PS/MS 194

2009-2010

SCHOOL
COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)

SCHOOL: 11X194
ADDRESS: 2365 WATERBURY AVE
TELEPHONE: 718-892-5270
FAX: 718-892-2495

TABLE OF CONTENTS

*As you develop your school's CEP, this table of contents will be **automatically** updated to refect 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 10

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) ..... Error! Bookmark not defined.

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.

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: 194 **SCHOOL NAME:** PS/MS 194

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 2365 Waterbury Avenue

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 718-892-5270 **FAX:** 718-892-2495

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Elmer Myers **EMAIL ADDRESS:** emyers@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION/TITLE	PRINT/TYPE NAME
SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON:	Tanya Carrion
PRINCIPAL:	Elmer Myers
UFT CHAPTER LEADER:	Richard Charap
PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT:	Tanya Carrion
STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE: *(Required for high schools)*	N/A

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL SUPPORT ORGANIZATION (SSO) INFORMATION

DISTRICT: 11 **SSO NAME:** Leadership LSO

SSO NETWORK LEADER: Irene Rogan

SUPERINTENDENT: Elizabeth White

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

Directions: Each school is required to form a School Leadership Team (SLT) as per State Education Law Section 2590. SLT membership must include an equal number of parents and staff (students and CBO members are not counted when assessing this balance requirement), and ensure representation of all school constituencies. Chancellor's Regulation A-655 requires a minimum of ten members on each team. Each SLT members should be listed separately in the left hand column on the chart below. Please specify any position held by a member on the team (e.g., SLT Chairperson, SLT Secretary) and the constituent group represented (e.g., parent, staff, student, or CBO). The signatures of SLT members on this page indicates their participation in the development of the Comprehensive Educational Plan and confirmation that required consultation has occurred in the aligning of funds to support educational programs (Refer to revised Chancellor's Regulations A-655; available on the NYCDOE website at http://schools.nyc.gov/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
Elmer Myers	*Principal or Designee	
Richard Charap	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Tanya Carrion	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
Shirley Berrios	Title I Parent Representative *(suggested, for Title I schools)*	
JoAnn Reyes	DC 37 Representative	
Marianne Trolio-Ernst	Teacher	
Jayne Zanelotti	Teacher	
Beth Perricone	Teacher	
Santos Rivera	Parent	
Lisa Vasquez	Parent	
Trace O'Campo Gaskin	Parent	
Ruth Nimchick	Parent	

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

* Core (mandatory) SLT members.

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

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

The mission of the PS/MS 194 school community is to provide every student with a quality education that will prepare them for the rigors and challenges of high school, college and life. Guided by the principles of learning, students will be challenged to think critically and become active participants in the learning process. We do this in the spirit of collaboration with educators and parents through our professional learning community.

PS/MS 194 is located in a Northeast Bronx neighborhood that is at once industrial, commercial, and residential. Visitors to the building will be impressed with the bright, clean, modern four-story structure, which boasts a diversified multimedia center in its library and a building design that lends itself to creative use of space. A walk through the wide corridor areas will reveal alcoves in which carpets and white boards have been placed for instructional use by Academic Intervention Specialist (AIS) with targeted students.

Our school is very proud of our successes. We have been a "School in Good Standing" for every year of our existence. We have received a "Well Developed" both years on our Quality Review. We have earned an "A" on our 2008-2009 Progress Report. We had 85% of our parents respond to our learning environment survey. These parents believe that we provide a safe environment with high expectations and opportunities for parental involvement. Finally, we firmly believe we are providing our students a well-rounded educational experience in which all students receive instruction in art, music and physical education.

Every school community has its challenges. The two greatest challenges have been over-crowding and under-funding.

PS/MS 194 has grown to a population of over 1300 students for this school year. When that number is combined with students from P168, we have almost 1400 students being educated in a building that was designed for 950-1000 students. This has created challenges during lunchtime and scheduling the use of the gym and auditorium, has brought about the conversion of spaces into classrooms, and most importantly, has caused our class sizes to swell to over 30 students.

Our second challenge is to accomplish more with less. Since the DOE has transitioned to a Fair Student Funding model, we have been informed that we receive $1,000,000 less than we should under the DOE's formulas. We have been informed that there is not enough money to fully fund our school. In addition, our school has received an additional $103,368 cut during FY08, an additional $111,456 cut in FY09, and an additional $500,000 for FY10. We are, therefore, operating with 1.1 million less than what the formula specifies.

