



P.S. 175

2009-10

SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)

SCHOOL: 11X175
ADDRESS: 200 CITY ISLAND AVENUE, BRONX, NY 10464
TELEPHONE: 718-885-1093
FAX: 718-885-2315

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	3
SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE.....	4
SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE.....	5
Part A. Narrative Description	5
Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot	Error! Bookmark not defined.
SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT	Error! Bookmark not defined.
SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS	12
SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN	13
REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010.....	18
APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.13
APPENDIX 2: PROGRAM DELIVERY FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELLs).....	21
APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION	17
APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS	18
APPENDIX 5: NCLB/SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS IDENTIFIED FOR IMPROVEMENT	23
APPENDIX 6: SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS UNDER REGISTRATION REVIEW (SURR).....	Error!
Bookmark not defined.	24
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.....	25Error! Bookmark not defined.
APPENDIX 8: CONTRACTS FOR EXCELLENCE (C4E) SCHOOL-BASED EXPENDITURES FOR 2009-10	Error!
Bookmark not defined.	35
APPENDIX 9: TITLE I, PART A – SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS IN TEMPORARY HOUSING (STH)	Error!
Bookmark not defined.	36

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: 175 SCHOOL NAME: P.S. 175

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 200 City Island Avenue, Bronx, NY 10464

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 718-885-1093 FAX: 718-885-2315

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Amy Lipson EMAIL ADDRESS: alipson@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON: Candy Mancuso

PRINCIPAL: Amy Lipson

UFT CHAPTER LEADER: Deborah McManus

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION CO-PRESIDENT: Lisa Fine & Leslie Hanley-Piri

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE:
(Required for high schools) _____

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL SUPPORT ORGANIZATION (SSO) INFORMATION

DISTRICT: 11 SSO NAME: Children First Network 12

SSO NETWORK LEADER: Emily Sharrock

SUPERINTENDENT: Elizabeth A. 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/Administration/ChancellorsRegulations/default.htm>). *Note: If for any reason an SLT member does not wish to sign this plan, he/she may attach a written explanation in lieu of his/her signature.*

Name	Position and Constituent Group Represented	Signature
Amy Lipson	*Principal or Designee	
Deborah McManus	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Lisa Fine	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
Danielle Minor	Teacher	
Pat Cambria	Teacher	
Shannon Stanford	Teacher	
Jeanne McDonald	Guidance/Counselor	
Susan Rosendahl-Masella	Parent	
Kim McGaughan	Parent	
Candy Mancuso	Parent	
Janine Mantzaris	Parent	
MaryAnn Albertelli	Parent	

* 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.

Vision Statement

P.S. 175 is a professional community of learners where students' individual academic and social needs are met and where parents are welcomed as valued members of our school community.

Mission Statement

Our mission is to make P. S. 175 a true collaborative community of practice where:

- We all work together to meet the instructional and social needs of every child
- We all see ourselves as learners
- Teachers work collaboratively to plan and implement instruction
- Classrooms reflect the enthusiasm of teachers and students
- Parents are welcomed into the building as meaningful contributors
- Instruction is rigorous and student achievement high
- Students love to come to school to learn, teachers love to come to school to teach, and parents are happy to send their children to our school.

Distinctive Characteristics

- only two classes on each grade from kindergarten through grade 8
- an open classroom area that houses 7 classes (grades 4, 5, 6, 8th grade math)
- a low teacher turnover rate
- our 7th and 8th grade is broken into smaller groups so that there are only 17 students in each content area class (this enables us to offer Regents classes without having top and bottom classes)
- strong parent involvement
- a dedicated and supportive staff
- a stable student population

Collaborations/Partnerships/Special Initiatives

- Sports & Arts in Schools After School Program – after school program for students in grades 5-8; in addition to athletic and visual arts components, students participate in cooking, homework help, and strategic thinking activities
- Bronx Arts Ensemble – works with our 5th grade to produce annual play as well as an after school program for students in grades 6-8 focusing on chorus and drama
- Lincoln Center Institute – K-3 students and teachers work with Lincoln Center teaching artists on two works of art each year; workshops are conducted for parents

- Studio-in-a-School – teaching artists will work with our K-6th grade students and teachers in 14-week residencies in the visual arts aligned with the Blueprint for the Arts; teachers will work alongside the artist which will enable them to continue to do work with the visual arts in the classroom at the end of the residency
- Greenkill Environmental Education Program – 6th graders spend 3 days and 2 nights at the Greenkill center immersed in activities focused on the environment
- Character Education Program – K-8 students participate in class, small group, and/or individual community service projects; our Guidance Counselor does classroom presentations of the 4R's Program; anti-bullying poster contests;
- Substance Abuse Intervention Program – recovering substance abusers conduct presentations for 7th and 8th grade students on the dangers of using drugs and alcohol and the possible consequences

CEP Section III: School Profile

Part B: School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot (Version 2010-1B - April 2010)

