non-LEP 10 Transitional students will also be included

Number of Teachers Four teachers

Other Staff (Specify) One school aide and one sight supervisor / staff developer

School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview

Title III, Part A LEP Program

Language Instruction Program

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

Public School 89 will implement an after-school program which will incorporate ELA and Math curriculum as well as the arts. This program will consist of four certified Bilingual or ESL teachers along with a sight supervisor and school aide. It will serve approximately 75 ELLs and SIFE students from grades 3 - 8th. The program will run for 20 weeks, meeting twice a week (Mondays and Fridays). This program will commence on October 16th, 2009. One hour would be devoted for instruction (ELA, Math, SS or Science) from 3:00 - 4:00pm and the last hour will be devoted to the arts. Our instructional model will be conducted in English and will consist of small group instruction, guided practice using ESL strategies and methodologies, as well as using technological support in mathematics, science, social studies and ELA instruction. Differentiated learning instruction using the four disciplines of language acquisition will be addressed (listening, speaking, reading and writing), in order for the students to continue to attain English language proficiency according to state standards. Parents will continue to be a part of the program. They will be invited to participate in a culminating art celebration. Refreshments will be served during the parent meetings.

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.

Public School 89 will continue to provide professional development to all teachers. All Bilingual, ESL, Special Education and Monolingual teachers, as well as supervisors will have the opportunity to attend workshops such as: Q-Tel, NYSABE, NYSTESOL, Fordham University (BETAC), ELL Literacy Institute, In-House Staff Development provided by our Literacy Consultants etc... to better inform them of ESL instruction models, policies and activities that will help tailor instructional practices for our ELL population. In-House professional development will focus on the Language Allocation Policy, Principles and Practices, Book Talks and how to incorporate these into content area instruction using methodologies such as scaffolding with emphasis on Academic Rigor.

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

School: Public School 89x
BEDS Code: 321100010089

Title III LEP Program
School Building Budget Summary

Allocation Amount:		
Budget Category	Budgeted Amount	Explanation of expenditures in this category as it relates to the program narrative for this title.
Professional salaries (schools must account for fringe benefits) - Per session - Per diem	\$25,800	This amount is budgeted for our ELL after-school program and includes expenditures for 4 certified bilingual and/or ESL teachers and 1 supervisor/staff developer. The program will run for 20 weeks, beginning in mid October . Students will attend twice a week for two hour sessions. Teachers and supervisor/staff developer will meet for an additional 1 ½ hours for professional development. 4 teachers for 5 ½ hours per week @ \$41.98 per hour for 20 weeks 1 supervisor/staff developer for 5 ½ hours per week @ \$43.94 for 20 weeks
Purchased services - High quality staff and curriculum development contracts	\$5,000	Purchase of Staff Development for teachers and supervisors to attend educational workshops such as: NYSABE, Q-TEL, NYSTESOL and In-House staff development provided by our Literacy consultants.
Supplies and materials - Must be supplemental. - Additional curricula, instructional materials. - Must be clearly listed.	\$5,800	The order of supplemental materials such as: picture dictionary, Word By Word and On Our Way To English.
Educational Software (Object Code 199)	\$5,000	The following software will be purchased to support the instructional needs of our ELL students: Math Songs K-5 Macmillan Language Arts, Leveled Practice K-6 Critical Listening, Speaking and Thinking Audio 1-5 Vocabulary Puzzlemaker 2-6 Grammar Tunes K-6 ELL Library Audio CDs K-3
Travel	0	No monies will be devoted for travel

Other	0	No monies will be devoted for "other".
TOTAL	\$41,600	

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.

At Public School 89, 21 % of the students are identified as ELLs. Translation and interpretation needs were assessed through the Home Language Informational Survey that parents completed at the beginning of registering their child in the school. Important information is regularly translated in the languages dominant in our school - Spanish. The Department of Education's Translation and Interpretation Services, NYC Over - the -phone (718) 752-7373, and NYCDOE website provide services in other languages, as needed.

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.

Out of twenty-six languages spoken at Public School 89 our dominant languages are Spanish and Albanian. Oral and written translations are made available in Spanish through our multi-lingual staff members, which include ESL coordinator, Staff Developers, Data specialist, Bilingual and ESL teachers, para professionals, parent coordinator, Assistant Principal and Principal. The Department of Education's Translation and Interpretation Services provide service in other languages, if needed.