PS/MS 194 has created and maintains partnerships with YMCA, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, New York Junior Tennis League, Chess in the Schools, Bronx Arts Ensemble, LEGO Robotics, Teacher's College Reading and Writing Project, 100 Book Challenge, P

ositive Behaviors Interventions and Supports, Learning Leaders and Westchester Square RAIN.

CEP Section III: School Profile
Part B: School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot (Version 2010-1B - April 2010)

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT									
School Name:	PS/MS 194								
District:	11	**DBN:**	11X194	**School BEDS Code:**	321100010194				
DEMOGRAPHICS									
Grades Served:	Pre-K		3	√	7	√	11		
	K	√	4	√	8	√	12		
	1	√	5	√	9		Ungraded	√	
	2	√	6	√	10				

Enrollment			
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Pre-K	0	0	0
Kindergarten	124	124	124
Grade 1	137	135	144
Grade 2	156	142	152
Grade 3	123	164	144
Grade 4	144	138	175
Grade 5	133	151	138
Grade 6	126	152	161
Grade 7	148	150	150
Grade 8	173	149	148
Grade 9	0	0	0
Grade 10	0	0	0
Grade 11	0	0	0
Grade 12	0	0	0
Ungraded	0	2	2
Total	1264	1307	1338

Special Education Enrollment:			
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
# in Self-Contained Classes	11	10	9
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	40	41	54
Number all others	66	82	89
These students are included in the enrollment information above.			

English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment: (BESIS Survey)			
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
# in Transitional Bilingual Classes	9	0	0
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0
# receiving ESL services only	169	185	199

Attendance - *% of days students attended*:			
(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	92.3	93.4	TBD

Student Stability - *% of Enrollment*:			
(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	91.7	94.7	TBD

Poverty Rate - *% of Enrollment*:			
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	90.8	92.2	90.6

Students in Temporary Housing - *Total Number*:			
(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	8	21	TBD

Recent Immigrants - *Total Number*:			
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	21	24	21

Suspensions *(OSYD Reporting)* - *Total Number:*			
(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Principal Suspensions	82	56	TBD
Superintendent Suspensions	15	15	TBD

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

Number of Staff - *Includes all full-time staff:*			
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Number of Teachers	89	92	TBD

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	2	20	Number of Administrators and Other Professionals		15	14	TBD
These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.				Number of Educational Paraprofessionals		4	3	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
	5	5	TBD	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school		100.0	100.0	TBD
				% more than 2 years teaching in this school		60.7	69.6	TBD
Ethnicity and Gender - *% of Enrollment:*				% more than 5 years teaching anywhere		49.4	51.1	TBD
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	*% Masters Degree or higher*		84.0	89.0	TBD
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.2	0.2	0.0	% core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED		95.5	98.3	TBD
Black or African American	13.0	13.0	12.2					
Hispanic or Latino	59.2	59.4	57.8					
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	23.7	23.1	25.5					
White	4.0	4.2	4.1					
Male	51.8	52.8	52.5					
Female	48.2	47.2	47.5					
2009-10 TITLE I STATUS								
√	Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP)							
	Title I Targeted Assistance							
	Non-Title I							
Years the School Received Title I Part A Funding:				2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	
				√	√	√	√	
NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY								
SURR School (Yes/No)		If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:						
Overall NCLB/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:			
Elementary/Middle Level		**Secondary Level**	
ELA:	√	ELA:	
Math:	√	Math:	
Science:	√	Graduation Rate:	

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

	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level			
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	√sh	√					
Limited English Proficient	√	√					
Economically Disadvantaged	√	√					
Student groups making AYP in each subject	8	8	1				

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY			
Progress Report Results – 2008-09		**Quality Review Results – 2008-09**	
Overall Letter Grade:	A	**Overall Evaluation:**	NR
Overall Score:	87.8	**Quality Statement Scores:**	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	
School Environment:	10.9	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	
(Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)		Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	
School Performance:	21.7	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	
(Comprises 25% of the Overall Score)		Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	
Student Progress:	45.4		
(Comprises 60% of the Overall Score)			
Additional Credit:	9.8		

KEY: AYP STATUS	**KEY: QUALITY REVIEW SCORE**
√ = Made AYP	Δ = Underdeveloped
$\sqrt{}^{SH}$ = 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
KEY: PROGRESS REPORT DATA	◊ = Outstanding
NR = Data Not Reported	NR = No Review Required