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT										
School Name:	P.S. 175 City Island									
District:	11	DBN:	11X175	School BEDS Code:	321100010175					
DEMOGRAPHICS										
Grades Served:	Pre-K		3	√	7	√	11			
	K	√	4	√	8	√	12			
	1	√	5	√	9		Ungraded	√		
	2	√	6	√	10					
Enrollment					Attendance - % of days students attended:					
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10			
Pre-K	0	0	0		94.7	95.2	TBD			
Kindergarten	39	31	36							
Student Stability - % of Enrollment:										
Grade 1	38	37	37	(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10			
Grade 2	37	40	34		97.5	95.4	TBD			
Grade 3	39	41	40							
Grade 4	39	38	42	Poverty Rate - % of Enrollment:						
Grade 5	46	40	40	(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10			
Grade 6	56	48	43		38.8	32.8	TBD			
Grade 7	53	58	48							
Grade 8	55	52	60	Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:						
Grade 9	0	0	0	(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10			
Grade 10	0	0	0		0	5	TBD			
Grade 11	0	0	0							
Grade 12	0	0	0	Recent Immigrants - Total Number:						
Ungraded	0	0	1	(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10			
Total	402	385	381		2	0	0			
Special Education Enrollment:				Suspensions (OSYD Reporting) - Total Number:						
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10			
# in Self-Contained Classes	0	0	0	Principal Suspensions	0	0	TBD			
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	0	2	7	Superintendent Suspensions	0	0	TBD			
Number all others	35	37	34							
These students are included in the enrollment information above.				Special High School Programs - Total Number:						
				(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10			
				CTE Program Participants	0	0	0			
				Early College HS Program Participants	0	0	0			
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:				Number of Staff - Includes all full-time staff:						
(BESIS Survey)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10			
# in Transitional Bilingual Classes	0	0	0	Number of Teachers	28	29	TBD			
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0							
# receiving ESL services only	9	12	6							

CEP Section III: School Profile

Part B: School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot (Version 2010-1B - April 2010)

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT							
# ELLs with IEPs	0	0	2	Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	4	3	TBD
These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.				Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	2	1	TBD
Overage Students (# entering students overage for grade)				Teacher Qualifications:			
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	0	0	TBD	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100.0	100.0	TBD
				% more than 2 years teaching in this school	75.0	72.4	TBD
				% more than 5 years teaching anywhere	78.6	79.3	TBD
Ethnicity and Gender - % of Enrollment:				% Masters Degree or higher			
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	% core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED	93.0	97.0	TBD
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.5	0.5	0.8		97.8	91.3	TBD
Black or African American	8.2	7.8	8.7				
Hispanic or Latino	26.9	26.5	22.0				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	2.7	4.2	4.7				
White			0.3				
Male	52.2	54.3	53.8				
Female	47.8	45.7	46.2				
2009-10 TITLE I STATUS							
	Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP)						
√	Title I Targeted Assistance						
	Non-Title I						
Years the School Received Title I Part A Funding:				2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
				N	N	N	N
NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY							
SURR School (Yes/No)	If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:						
Overall NCLB/Diferentiated Accountability Status (2009-10) Based on 2008-09 Performance:							
	Phase			Category			
	In Good Standing (IGS)	√		Basic	Focused	Comprehensive	
	Improvement Year 1						
	Improvement Year 2						
	Corrective Action (CA) – Year 1						
	Corrective Action (CA) – Year 2						
	Restructuring Year 1						
	Restructuring Year 2						
	Restructuring Advanced						

CEP Section III: School Profile

Part B: School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot (Version 2010-1B - April 2010)

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT							
Individual Subject/Area AYP Outcomes:							
<u>Elementary/Middle Level</u>				<u>Secondary Level</u>			
ELA:		√		ELA:			
Math:		√		Math:			
Science:		√		Graduation Rate:			
This school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for each accountability measure:							
	<u>Elementary/Middle Level</u>			<u>Secondary Level</u>			
Student Groups	ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad Rate**	Progress Target
All Students	√	√	√				
Ethnicity							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Black or African American	-	-	-				
Hispanic or Latino	√	√	-				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	-	-	-				
White	√	√					
Multiracial							
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-				
Limited English Proficient	-	-	-				
Economically Disadvantaged	√	√					
Student groups making AYP in each subject	4	4	1				
CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY							
Progress Report Results – 2008-09				Quality Review Results – 2008-09			
Overall Letter Grade:	A			Overall Evaluation:	√		
Overall Score:	79.9			Quality Statement Scores:			
Category Scores:				Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	W		
School Environment:	10.9			Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	√		
<i>(Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)</i>				Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	W		
School Performance:	18.2			Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	W		
<i>(Comprises 25% of the Overall Score)</i>				Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	√		
Student Progress:	47						
<i>(Comprises 60% of the Overall Score)</i>							
Additional Credit:	3.8						
KEY: AYP STATUS				KEY: QUALITY REVIEW SCORE			
√ = Made AYP				Δ = Underdeveloped			
√ ^{SH} = Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target				▶ = Underdeveloped with Proficient Features			
X = Did Not Make AYP				√ = Proficient			
- = Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status				W = Well Developed			
				◇ = Outstanding			
* = For Progress Report Attendance Rate(s) - If more than one attendance rate given, it is displayed as K-8/9-12.							
Note: Progress Report grades are not yet available for District 75 schools; NCLB/SED accountability reports are not available for District 75 schools.							
** http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/nyc/APA/Memos/Graduation_rate_memo.pdf							

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?
-

Based on information from our 2007-2008 Quality Review and Progress Report, we have identified the following:

Student Performance Trends

- High numbers of students scoring at levels 3 and 4 on both ELA and Mathematics standardized tests
- Insufficient number of high performing students (3.5-4.5 proficiency level) making one-year's progress in ELA and Mathematics
- The lower performing students are the ones making one-year's progress

Greatest Accomplishments

- Teachers utilize data to better plan and individualize instruction
- The implementation of schoolwide initiatives including differentiated instruction, individual student goal setting; strategic mini-lessons
- The implementation and ongoing revision of literacy curriculum maps in all grades
- The creation of clearly defined writing criteria and rubrics for all ELA units of study
- The ability to offer our middle school students Regents level classes in math and science without having a "top" class and a "bottom" class
- Middle school content area instruction is done in small groups
- All classroom teachers have daily common prep periods with the other teacher on their grade and (with the exception of grade 4) with the teachers of either the grade above or below; all four cluster teachers also have daily common preps
- The ability to individualize and personalize professional development