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.

At Public School 89, Spanish is the primary language spoken by parents. Written, oral translation and interpretations are provided to parents by our multi-lingual school personnel. The Parent coordinator will access the Department of Education's Translation and Interpretation Services to ensure that correspondence is translated to non-English speaking parents, when needed.

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.

At Public School 89, non-English speaking parents are provided oral communication through translation through our multi-lingual staff members. This provides non-English speaking parents and guardians increased communication opportunities in order to enhance students' academic success.

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>.

Attachment A of the Chancellor's Regulation A-633, "*Important Notices for Parents Regarding language Assistance Services*" are posted at the school's main office in various languages for parents to be advised and assisted by the school of how to avail themselves of services provided by the school and the Translation and Interpretation Unit. Every attempt is made to provide parents with translation and interpretation in their primary language.

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:	\$940,649	\$661,215	\$1,601,864
2. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside for Parent Involvement:	\$9,406		
3. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside to Improve Parent Involvement (ARRA Language):		\$6,612	
4. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified:	\$47,032		
5. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect – HQ PD (ARRA Language):		\$33,060	
6. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Professional Development:	\$94,649		
7. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect (Professional Development) (ARRA Language):		\$66,121	

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

83%

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. We offer professional development workshops to non-highly qualified teachers. The funding helps teachers take courses in preparation for their Master's Degrees in Qualified Areas.

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

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

Parents are encouraged to meet with other parents at monthly Parent Teacher Association meetings. The Parent's Association members are also encouraged to incorporate new parents into their organizational structure. There is also a monthly meeting with the Principal at which monthly reports on fiscal standing, the state of the school community, etc. are discussed. Workshops are offered regarding student test prep, family math and reading initiatives. Parents are encouraged to take part in book sales, student carnivals, trips and activities.

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

Parents are encouraged to build a partnership with their children's teachers and are invited to come in during Open School Week, Meet the Teacher Night and during the fall and spring Parent Teacher Conferences. They are also encouraged to go to CEC meetings at the District Offices, as well as, join Title I and PAPAC groups.

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.

This has been addressed in our needs assessment on pages 11-22.

2. Schoolwide reform strategies that:

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

Our K-3 children are invited to attend "Project Hope" which conducts classes on Saturdays in ELA, Math and sports activities. We also have four SES providers which are federally funded to provide after school academic learning for our students in K- 8. We have received a Century 21 grant for academic tutoring in Math and ELA, sports and arts. We also have instituted our 37 1/2 minute AIS instruction for all of our at risk students. We will have test preparation classes during the Winter and Spring recesses, as well as, a Saturday Academy. We have received Title III funds for our ELL students to receive additional instruction in ELA and in Math.

We also have received a LEAP grant which will offer students learning in Literacy through the Arts. A collaborative program for our 7+ children with Truman High School has been developed enabling them to take courses at Truman and earn high school credits while in elementary school. We also have several cultural after school clubs available for our children who are learning violin, guitar, drumming, drama, and art.

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

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

We are encouraging collaborative learning and differentiated instruction in Special Education and General Education classes. See additional above.

o Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.

We have developed an SP program for our 7+ students with Truman High School. Students are able to go to Truman and take credits in Robotics, Engineering and in other electives. We have an initiative for our students to take tutoring classes prior to taking the specialized high school exam. We also have 8th grade regents classes in Integrated Algebra, Living Environment and in Spanish Proficiency.

- o Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.

We have four SES programs serving our at risk population in an extended day situation. We also have a 37 1/2 minute session on Mondays through Thursdays in ELA and in Math for our students needing AIS instruction.

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

There are AIS services provided by all teachers each morning. We have mandated counseling for our at-risk population. We have students that attend Bronx House and Bronx Lebanon for psychological services.

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

3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.

5% of our Title I budget is assigned to providing learning opportunities for our staff that are not highly qualified. They are entitled to take courses towards completing their education and we are able to reimburse a percentage of tuition to them.

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.

We have two ELA staff developers, one Literacy Coach, one Math staff developer in our building to serve teachers with in house professional development. We also employ Literacy Support Services, LEAP, and Spaulding to enhance our Literacy effort. We also have the services of a member of our PSO - (CEI-PEA) - to help with our ELA Special Education initiative.

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

Since our Progress Report is an "A", our success has attracted highly qualified staff.