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

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

** 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?

Data Summary for PS/MS 194

Student Performance

	2009 % 3's & 4's	2009 Median Proficiency	2008 % 3's & 4's	2008 Median Proficiency	2007 % 3's & 4's	2007 Median Proficiency
English Language Arts	**74.7**	3.21	**56.8**	3.09	**49.6**	2.98
Mathematics	**88.5**	3.63	**78.8**	3.47	**71.6**	3.41

Student Progress

	ELA 2009	Math 2009	ELA 2008	Math 2008	ELA 2007	Math 2007
% 1 Yr. Progress	**67.4**	**65.5**	**58.6**	**56.6**	**45.1**	**48.3**
% Lowest 1/3 w/1 Yr Progress	**87.8**	**73.5**	**81.6**	**61.6**		
Avg. Change for 1's and 2's	**0.41**	**0.41**	**0.21**	**0.20**	**-0.03**	**0.01**
Avg. Change for 3's and 4's	**0.02**	**0.00**	**(0.05)**	**(0.08)**		

Narrative Summary of our needs

The first chart above shows student performance in the areas of English Language Arts and Mathematics for the 2007, 2008 and 2009 school years. You can see the progress that our school has made with all students in both ELA and Mathematics. In 2007, 49.6% of students were performing at or above grade level (level 3 and 4) in English Language Arts. That number improved to 56.8% in 2008 and to 74.7% last year, in 2009. This is an improvement of 25.1% over the previous three years. In mathematics, 71.6% of our students were performing at or above grade level in 2007, which increased to 78.8% in 2008, and to 88.5% in 2009. This represents an increase of 16.9% over the three year period.

The second chart above shows student progress in the areas of English Language Arts and Mathematics for the 2007, 2008, and 2009 school years. The numbers represent the percentage of students in grades 3-8 who made at least one year of progress (as measured by the NYS assessments). Over the same three year period, 2007-2009, the percentage of students making at least one year of progress in ELA has increased from 45.1% in 2007, to 58.6% in 2008, and to 67.4% in 2009. In mathematics, the percentage of students making a full year of progress has increased from 48.3% in 2007, to 56.6% in 2008, and to 65.5% in 2009. What this chart demonstrates is that more students are making progress (as measured by the NYS assessments) on a yearly basis in both ELA and Mathematics.

Our greatest impediment to continuous school improvement is funding. Our school's funding level has decreased per student in each of the previous two years, while we have continued to improve. A funding cut of over $500,000 this school year and the resulting cuts to personnel or programs may impact student performance. Since the shift to the Fair Student Funding formula system, our school has been one of the most under funded schools in NYC. We are currently funded at approximately $7200 per student, while having 92.2% of our students in poverty. This compares to almost $15,000 per student for another K-8 school in our "peer index".

The funding issue has impacted class size, the amount of materials we can purchase, the number of cluster teachers we can hire, class trips, educational consultants, the amount of technology we can purchase and many other items. All of these items impact students' academic performance and the educational experience that we are able to provide.

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: A closer look at the school's data shows that students continue to improve in both English Language Arts and Mathematics, but are not progressing as much in writing. Therefore, one of our goals this year is to develop benchmark writing rubrics and improve the writing of all students in grades K-8. By the end of the school year, each grade will develop rubrics to evaluate student writing in multiple genres. By June 2010, students will demonstrate progress in writing as measured by a 5% increase in students scoring at levels 3 or 4 on the grade specific writing rubric.

Goal 2: A well-developed Science curriculum has the ability to develop students into innovative, logical, critical thinkers who possess a 21st century vision and who can utilize technology and the scientific method to solve problems. Therefore, our second goal is to utilize the NYC science curriculum and implement this science curriculum across all grades, K-8, over the next two school years. Evidence of having achieved this goal would be the inclusion of the curriculum in teacher lesson and unit plans, and the use of FOSS kits as observed during classroom visits and teacher observations.

Goal 3: The percent of students at PS/MS 194 scoring at or above grade level has increased 25.1% in ELA and 16.9% in Math over the past three years. In order to continue to build upon this growth, it is necessary that staff be proficient at not only interpreting the data to identify areas of strength and areas in need of improvement, but also at using the data to drive their instruction to meet the individual needs of their students. For this reason, another goal for the 2009-2010 school year is to develop teachers' expertise in the effective utilization of data in order to expand their teaching repertoire and use of differentiated instruction. Progress toward meeting this goal will be evidenced by a 30% increase among staff in the use of ARIS and the incorporation of differentiated instruction into daily lesson plans.