Significant Aids to Our School's Continuous Improvement

- Annual School Goals are explicitly communicated to the community
 - Differentiate instruction to better meet needs of higher performing students
 - Set measurable learning goals in all content areas to better meet individual student needs
 - Develop teacher understanding of higher order thinking skills and strategies to more effectively plan for differentiated instruction
 - Incorporate strategic mini-lessons to target instruction aligned to assessed student needs
- Professional Development is differentiated depending on the needs of the individual teachers, grade teams, departments and school level (K-2, 3-5, 6-8). Major initiative is focus at all grade

levels and then support is delivered depending on where the individual, grade, etc. are on the continuum of meeting school goals

- Goals for the year are explicitly laid out along with the support being provided beginning in the spring of the previous year. This leads to consistency of curriculum across and through grades. Students enter each grade prepared with the necessary skills, concepts and content.
- We have a dedicated, committed and supportive faculty and staff
- Literacy curriculum maps are horizontal (across grades) and vertical (spiraling from one grade to the next). Teachers and administration reflect during and at the end of each unit of study in order to revise and deepen the work for the following year
- Teachers of grades 5-8 are implementing interdisciplinary units of studies in social studies and ELA
- Block scheduling allows for longer periods of content area instruction
- There is a high level of teacher commitment to professional development before and after school
- Middle school programming allows for small content area class size in order to provide Math and Science Regents level courses without homogeneous grouping
- The school is well supported by the PTA financially. Parents are encouraged to participate in school events.
- Arts are a valued part of our instructional and enrichment program. Although we were unable to fund a full-time visual arts teacher this year, Lincoln Center Institute works with K-3 classes on two works of art; Studio-in-a-School teaching artists work with our K-6th grade students and teachers in 14-week residencies in the visual arts aligned with the Blueprint for the Arts; teachers work alongside the artist which will enable them to continue to do work with the visual arts in the classroom at the end of the residency; 7th and 8th grade students receive visual arts instruction by a staff member; 5th grade puts on a dramatic performance; 5th-8th grade students have the opportunity to participate in the Sports & Arts after school program in which they are offered visual arts and athletics; 6th-8th grade students are offered an after school arts program that includes drama and chorus
- Technology is being used in the classroom to enhance learning – all 4th-8th grade classrooms have SmartBoards that are utilized by classroom teachers

Significant Barriers to Our School's Continuous Improvement

- Building design/open classrooms/no walls – Our school, which opened in 1975, was built on an experimental open space design and for a significantly smaller number of students. The school's second floor is mostly open space designed for four classes; it now accommodates seven classes. Only low partitions and/or bookcases separate the class areas and the cafeteria on the first floor has no ceiling. This absence of walls allows excessive noise and prevents the rich discussions and group work that our students need. Teachers and students must contend with multiple distractions during the day.
- Only one teacher on each grade in each subject area in grades 5-8
- Limited budget and space does not allow us to offer as diverse a curriculum as we would like both during the school day and after school hours

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

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

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

Goal 1

To improve ELA standardized test results of target population in grades 4-8 who are higher performing (3.5-4.5 proficiency level) in ELA but did not make one year of progress in 2008-2009, 32 of 50 students in the target group will make at least one year of progress on the 2009-2010 ELA standardized test.

This goal is based on data from the 2008-2009 Progress Report.

Goal 2

To improve math standardized test results of target population in grades 4-8 who are higher performing (3.5-4.5 proficiency level) in Math but did not make one year of progress in 2008-2009, 20 of 31 students in target group will make at least one year of progress on the 2009-2010 mathematics standardized test.

This goal is based on data from the 2008-2009 Progress Report.

Goal 3

100% of ELA and math teachers in grades 4-8 will be able to show evidence of understanding and implementing differentiated instruction strategies and techniques to better meet individual student needs by the end of the 2008-2009 school year, as evidenced by lesson plan reviews, choice boards, tiered activities, and a review of data collection sheets in their Assessment Binders.

This goal is based on data from the 2008-2009 ELA and Mathematics standardized tests, our Quality Review, as well as a review of teachers' lesson plans and Assessment Binders.

<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p>	<p><u>Our budget will be used for:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literacy Coach • Purchasing additional texts on all guided reading levels <p><u>Scheduling will be done to allow for:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daily common preps • Weekly Professional Activity Periods used for professional development with literacy coach and/or AUSSIE consultant
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning goals will be on display in classrooms, evident in lesson plans and in assessment binders and will be updated on a monthly basis • Teacher resource binders will contain sheets indicating how books were chunked and the follow-up writing prompts that students had to complete • Higher order thinking skills and strategies will be evident in lesson plans and observed during formal and informal observations on an on-going basis • Differentiated learning tasks geared toward higher performing students will be evident in lesson plans, on bulletin boards, in student work folders and observed during formal and informal observations on an on-going basis