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

See above.

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.

To assist our Pre-K and Kindergarten children we have Cookie Hello - a initiation for parents with children entering the school for the first time to get acclimated to the school and its offerings. We also have guidance intervention for any traumatic situations that occur during the school day.

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.

The Assistant Principals hold SAMS conferences with all teachers to speak about students that are at risk. We also offer professional development sessions led by our own teachers who have gone to workshops and are willing and able to turn key the information. We have a data specialist, on staff, who is able to run various reports and interpret statistics for teachers to use in sculpting their lessons to meet the needs of their students. The data specialist is also able to disseminate Quality Review results and ARIS reports to staff and parents for their interpretation. We also have AIS assessors who determine the need for additional instructional support.

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.

We offer additional assistance for our at risk students during the 37 1/2 minute morning sessions in ELA and in Math. We administer a pre and post interim assessment to measure the progress our students are making during the morning program and in our extended day programs. We will have a Saturday academy for test preparation. We have several art, drama, music clubs in our extended day program.

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.

We have a sapis worker, four guidance counselors, three deans of discipline to assist us in helping students that are having psychological, emotional and behavioral issues. We also meet monthly with our safety committee to discuss any safety, security issues. We have a parent coordinator to assist parents who need assistance. We also invite officers from the 49th precinct in to speak to our middle school children about gang violence. And we have a partnership program with Bronx Lebanon to assist families with guidance intervention.

PART D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS

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

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

We will offer an extended day program for test preparation in ELA and in Math funded with Title I funds. We also offer our 8th graders tutoring for taking the Specialized High School examination. There is also an academic/arts academy (K-8) during the extended day.

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

See CEP Action Plan - Pages 23 - 37 and see above.

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

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

CEP - Action Plan - Extended Day

We also offer a summer school program for all Grade 3-8 students. In addition we have a morning AIS 37 1/2 minute instructional program on Mondays-Thursdays for all at risk AIS children. We will offer a Saturday academy for ELA/Math test preparation.

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

We have an accelerated 7+ Truman Program offering students the opportunity to take elective high school courses. We also offer our 8th graders Regents courses in Mathematics (Integrated Algebra); science (Living Environment) and in Spanish (Spanish Proficiency).

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

Our morning 37 1/2 minute AIS instruction supplements instruction and there will be AIS push -in instruction, funding permitted.

4. Coordinate with and support the regular educational program;

Title I funding will support our extended day program, as well as our push ins , guidance counselors , SES, SETTS teachers and other out of class room personnel to collaborate/articulate with classroom teachers.

5. Provide instruction by highly qualified teachers;

5% Highly Qualified funding has been allocated for teacher tuition reimbursement.

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

We provide ongoing professional development with Literacy Support Services, our LEAP grant, Spaulding Reading program, and the services of our PSO – (CEI-PEA). Principals receive ongoing PSO training. We also utilize our in house staff developers to provide ongoing professional development for our staff. We have a Pupil Personnel Team that meets weekly to discuss students that are academically/emotionally at risk. We encourage our office staff to attend workshops that will enhance their positions.

7. Provide strategies to increase parental involvement; and

We have a "Met the Teacher Night" in September to welcome all of our parents and enable them an opportunity to meet their childrens' teachers. We also have Parent Conferences in the Fall and in the Spring, in the afternoon and evening, to give our parents an opportunity to discuss their childrens' progress with the teachers. We also have drama performances, award nights, a story night and workshops to encourage our school community to become part of the happenings of our school. Monthly, our School Leadership Team, made up of administrators, teachers, school aides and parents meet to discuss the status of construction initiatives, educational and cultural activities in the school, as well as, any parental issues which need to be addressed.

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

We have four SES programs which are Federally funded which address the need for extended day tutoring, sports and arts activities. We also receive Title I and Title III funding for our at risk ELLS and General Education students. We have received a Century 21 grant which will provide academic, arts and drama programs for our students after school.

**(TO BE REVISED FOLLOWING CONVERSATION WITH SED ABOUT TIMELINE FOR
IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY REQUIREMENTS)**
**APPENDIX 5: NCLB/SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS IDENTIFIED FOR
IMPROVEMENT**

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

NCLB / SED Status:

Corrective Action (CA) – Year 2 schools

SURR Phase / Group (If Applicable):

Part A: For All Schools Identified for Improvement

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

Although our projected targets in all areas were met, one focus for our Inquiry Teams will be Special Education. Our Special Education students have met "Safe Harbor" however the AMO was not met in ELA. We also realized that although we did make our AYP in science - we made it uncomfortably close to the projected target.