Goal 4: It is the school's responsibility to not only educate children academically, but to focus on the whole child and help them develop into good citizens. PBIS is a systemic approach that seeks to motivate students by tuning in to their individual strengths and encouraging them to use positive qualities as a basis for citizenship as both students and a future workforce. Our fourth goal is to decrease negative behaviors with the full implementation of the PBIS approach. Success with this goal will be measured by a 10% reduction in the number of occurrences recorded by the OORS or SWIS systems. Occurrences will be evaluated in January, April and June.

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

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

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

Annual Goal *Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.*	To develop benchmark writing rubrics and improve the writing of students in grades K-8. By the end of the school year, each grade will develop rubrics to evaluate student writing in multiple genres. By June 2010, students will demonstrate progress in writing as measured by a 5% increase in students scoring at levels 3 or 4 on the grade specific writing rubric.
Action Plan *Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.*	• AUSSIE consultant and literacy coaches will develop a plan with the cabinet to coordinate benchmark writing development throughout school year. • Teachers will be trained in benchmark writing rubrics to gain a level of understanding, expertise and reliability in use of said rubric. • Grade level teams of teachers will collaborate during PLTs to develop grade specific benchmark writing rubrics in multiple genres. • Students will be required to produce benchmark writing samples at specified times. • All students work will be assessed using writing rubric. • Lessons will be developed to address class and individual student needs. • Additional writing samples will be produced by students to measure growth in writing throughout school year. • Literacy coaches; Ms. Kawas and Ms. Perricone; will work directly with Mr. Green, the AUSSIE consultant, to follow through on professional development issues arising from Mr. Green's consultancy visits. • Assistant Principals and Principal will meet with Mr. Green for approximately 30 minutes during each visit to evaluate the efficacy of his efforts and plan accordingly.

Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule *Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.*	• Use of Title I funding to pay for AUSSIE consultant 30 days $34,500 • Use of Title I funding to pay for substitutes to allow teachers to attend or meet for professional development • Use of Contract for Excellence money to pay for both literacy coaches 2x $95,443
Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment *Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains*	• All students will produce writing pieces at specified times of the year. • Student writing will be assessed using the writing rubrics created by grade level teams. This work will be done during PLTs and extended day professional development. • Findings from the evaluation of student benchmark writing samples will be used to design subsequent units of study that address class and individual needs.

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

Annual Goal *Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.*	To utilize the NYC science curriculum and implement this science curriculum across all grades, K-8, over the next two school years. Evidence of having achieved this goal would be the inclusion of the curriculum in teacher lesson and unit plans, and the use of FOSS kits as observed during classroom visits and teacher observations.
Action Plan *Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.*	• Science teachers will meet in September 2009 to outline the steps to implement the science curriculum. • Cabinet and Tier III committee will determine a timeline for professional development and implementation of the science curriculum. • The budget will be used to allow professional development and meetings to occur after school as needed. • Additional materials will be purchased as needed. • Plans will be developed to conduct a science fair for all students, K-8 • Timeline: ▪ September-October : Staff trained in K-2 FOSS Kits ▪ November: Roll out of Science Fair plans and PD on election day ▪ November-March : Follow up with grade level support for the implementation and planning of the science fair ▪ March: K-8 science fair ▪ May-June: 4th and 8th grade NYS Science assessment ▪ September 2010-June 2011: Full implementation K-8 of science curriculum
Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule *Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.*	• Hire substitutes for staff members attending staff development • 10 days = $1540
Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment *Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains*	• Teacher lesson and unit plans are evidently planned with the NYS standards based science curriculum. • Teacher observations and walk-throughs reveal incorporated science core curriculum materials. • FOSS kits will be depleted through the use in relevant classrooms.