MATH

Subject/Area (where relevant): _____

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>20 of 31 students in target group will make at least one year of progress on the 2009-2010 mathematics standardized test.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p><u>Classroom teachers will:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set differentiated instruction goals for themselves • Work with students to set monthly measurable learning goals in math • Use the Item Skills Analysis in ARIS to focus instruction on areas of need • Differentiate instruction on a daily basis to better meet student needs <p><u>The Network Achievement Coach will work with teachers on an on-going basis to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Align assessment binders to the state standards • Develop teacher understanding of higher order thinking skills and strategies <p><u>Principal will:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct bi-monthly reviews of teacher progress toward their own differentiated instruction goals • Conduct monthly reviews of Assessment Binders to evaluate teacher use of data and to assess student progress.
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<p><u>Our Network Achievement Coach will work with us to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create “exemplars” and visual instruction plans for grades 5-8 <p><u>Scheduling will be done to allow for:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daily common preps • Weekly Professional Activity Periods used for professional development with literacy coach and/or AUSSIE consultant
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning goals will be on display in classrooms, evident in lesson plans and in assessment binders and will be updated on a monthly basis • Higher order thinking skills and strategies will be evident in lesson plans and observed during formal and informal observations on an on-going basis • Differentiated learning tasks geared toward higher performing students will be evident in lesson plans, on bulletin boards, in student work folders and observed during formal and informal observations on an on-going basis

Subject/Area (where relevant): ELA & MATH

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>100% of ELA and math teachers in grades 4-8 will be able to show evidence of understanding and implementing differentiated instruction strategies and techniques to better meet individual student needs by the end of the 2008-2009 school year, as evidenced by lesson plan reviews, choice boards, tiered activities, and a review of data collection sheets in their Assessment Binders.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p><u>Classroom teachers will differentiate instruction on a daily basis to better meet student needs by:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tiering lessons • Including choice board activities in lesson plans • Using our Network’s differentiated classroom continuum to assess themselves at the beginning, middle and end of the year • Incorporating differentiated instruction structures in their classrooms <p><u>The Literacy Coach will work with teachers on an on-going basis to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop their understanding of higher order thinking skills and strategies • Set interim benchmarks in reading and writing • Design and implement strategic mini-lessons • Further develop school-wide writing rubrics and criteria • Revise Literacy Curriculum Maps on a monthly basis <p><u>The Principal will:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet with teachers at the beginning, middle and end of the year to set differentiated instruction learning goals and to assess where teachers are on the classroom continuum. • Review lesson plans to ensure that teachers are tiering lessons, creating choice board and agenda activities and incorporating differentiated instruction structures in their classrooms • Conduct classroom observations to ensure that differentiated instruction structures and techniques are being utilized in classrooms • Conduct monthly reviews of Assessment Binders to evaluate teacher use of data and to assess student progress
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p>	<p><u>Our budget will be used for:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literacy Coach • F-status Assistant Principal <p>Scheduling will be done to allow for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daily common preps • Weekly Professional Activity Periods used for professional development with literacy coach

Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment

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

Differentiated lessons and tasks will be:

- **evident in teacher lesson plans which will include choice boards, agendas, tiered tasks which will be review on an on-going basis**
- **observed during formal and informal observations on an on-going basis**
- **shared at monthly individual teacher and grade level meetings with principal**

Charts, agendas, management tasks will be posted in classrooms

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENT FOR ALL TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

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

Grade	ELA	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	At-risk Services: Guidance Counselor	At-risk Services: School Psychologist	At-risk Services: Social Worker	At-risk Health-related Services
	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS				
K	0	0	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0
1	8	5	N/A	N/A	1	0	0	0
2	8	4	N/A	N/A	1	0	0	0
3	10	4	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0
4	10	10	N/A	N/A	4	0	0	0
5	7	10	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0
6	13	9	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0
7	14	14	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0
8	12	5	N/A	N/A	1	0	0	0
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

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

Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	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:	Grades 1-8 –small group tutoring after school – Acuity, Mondo, teacher-created remedial resources, Reciprocal Teaching Strategies
Mathematics:	Grades 1-8 – small group tutoring after school – Acuity, EveryDay Math, Impact Math, teacher-created remedial resources
Science:	N/A
Social Studies:	N/A
At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:	K-8 – individual and small group counseling, as needed, during the school day
At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	N/A
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	N/A
At-risk Health-related Services:	N/A

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. LAP attached to end of 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) K-8 Number of Students to be Served: 7 LEP Non-LEP

Number of Teachers 1 Other Staff (Specify) _____

School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview

Title III, Part A LEP Program

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

- I. Instructional Program for ELLs (including brief description of program, # of classes per program, language(s) of instruction, instructional strategies, etc). Program planning and management description to include identification and placement of ESL/Bilingual certified teachers, utilization of appropriate instructional materials (English and other languages) and technology, school-based supervisory support, use of external organizations, compliance with ELL-related mandates, and use of data to improve instruction:

Students are identified for ESL services through the Home Language Survey, LAB-R and NYSESLAT test. Students are placed in our ESL program at the choice of the parents and orientations are held at the beginning of the year and on an on-going basis throughout the year for new admits.

A. Curricular:

- Pull-out freestanding ESL program – **Imagine Learning English technology based program used**

- All classes conducted in English with support in students' native language
- Beginner & Intermediate levels – 360 minutes per week
- Advanced level – 180 minutes per week
- Development of social skills/assimilation into school community

B. Extracurricular:

- Sports & Arts – 4 of the 7 ESL students in grades 5-8 attend

- II. Parent/community: Describe parent/community involvement activities planned to meaningfully involve parents in their children's education and to inform them about the state standards and assessments.
- Consent letters sent home to parents with program description
 - Parent-teacher conferences/progress meetings
 - Parent workshops (conducted by Parent Coordinator who is fluent in 4 languages)
- III. Project Jump Start: Describe the programs and activities to assist newly enrolled ELL/LEP students prior to the first day of school.
- Conferences with ESL teacher and Parent Coordinator
- IV. Support services provided to LEP students: Describe other support structures that are in place in your school which are available to ELLs.
- AIS services when appropriate
 - Counseling when needed
 - Translated materials for parents

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.