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.

We have begun a series of workshops for our Special Education teachers, with assistance from members of our PSO - (CEI-PEA) - focusing efforts on "Differentiated Instruction". We will continue with additional professional development opportunities focusing on ELA and Science for the school year. We also need to begin professional development in our lower grades (K-3) in the area of differentiated instruction, since we have dismantled our AIS team due to lack of funding.

Part B: For Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

percent of the Title I funds for professional development (amounts specified in Part A of Appendix 4) will be used to remove the school from school improvement.

We employ Literacy Support Services to provide part of the professional development for our teachers to maintain a highly qualified staff. We also receive professional development assistance from our PSO partner - CEI-PEA . We have secured a LEAP grant and often utilize our in-house staff developers to provide staff development for our teachers.

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

For any new teacher that is entitled to mentoring services, we assign the mentoring position to a staff developer/experienced teacher twice per week.

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

We will send a letter in all appropriate languages to parents notifying them about our identification for school improvement.

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Background

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

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

CURRICULUM AUDIT FINDINGS

KEY FINDING 1: CURRICULUM

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

1A. English Language Arts

Background

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

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

ELA Alignment Issues:

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

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

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

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

-English Language Learners.

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

programs. Further, there is a general lack of awareness of the New York State Learning Standards for ESL.

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

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

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

After a careful review of both *The Comprehensive Approach to Balanced Literacy*, as well as grade level curriculum maps, we worked to ensure that curriculum was aligned with state standards for ELA. Intervisitations followed by grade level conferences are utilized to monitor continual alignment and progress. Work/study sessions during common preps serve as a reliable way to look at student work. Pre and Post observation conferences with supervisors, checklists and quantitative, as well as qualitative assessments ensure that we remain on task. Grade level "SAMS" - (Student Assessment Management System) conferences conducted twice yearly to drive student instruction. The progress of our ELL students is monitored by careful review of NYSESLAT data.

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

- Applicable
 Not Applicable

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

At the initial faculty conference prior to school opening, *The Comprehensive Approach to Balanced Literacy*, as well as the *New York State ELA Standards Manual* is distributed to new staff members along with a menu of staff development options on its use in the classroom. Curriculum Maps are continually being expanded to reflect ongoing changes in curriculum, and pinpoint skills, strategies, and expected outcomes. A writing component is integrated into every aspect in the curriculum map, with a subsequent required work product. Teachers are utilizing Gretchen Owoki's *Literate Days: Reading and Writing with Preschool and Primary Children, Pre-K and K, Lucy Calkins Primary Units of Study, 1-2 and Lucy Calkins Units of Study, 3-5* for writing. An ELL on-site coordinator serves to provide staff development and ensures that all aspects of literacy are incorporated in the ELL classroom. She attends the yearly TESOL conference and turn-keys new strategies and materials focusing on language acquisition. Therefore, this finding is not applicable to our school as evidenced by:

- Improving state assessment scores
- Improving NYSESLAT scores
- Published student work found in portfolios, writing folders and displayed work
- Ongoing alignment of curriculum maps

- Alignment of ELA standards are evident across content areas as well, specifically, Social Studies and Science.
- Activities such as Interactive Read Aloud, Partner Reading, Book Clubs, Share-outs, Plays and Performances

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.

One relevant issue we are addressing is the need to purchase more high interest, low level readers which reflect appropriate grade level curriculum for our IEP population. Additionally, plans to expand our library funded by a grant, will offer students and teachers a broader range of reading materials and media resources spanning all grade levels and content areas.

1B. Mathematics

Background

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

Specific Math Alignment Issues:

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

- The SEC data for mathematics curriculum alignment (similar to Key Finding 1A for ELA), shows that there is a lack of depth in what is being taught in the mathematics classroom as

compared to what is required by the state standards.