Subject/Area (where relevant): **Differentiated Instruction**

Annual Goal *Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.*	To develop teachers' expertise in the effective utilization of data in order to expand their teaching repertoire and use of differentiated instruction. Progress toward meeting this goal will be evidenced by a 30% increase among staff in the use of ARIS and the incorporation of differentiated instruction into daily lesson plans.
Action Plan *Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.*	• Start school year with presentation of the school's progress in the last three years with regards to subgroups: boys v. girls, ethnicities, ELLs and Special Education students. • Train teachers in the use of ARIS in September and again during Election Day. • Meet with teachers and literacy and math coaches to review data and design targeted lessons to address specific needs of students. • Give 2 Math and ELA test simulations. Train teachers to score the exams. • School's data specialist will provide teachers with detailed item analysis reports from each simulation. Teachers will meet during grade PLTs and extended day professional development to review the data and develop strategic lessons to assist specific subgroups. • Development of Data Binders by all teachers in which teachers house all relevant student testing data. • Data from the simulations will be used to target specific students for inclusion in the after-school Test Sophistication programs in ELA and Mathematics as well as the Saturday Academy Enrichment Program • Offer PD in gender learning styles, brain development, leveling libraries across the content areas and conferencing with students.
Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule *Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.*	• Due to the 4.9% reduction (approximately $500,000) in our budget, we will need to accomplish this goal without the consultant that supported the work previously. • Literacy and math coaches and the data specialist will meet routinely with teachers during grade PLTs to review and analyze data. • C4E money used to pay for 12 after-school teachers. • C4E money used to pay for 9 Saturday Academy teachers.
Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment *Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains*	• Teacher lesson plans/unit plans are evidently planned with differentiated strategies which consider student groups listed above. • Teacher observations and walkthroughs reveal incorporated lessons targeted in professional development sessions. • Libraries are leveled and possess a variety of genres.

Subject/Area (where relevant): **School-wide Behaviors**

Annual Goal *Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.*	To decrease negative behaviors by the full implementation of the PBIS approach. Success with this goal will be measured by a 10% reduction in the number of occurrences recorded by the OORS or SWIS systems. Occurrences will be evaluated in January, April and June.
Action Plan *Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.*	• Purchase and implement "SWIS" – school wide information system • Identify Ms. Russo, K-2 guidance counselor, as Internal PBIS Coach. • Establish a PBIS steering committee, made up of teachers, parents, guidance, deans, and administrators to oversee the implementation of PBIS. Committee will meet bi-weekly throughout the school year. • Conduct surveys of staff to gain knowledge of behavioral concerns twice yearly; September and February. • Plan professional development to educate teachers on the intricacies PBIS for Election Day and extended day professional development • Develop lesson plans to address behavioral issues discovered through "SWIS" data • Work with city PBIS implementation team to further strengthen our approach
Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule *Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.*	• Title I money used for purchasing materials (positive "reinforcers") for PBIS store and cart ($10,000) • Title I or legislative grant money used for purchasing class rewards, such as pizza or ice cream parties. ($10,000) • Per Session for staff for different events
Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment *Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains*	• Minutes from PBIS committee meetings • Data from SWIS system; January, April, and June • Data from OORS and SOHO systems; January, April, and June • Learning Environment Survey results • Surveys of staff members

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	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS
K	30	30	N/A	N/A				
1	30	30	N/A	N/A				
2	50	50	N/A	N/A				
3	50	50	N/A	N/A				
4	50	50	**30**	**30**				
5	50	50	**50**	**50**				
6	50	50	50	50				
7	50	50	50	50				
8	50	50	50	50				
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:	**Meets small groups on a daily basis to improve ELA skills, including fluency, comprehension, predictions, drawing conclusions. Programs and strategies used; Reader's Theater, Soar to Success, Benchmark Educational Bags, Houghton Mifflin etc.** **Students in grades K-6 (30 per grade) receive instruction on a daily basis. An additional 35 students receive small group support for 150 minutes per week after school.**
Mathematics:	**K-2 The AIS for math is a pull-out program of six at similar academic levels. The service is provided during the school day and extended day.** **Grades 3-8: The AIS for mathematics is a push-in program. The service is provided during the school day, extended day and after-school.** **Students are provided with additional math instruction during extended day programming.**
Science:	**Students are provided with additional science instruction during extended day programming.**
Social Studies:	**Meets small groups on a daily basis to increase grade appropriate content knowledge. Use various non-fiction and historical fiction texts, primary and secondary sources.** **Students are provided with additional social studies instruction during extended day programming.**
At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:	**At-risk services are provided by the 2 guidance counselors and 1 sapis worker on an as needed basis, after mandated students have been seen.**
At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	**At-risk services are provided based on time available and referrals by the school administration.**
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	**At-risk services are provided based on time available and referrals by the school administration.**
At-risk Health-related Services:	

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

Type of Program: Freestanding ESL
Number of LEP Students Served in 2008-2009: 198

A. Language Allocation Policy Team Composition

SSO/District 11	School PS/MS 194
Principal Mr. Elmer Myers	Assistant Principal Ms.Sifuentes, Ms.Young
Coach Ms. L. Kawas	Coach
ESL Teacher Ms. D. Kuszel	Guidance Counselor Mr. Saez, Ms. Russo
Teacher/Subject Area	Parent
Teacher/Subject Area	Parent Coordinator Ms. L. Lombardi
Related Service Provider Ms. Velasquez, Ms. Schrader	SAF
Network Leader	Other