- V. Professional Development (2009-2010 activities): Describe how staff will participate in ongoing, long-term staff development with a strong emphasis on the State learning standards and high impact differentiated and academic language development strategies.
- NYSESLAT training and scoring
 - Incorporation of ESL strategies into classroom/content area instruction
 - Visualization
 - Differentiated Instruction
 - Strategic Mini-Lessons

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

School: P.S. 175 BEDS Code: 11X175

**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		
Purchased services - High quality staff and curriculum development contracts.		
Supplies and materials - Must be supplemental. - Additional curricula, instructional materials. - Must be clearly listed.	\$241.00	Books on tape, headphones, book bins, leveled books
Educational Software (Object Code 199)		
Travel		
Other		
TOTAL	\$241.00	

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

Requirement under Chancellor's Regulations – for all schools

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

Part A: Needs Assessment Findings

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

A school created survey indicates that less than 3% of our overall parent population does not speak English in the home. Of that, 3 families are native Spanish speakers and information is translated for them both orally and in writing.

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.

According to our school created language survey, translation services are needed on a limited basis. Our Parent Coordinator is able to fulfill the needs of translation and interpretation for the school. The findings were reported to the school community through SLT and PTA meetings. When appropriate, letters are backpacked home in both English and Spanish.

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.

Our Parent Coordinator is available for the translation of all school generated parent letters. Any document that needs to be translated is submitted to the Parent Coordinator no later than 48 hours prior to dissemination.

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.

Our Parent Coordinator takes care of all Spanish and Portuguese phone calls from parents, as well as providing oral translation during the school day and during parent teacher conferences.

3. Describe how the school will fulfill Section VII of Chancellor's Regulations A-663 regarding parental notification requirements for translation and interpretation services. Note: The full text of Chancellor's Regulations A-663 (Translations) is available via the following link: <http://docs.nycenet.edu/docushare/dsweb/Get/Document-151/A-663%20Translation%203-27-06%20.pdf>.

Based on the Home Language Survey, we determine which families require translation and interpretation services. At our September orientation meeting for parents, Chancellor's Regulation A663 will be distributed in both English and Spanish. Translation and Interpretation posters are posted in the Main Lobby at all time

APPENDIX 4

NOT REQUIRED

APPENDIX 5

NOT REQUIRED

APPENDIX 6

NOT REQUIRED

**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)¹ 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

¹ To examine whether instruction was aligned to the New York state standards and assessments, teachers in the district completed the *Surveys of Enacted Curriculum* (SEC). Based on two decades of research funded by the National Science Foundation, the SEC are designed to facilitate the comparison of enacted (taught) curriculum to standards (intended) and assessed curriculum (state tests), using teachers' self-assessments. The data for each teacher consist of more than 500 responses. The disciplinary topic by cognitive-level matrix is presented in graphic form, which creates a common language for comparison and a common metric to maintain comparison objectivity.

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

– **English Language Learners**

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

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

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

- **Grade level meetings to review curriculum maps and pacing calendars to ensure horizontal and vertical alignment with state standards.**

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?

- **In accordance with suggestions from a workshop presented by Heidi Hayes Jacobs, our curriculum maps were reviewed and rewritten to include: Essential questions, concepts, content focus, ways to differentiate, the incorporation of both skills and strategies, and a variety of on-going formal and informal assessments.**
- **All teachers involved in the process of designing new curriculum maps consulted state standards for ELA. The ELA standards are explicitly written on the maps for each unit.**
- **The maps include a variety of resources specific to each unit of study and specific to each grade.**
- **Mid and end-year benchmarks have been developed for each grade level based on the ELA standards.**
- **Writing rubrics based on the Six Traits of Good Writing were collaboratively developed based on the curriculum maps and the standards. They are used as both an instructional and assessment tool.**

- The project for the year is to create exemplar and anchor papers for process writing in the genres specific grade that will act as benchmark guides to insure a common systemic understanding of standards and expectations.
- Teachers will continue to meet across grade levels to engage in the process of looking at student work to insure moderation of assessment.
- Teachers will continue to develop tiered writing tasks based on higher order thinking taxonomies to insure depth and rigor.
- Student learning goals in reading and writing are individualized for each student. Where appropriate, these goals were developed through collaboration with classroom teachers and support teachers (SETTS, ELL, AIS).
- To insure that guided reading happens in Grades K – 8, the new Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment Systems are being used in each grade. The reading benchmarks included on our curriculum maps are aligned with this system.
- Standards based programs (IIM, Teacher College Writing Units) are incorporated into units of study for each grade level.

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

1B. Mathematics

Background

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

Specific Math Alignment Issues:

MAY 2009

- 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.

- **Grade level meetings to review pacing calendars and resources to insure horizontal and vertical alignment with state standards.**

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

- **The Math staff developer works with teachers to revise the pacing calendars for Everyday Math and Impact Math to align with standards and to align with the state math assessments in March. This revision is also designed to allow more in depth instruction of appropriate grade level math strands.**
- **Teachers continue to work collaboratively to align instruction vertically across all grades to insure that there are no instructional gaps and to explicitly include indicators for the different process strands for each grade level.**
- **The math staff developer worked with teachers in Grade 7 and 8 to make adjustments necessitated by new Impact resources and textbooks.**
- **Student learning goals in math are individualized for each student. Where appropriate, these goals were developed through collaboration with classroom teachers and support teachers (SETTS, ELL, AIS).**

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

KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION

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

2A – ELA Instruction

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

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

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

- **Formal and informal classroom observations by administration and professional development support personnel.**
- **Grade level meetings to discuss and share best practices.**

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?