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

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

The Math Staff Developer and Math Instructional Specialists undertook a critical analysis of NCTM standards and how they pertain to the Everyday Math and Impact Math programs. Grade level conferences were held to share out practices which incorporate the content and process strands. Grade level math tasks and rubrics were evaluated to ensure that the process strands were well represented in the curriculum. Teachers were given staff development on strategies to expand the "develop" and "explore" components of the lesson, and encouraged to accept different methods if students could support their solutions. Generally, mathematics instruction is strong, supported by two nationally validated programs which emphasize techniques for improving mathematical knowledge and understanding for all students, including ELL and IEP students. In conjunction with Everyday Math and Impact Math, our IEP students are receiving additional instruction with the McGraw Hill SRA program.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

We have found that instructional practices within our mathematics classrooms are well developed and adhere closely to the NYS Content and Process strands. The Process strands are embedded within the programs and teachers are becoming more adept at integrating them into lessons. The explorations and investigations have permitted students to become active participants in their own learning: teachers thereby take on the role of instructional facilitators. Making connections and providing opportunities to share and clarify ideas with peers have become an integral part of the lessons. This fosters the acceptance of multiple strategies for problem solving. Math Journals, "share and summarize", and "in your own words" allow students to communicate mathematical thinking clearly and coherently using appropriate mathematical language. Grade appropriate math tasks encourage students to explain strategies, while rubrics guide students to self assess.

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

We will differentiate instruction for our IEP students by expanding the use of supplemental programs such as McGraw Hill's SRA Program, as well as further incorporating hands-on math games. Mathematics instruction will also be differentiated by content, process and product according to student readiness, interest and learning style.

KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION

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

2A – ELA Instruction

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

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

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

Intervisitations and grade level conferences are used to evaluate instruction and monitor progress. Supervisors meet with staff members in pre and post observation conferences to evaluate the quality of planning and instruction. Data supporting school progress is continually analyzed and used to adjust instructional practices. Looking at student work is the frequent focus of grade level meetings. Successful practices are shared.

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?

- Observations
- School Progress Report
- NYS ELA assessment results
- NYSESLAT scores

- NYS Social Studies assessment results
- NYS Science assessment scores
- Displayed student work
- Student portfolios

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.

Although this finding is not applicable to our school, one area in need of improvement is a better alignment of ELA, Science and Social Studies instruction by classroom and cluster teachers. This will be addressed by allotting more time for articulation.

2B – Mathematics Instruction

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

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

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

Instruction is monitored and evaluated by intervisitations and grade level conferences. Supervisors meet with staff members in pre and post observation conferences to evaluate the quality of planning and instructional success. Teachers adhere to math planning guides and pacing schedules. Data from chapter and unit tests is submitted and analyzed on a monthly basis to plan for future instruction. Technology such as Smartboards, Scientific and Graphing calculators, and interactive software are integrated into instruction. The increasing percentage of students performing at or above grade level expectations on the NYS Math exam will demonstrate the effectiveness of our instruction, as will the percent of students passing the Integrated Algebra Regents exam.

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?

- School Progress Report

- NYS Math results
- NYS Integrated Algebra Regents results
- Chapter/Unit tests
- Students ease using technology such as Smartboards, Scientific and Graphic calculators and Interactive software embedded in the math programs.

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.

In an effort to enhance our technology base, we have upgraded our science lab to facilitate hands-on activities involving math concepts and processes such as measurement, representation and problem solving utilizing the scientific method. Upgraded hardware in the classrooms will increase access to online math support for students. We will also be providing further professional development opportunities to increase teacher confidence and proficiency in teaching mathematics through the constructivist approach. Continuing professional development will be offered to improve teacher competency in the use of new technology.

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

KEY FINDING 3: TEACHER EXPERIENCE AND STABILITY

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 3:

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

N/A According to our annual School Report, our staff has remained stable over the past several years with no turnover.

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?

Annual School Progress Report

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

N/A

KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT - ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

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

- ELL coordinators and administrators investigate and disseminate the availability of relevant workshops to ensure that interested teachers are able to attend.
- Discussions at grade conferences

- Meetings with supervisors
- Post-workshop sharing and feedback
- Teacher surveys/menus of relevant staff development

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?

At P.S. 89, professional development is provided through our cross-grade common preparation periods, facilitated by supervisors as described in our Language Allocation Policy. Best practices and issues pertaining to our ELL population are shared. Staff members also receive on-site staff development by our Literacy Support Team Consultants, which include professional book studies and discussions concerning current research on language acquisition. Teachers are also encouraged to participate in professional development provided by the Department of Education, BETAC, NYSABE and Q-TEL either during or after school hours. The ELL coordinator attends the annual TESOL conference and information is used as a source of on site professional development for the P.S. 89 learning community. The ESL self-contained classes participate in an annual cross-cultural event in June, highlighting the similarities and differences among cultures. This helps to encourage understanding and respect among our student body.