- **Teachers engage in a wide range of differentiated instructional techniques to best meet their students' needs based on a wide range of data (i.e. Acuity, ELA simulations, conferencing, Fountas & Pinnell benchmark assessments, rubrics, and classroom assessments). These include:**
 - **Flexible grouping**
 - **Guided reading and writing groups**
 - **Reciprocal Teaching Strategies**
 - **Literature circles**
 - **Individualized student learning goals in reading and writing**
 - **Conferences**
 - **Group projects**
 - **Tiered tasks**
 - **IEPs**
 - **Literacy Centers**
 - **Units, activities, and tasks are planned to incorporate multiple intelligences, learning styles, and higher order thinking skills.**
 - **Student choice is provided through the use of activity agendas and menus.**
 - **Class trips that are linked to units of study**
- **Through a range of professional development opportunities, teachers have increased their understanding of the relationship between using the above strategies and student engagement. Examples of high levels of student engagement are evidenced in our school through:**
 - **IIM research projects and celebrations**
 - **Writing celebrations**
 - **Gallery Walks**
 - **Interesting and creative bulletin boards**
 - **High levels of student performance**
 - **Class trips**
 - **Positive school and classroom environments**

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

2B – Mathematics Instruction

Auditors noted that although high academically focused class time was observed either frequently or extensively in 80 percent of K–8 mathematics classes, it was observed at this level only in 45 percent of the high school mathematics classes. Further, a high level of student engagement was observed either frequently or extensively in 52 percent of Grades K–8 and 35 percent of Grades 9–12 mathematics classrooms. *School Observation Protocol* (SOM²) and SEC results also shed light on some of the instructional practices in the mathematics classroom. The SOM noted that direct instruction in K-8 mathematics classes was frequently or extensively seen 75 percent of the time in Grades K–8 (and 65 percent of the time in Grades 9–12). Student activities other than independent seatwork and hands-on learning in the elementary grades were rarely if ever observed. Technology use in mathematics classes also was very low.

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

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

- **Formal and informal classroom observations by administration and professional development support personnel.**
- **Grade level and across grade level meetings to discuss and share best practices.**

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?

- **Teachers engage in a variety of differentiated instructional techniques to best meet their students' needs based on a wide range of data (i.e. Acuity, simulations, conferencing, observations, warm-ups, homework, quizzes, unit tests). These include:**
 - **Flexible grouping**
 - **Small guided group instruction**
 - **Individualized student learning goals**
 - **Group projects**

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

- **IEPs**
 - **Math centers**
 - **Tiered tasks**
 - **Hands-on learning: manipulatives and math tools**
 - **Activities and tasks are planned to incorporate multiple intelligences, learning styles, and higher order thinking skills.**
 - **Reciprocal Teaching Strategies are also incorporated into math instruction.**
 - **Math instruction includes reading and writing strategies with a focus on problem solving.**
 - **Middle school teachers use SmartBoards in math instruction.**
- **Through a range of professional development opportunities, teachers have increased their understanding of the relationship between using the above strategies and student engagement. Examples of high levels of student engagement are evidenced in our school through:**
 - **Interesting and creative bulletin boards**
 - **High levels of student performance**
 - **Positive school and classroom environment**

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

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.

- **Review of teacher staffing trends over the last four years.**

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?

- **There is a relatively low percentage of new or transfer teachers each year.**
- **New teachers are hired to replace retiring teachers.**
- **There is a high rate of longevity among the teachers in the school.**

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.

- **The administration sets goals with the ELL teacher, reviews the ELL instructional program for all grades, and determines the professional development needs of the ELL teacher.**

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

- **Our ESL teacher received professional development in Imagine Learning (ELL) and the Wilson Program (SETTS).**
- **Information about various ESL professional development workshops is disseminated to teachers by the administration.**
- **Teachers are encouraged to attend professional development workshops.**
- **Teachers are released during the school day to attend science workshops, as well as workshops in differentiated instruction.**
- **Teachers are encouraged to check their email accounts for monthly professional development opportunities offered through the city.**

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

KEY FINDING 5: DATA USE AND MONITORING—ELL INSTRUCTION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

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

- **The administration reviews the assessment binder maintained by the ELL teacher that includes data for all ELL students to determine the progress of ELL students.**

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

- **ESL teacher has access to all Acuity ELA and math reports**
- **The Imagine Learning program is individualized to meet the needs of ELL students. The program, which includes activities that students complete on the computer, also includes an on-going on-line assessment of student strengths and weaknesses.**
- **All teachers receive reports of data including NYSESLAT as soon as scores are available**
- **Standardized ELA and math data is disaggregated by ELL students and proficiency levels**
- **The ELL teacher articulates with classroom teachers to monitor the progress of ELL students and to share data about the progress of these students.**
- **A wide range of data is analyzed to monitor the progress of ELL students, including NYSESLAT, Acuity, math and ELA simulations, Fountas and Pinnell benchmark assessments, and other formative and summative assessments.**
- **The administration closely monitors the progress of all subgroups, including the ELLs to identify trends and to evaluate the effectiveness of our programs.**
- **The ELL teacher collaborates with classroom teachers to set specific goals for ELL students based on a wide range of data.**
- **The ELL teacher attends grade meetings in order to share information with teachers, target needs, and discuss strategies and interventions.**
- **Classroom teachers differentiate instruction and tier tasks and activities to meet the targeted needs of ELL students.**

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.

- **Relevancy was determined through an administrative review of the school professional development plan and the individual learning goals of the teachers. The review centered on the professional development that would enable teachers to meet the needs of IEP students**

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?

- **Student IEPs are accessible to all teachers in the school. Classroom teachers are familiar with the accommodations and modifications in the IEPs.**
- **The SBST shares the IEP accommodations with the teachers. There is collaboration between the team and the teachers regarding behavioral support plans for IEP students.**
- **The administrative closely monitors the progress of all subgroups, including IEP students to analyze trends and to evaluate the effectiveness of our programs.**
- **The focus of school-wide professional development is using data to differentiate instruction for all students. Classroom environments are designed to accommodate a variety of different instructional techniques, including flexible grouping. Activities, tasks, and resources are tiered to meet the individual learning goals of students and to appeal to a variety of learning modalities.**
- **SETTS teachers attend grade level meetings to share information with teachers, target needs, and discuss strategies and interventions.**

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

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

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

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

- **On-going administrative review of IEPs, assessment binders, lesson plans, formal and informal classroom observations, and individual student goals.**

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?

- **IEPs are accessible to all teachers. Classroom and SETSS teachers attend SBST meetings and are actively involved in the process of identifying specific accommodations and modifications. Their suggestions for behavioral plans and modifications for the classroom environment and instruction are considered in writing the IEP.**
- **There is a systemic focus on data-informed differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all students as well as students with special accommodations. Alignment between the goals, objectives, and modified promotion criteria on student IEPs and the content assessed on state assessments is achieved through instruction that differentiates content, process, and product. In addition, teachers consider student readiness, learning style, and interest in planning instruction. Some of these techniques include:**
 - **Flexible grouping**
 - **Guided reading and writing groups**
 - **Reciprocal Teaching Strategies**
 - **Literature circles**
 - **Individualized student learning goals**
 - **Conferences**
 - **Tiered tasks, activities, and resources**
 - **Tiered exit projects in science and social studies**
 - **Literacy centers**
 - **Activities and tasks that incorporate multiple intelligences, learning styles, and a taxonomy of thinking skills.**
 - **Student choice is provided through the use of activity agendas and menus.**
- **Teachers meet with students to discuss and identify individual learning goals that are targeted to meet the needs of the student.**

- **SETSS teachers formally and informally articulate with teachers regarding students with learning accommodations. SETSS teachers attend grade meetings to collaborate and discuss student progress.**
- **There is a monthly administrative review of assessment binders to monitor the progress of IEP students, review targeted skills and strategies, and discuss ways to differentiate to meet the needs of all students, as well as students with IEPs.**

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

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

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

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). **1**
2. Please describe the services you are planning to provide to the STH population with the Title I set-aside funds.

Funds are used to provide our STH population with at-risk counseling and academic intervention services.

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.

\$2,323.00

2009-2010 Language Allocation Policy

LAP Team Members

<u>Team Member's Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
Amy Lipson	Principal
Josephine Rondi	Assistant Principal
Jacquelyn Moscone	ESL Teacher
Tina Gisante	Parent Coordinator
Helen Masotti	Literacy Coach

Program Goals and Description

The English as a Second Language Program at P.S. 175 is a pull-out program with a total of eight students currently receiving ESL services. The language of instruction is English and students are grouped by grade level and sub-grouped according to language proficiency. The instructional components include English as a Second Language Arts, and content area instruction in English using ESL methodologies.

At P.S. 175 our Language Allocation Policy describes the ESL program in the school. The LAP policy implementation and refinement plans are included in the school's Comprehensive Education Plan. The parents of ELL students are provided with an orientation session on State Standards, assessments, school expectations and general program requirements for ELL learners at the beginning of the academic school year. Parents are invited and encouraged to attend PTA meetings and parent workshops.

Our school has established, as one of its primary goals, the improvement of ELL student achievement through a balanced approach to literacy, mathematics, and mastery of content area instruction. Full participation in extracurricular school activities is also a priority.

ELL students are evaluated each spring using the NYSESLAT. Student schedules ensure that all ESL students are provided with appropriate ESL services based on their proficiency levels. In accordance with CR Part 154 mandates, all students at the beginning or intermediate proficiency levels receive 360-minutes of ESL instruction per week. Those at the advanced proficiency level receive 180 minutes of ESL instruction and 180 minutes of ELA instruction per week. Any child who is newly admitted is administered the Home Language Survey. Based on the information provided on the survey, new students are administered the LAB-R to determine eligibility for ESL services.

There are currently no SIFE students at P.S. 175. In the event that an ELL SIFE student is admitted to the school, provisions will be made for extensive supplementary services through the extended day program.

To date, we have 5 students who have been in an English language school system for three years or less. 1 student has been in an English language school system for 4-6 years, and 2 students for 7 years. 2 of the students receive SETSS services.

Our ESL Model

Based on a review of the four modalities - listening, speaking, reading, and writing - it has been determined that our ELL students' greatest needs are in the areas of reading and writing. In addition, our review of scores in the content areas (ELA, math, social studies and science) indicates that the development of language and vocabulary, in these areas needs to be addressed. Academic language acquisition is also an area of need. These areas will be addressed through the alignment of ESL

instruction with our literacy curriculum maps, the development of oral language skills, use of content area word walls and the scaffolding of instruction.

The ESL teacher uses the components of a balanced approach to learning that includes listening, speaking, reading aloud, shared and guided reading and writing, and partner and small group work. The ESL teacher uses these strategies to develop English language skills and to teach content area information. All instructional materials are aligned with the New York State Standards.