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.

Funding from Central would be helpful in defraying the expense of hiring substitute teachers to cover the classes of those teachers attending professional workshops. Testing and vacation periods should be avoided when scheduling Q-TEL workshops.

KEY FINDING 5: DATA USE AND MONITORING - ELL INSTRUCTION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

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

At P.S. 89, we have self-contained ESL classes throughout all grades, K-8, as well as a Bilingual CTT program in Kindergarten and First Grade. We have highly qualified stable staff

members who are experienced in differentiating and delivering instruction. In June, pupil placement cards containing relevant data and information are filled out for each student distributed to teachers on the first day of the following new school year. The data includes NYSESLAT, LAB-R, Spanish LAB, years of service, NYS ELA and Math, Science and Social Studies, Dibels, and ECLAS scores. Teachers also receive data analysis sheets which include scores provided by ARIS, as well as our in-house data collection.

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?

Teachers receive complete data profiles on each of their students and periodically update the data analysis sheets throughout the school year. Our Data Specialist inputs the information and updates the ARIS reports. Teachers can utilize the data to individualize and inform instruction.

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

N/A

KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT - SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

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

Assessment relevant to this finding include:

- Post Formal and informal observation meetings with supervisors
- Surveys
- Grade conferences
- Meetings with Guidance counselors Deans and all other service providers (SBST, SETSS, Speech, O.T.)

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?

This evidence is relevant to this school's educational program because very few children are decertified from special education and our test scores and teacher feedback demonstrate that although our special education population has made some gains in English Language Arts and Mathematics, there is still room for growth and improvement.

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

This school will address the relevant issues by developing an action plan with the help of the administration, SBST, related service providers, and special education teaching staff which will generate a set of goals and objectives that everyone agrees is important in meeting student needs and increasing academic performance. The plan will also utilize strategies which will incorporate the use of modifications and accommodations. A Special Education initiative providing professional development is offered to all special education teachers, as well as inclusion teachers, by our PSO- CEI/PEA and our on site Literacy Coach. They meet once a week to discuss relevant issues as well as current instructional strategies for differentiating instruction. We are currently developing a system of behavioral supports to strengthen the learning environment. Professional development for teachers *and* paras on how to most effectively utilize paras within the classroom is scheduled. Added support is necessary from Central in terms of resources such as time, materials and monies for professional development.

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

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

A yearly review of IEPs ensures that they are updated and reflect the current needs of the students. Articulation among service providers and classroom teachers serves as a means to share issues concerning these students. Although our IEP students have demonstrated

considerable progress, there still remains a wide performance gap between IEP and General Ed students as evidenced by recent test data and performance within the classroom.

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?

Observations, both formal and informal, informal conversations and test results support the relevance of this finding. Mainstreaming is only offered to a very limited number of students and should be considered more often as a placement option.

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.

The school will address the relevant issues cited in Key Finding 7 by establishing an IEP committee comprised of teachers, administration, SBST, auxiliary staff such as literacy and math coaches. They will meet as needed to discuss, monitor and review students IEPs, as well as look carefully at the learning environment to determine if modifications and accommodations are being implemented as per IEP academic and behavioral goals. Learning style surveys will be developed to ensure that best instructional methodologies, specific to each student, will be implemented. Workshops on writing IEPs with a special focus on behavioral plans are scheduled. We are planning ongoing professional development to include strategies such as differentiating instruction and optimizing the use of paras within the classroom, budget permitting. Intervisitations and demonstration lessons by experienced staff are being discussed. Support is needed from Central in terms of supplying resources such as time, materials and monies to address this issue.

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

This appendix will not be required for 2009-10.

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

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

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:

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

Supporting Students in Temporary Housing (STH)

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

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

Part A: For Title I Schools

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

12
2. Please describe the services you are planning to provide to the STH population.

We are providing counseling services for any of our students in temporary housing. Our parent coordinator assists parents in transitioning students into our school community. We have the services of two attendance monitors who assist us with our attendance initiative. After school programs include academic tutoring from our four SES programs which are available to our temporary housing students. We also have ongoing parental workshops for any parent that is interested in attending.

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).

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A