Our ELL population consists of 1 beginner, 3 students at the intermediate level and 4 students at the advanced level (See *Addendum #1, Table A* for the total number of students per grade and languages spoken). When looking at parent choice letters, all parents chose the ESL model. Students are grouped homogeneously for targeted areas of instruction according to the LAB-R and NYSESLAT. The students participate in an instructional program that is aligned with mandated ESL, ELA content learning standards, and the core curriculum. The ESL teacher works with small groups providing the students with task-oriented situations that guide the production of both oral and written language. Through the use of common preparation periods, the ESL teacher is able to articulate and collaboratively plan with classroom teachers. This allows for consistency in both the regular and ESL classrooms. School-wide literacy blocks are devoted to providing intensive reading and writing instruction to all students.

ESL methodologies are used to develop cognitive academic language skills necessary for content area success. The instructional program for English language learners provides for the development of abstract concepts through concrete applications using models, manipulatives, charts, pictures, think-alouds, accountable talk and critical thinking skills.

Instruction is aligned to ESL and ELA standards. The ESL teacher scaffolds the use academic language to support students' participation and access to information. The instructional program used is *Imagine Learning English*, which is a computer-based instructional program that teaches children English and also develops their literacy skills. Students receive one-on-one instruction through hundreds of engaging activities specifically designed to meet their individual needs, so they progress quickly. The research-based language acquisition curriculum provides strategic first language support that is customized to the needs of each student, as well as reports to the teacher that documents student progress. Trade books that help promote English language acquisition are also used.

In grades K-2, ECLAS and the Fountas & Pinnell assessments are used to assess literacy skills. The data collected from these assessments provides information to both the classroom and ESL teachers that supports literacy instructions for our ELL students. The data across grades and proficiency levels indicates that the greatest area of weakness in our students is in writing. This pattern is reflected in how writing curriculum is developed across grades levels and where the emphasis is put in academic intervention. Periodic assessment results are used to focus instruction around areas of student need. Most of our students become proficient on the NYSESLAT within three years which is an indicator of the success of the program we have in place.

Quality Instruction for ELLs

Content area instruction, aligned with the NYC and NYS standards in mathematics, science, social studies, and technology is provided in English. Instruction is supported by instructional materials according to the students' proficiency levels and needs. Instruction is designed to mediate the learning of various proficiency classifications: newcomers, long-term ELLs, beginners, intermediate and advanced proficiency levels. The ESL teacher differentiates instruction to meet the diverse learning needs of all students.

An analysis of the content performance data for beginning students indicates that work is needed in all four of the learning modalities. Content area teachers scaffold academic language and complex content material to support student participation. Explicit ESL strategies and visual aids are used to support

student understanding. Students are exposed to many forms of print including fiction, nonfiction, newspapers, charts, and pictures.

In our school the needs of second language learners are addressed in many of our professional development sessions. Some of the topics include differentiating literacy and mathematics instruction to meet the needs of second language learners, strategies for helping second language learners access and develop academic language, and specific ESL methodologies.

To further provide ELLs with language acquisition opportunities, non-ESL licensed teachers are prepared with the methodologies and techniques that will facilitate and enhance instruction. Our teachers meet the mandated 7.5 hours of mandated ESL training. ESL professional development offers specific scaffolds to help our ELLs reach academic standards. Our program ensures that our teachers deliver lessons that are aligned with ESL and ELA standards. It is through ESL strategy integration within the curriculum and through explicit ESL instruction that our students will continue to demonstrate academic progress in the English language.

Content area academic intervention services are offered to all students in all subjects in which ESL students are indicating a need. Students work with content area teachers in small groups; the language of instruction is English.

Our ESL students have access to and participate in all academic and non-academic after school programs including Extended Day for academic intervention, Sports & Arts, and Arts Enrichment.

Support services are provided to students who reach proficiency levels and exit our ESL program. These support services include peer tutoring, small group instruction, after school programs and academic intervention services.

P.S. 175 follows all mandates of CR Part 154 as follows:

1. Parents of new arrivals must complete a Home Language Survey. Our Guidance Counselor conducts the informal oral interview and formal initial assessment in English and our Parent Coordinator, who speaks fluent Spanish, Italian and Portuguese, conducts this interview and assessment in the native language if needed. The Home Language Survey is administered by the school secretary with assistance from the Parent Coordinator when necessary. The completed HLS is reviewed by our Assistant Principal who determines next steps. The NYSESLAT is administered in the spring to all eligible students.
2. During the registration process, parents are informed that the only program choice available at P.S. 175 is ESL. The other programs are described to the parents and other options are presented. The school will reach out to OSEPO should a parent want another program.
3. Entitlement letters are sent home in student backpacks. Classroom teachers make follow-up phone call if Parent Surveys and/or Program Selection forms are not returned.
4. The only program available at P.S. 175 is ESL so all students are placed there unless a parent indicates that they would like a different choice; referral to OSEPO follows.
5. 100% of parents choose to have their children in an ESL program at P.S. 175.
6. The program model offered at P.S. 175 is totally aligned with parent requests.

P.S. 175 has a very strong parent involvement component. Parents of all students, including ELLs participate in PTA meetings and committees, chaperone class trips and participate in other school events (i.e. Family Night, Spring Festival). Our Parent Coordinator establishes a strong relationship with all ELL families and evaluates parent needs through informal assessment measures (conversations during Parent Teacher Conferences, PTA meetings and Family Nights). Our parental involvement activities are reflective of the needs of both our parents and students. These activities include strategies for parents to support student learning, internet safety, and anti-bullying. Our Parent Coordinator is at all events to provide interpretation when needed.

Our LAP Team revisits this plan yearly to ensure that we are meeting the needs of our targeted ELL population.

Addendum #1

Table A - ESL Students by Grade

GRADE	# OF ESL STUDENTS	LANGUAGE SPOKEN
K	0	
1	0	
2	0	
3	4	Spanish
4	1	Spanish
5	0	
6	0	
7	3	Spanish
8	0	