B. Teacher Qualifications

Please provide a report of all staff members' certifications referred to in this section

Number of Certified ESL Teachers	4	Number of Certified Bilingual Teachers	0	Number of Certified NLA/FL Teachers	0
Number of Content Area Teachers with Bilingual Extensions	0	Number of Special Ed. Teachers with Bilingual Extensions	0	Number of Teachers of ELLs without ESL/Bilingual Certification	0

C. School Demographics

Total Number of Students in School	1310	Total Number of ELLs	206	ELLs as Share of Total Student Population (%)	15.73%

Upon registration parents are given the Home Language Identification Survey. The office staff helps with interpretation (Spanish) where necessary, as well as assuring that all information is filled out. When possible the ESL Coordinator is present to conduct interviews with parents and children to determine the best placement for the student. The Pupil Accounting Secretary is responsible for checking the Home Language Identification Survey and entering the correct OTELE code as per the HILS and any notations made by the ESL Coordinator. Within the first ten days of school potential English Language Learners are tested using the Language Assesment Battery- Revised (Lab-R). Those Spanish speaking Ells who don't pass the Lab-R are then given the Spanish Lab. At this time a letter is sent home determining eligibility for the ESL Program. Students are given a non-entitlement or parent orientation /parent survey letter, in their native language.

At the parent orientation meeting, Supervisors, ESL Staff and the Parent Coordinator are present. Brochures and a presentation is made to inform parents on all possible options, Freestanding ESL, Bilingual and Dual Language Programs. A DVD outlining this process is also shown to help

parents get a clear picture of their choices. All information is made available in the parent's native language. After collecting the parent survey forms, students eligible for services receive a placement letter.

All Ells at PS/MS 194 are assessed using the New York State English A Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT). English As A Second Language teachers work with Ells for their allotted time periods to help students improve their skills in speaking, listening, reading and writing and help them prepare for the NYSESLAT. Those students that do not pass the NYSESLAT are given a continued entitlement letter and receive services until proficiency is reached.

After determining the ESL eligibility of the newly admitted students Parent Survey and Program Selection forms are distributed. With the help of the parent coordinator, classroom teachers and ESL staff and incentives the timely return of these letters is insured as well as monitored. If necessary letters are redistributed and phone calls are made to homes from where forms have not been returned.

At the orientation meeting the parents are informed that PS/MS 194 offers a Freestanding ESL Program. If, however parents are interested in a bilingual or dual language program all accommodations are made to help find that student and alternate placement. All parent orientation information is relayed to parents in their native languages. Students who do not hand in a completed parent survey form are given another copy or a call is made home in their native language.

The general trend over the years among parents seems to be the selection of the English As A Second Language Program as the preferred choice. In September, the first ELL Parent meeting was held to discuss various English language instruction options available, both within and outside the school. As in previous years, a vast majority of parents selected the ESL program, as it currently exists at PS/MS 194. Arrangements were also made to accommodate the small minority who preferred other models. The ESL teachers and parent coordinator have also met with parents during scheduled meetings, parent-teacher conferences, and preparation periods to further discuss and inform the dynamic instructional needs of the school's Ells. This trend is obviously reflected in the data. Of a total of forty parents, 28 chose ESL as their first preference, 11 selected TBE as their first choice, and only 1 parent selected DL as their first choice.

A. ELL Programs

ELL Program Breakdown										
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Transitional Bilingual Education (60%:40% → 50%:50% → 75%:25%)										0
Dual Language (50%:50%)										0
Freestanding ESL										
Self-Contained										0
Push-In/Pull-Out	2	4	2	4	3	3	3	3	2	26
Total	2	4	2	4	3	3	3	3	2	26

B. ELL Years of Service and Programs

Number of ELLs by Subgroups					
All ELLs	206	Newcomers (ELLs receiving service 0–3 years)	126	Special Education	20
SIFE	5	ELLs receiving service 4–6 years	46	Long–Term (completed 6 years)	7

	ELLs by Subgroups									
	ELLs (0-3 years)			ELLs (4-6 years)			Long-Term ELLs (completed 6 years)			
	All	SIFE	Special Education	All	SIFE	Special Education	All	SIFE	Special Education	Total
TBE										0
Dual Language										0
ESL	126	5	6	46		10	8		3	180
Total	126	0	6	46	0	10	8	0	3	180

Number of ELLs in a TBE program who are in alternate placement: 0

C. Home Language Breakdown and ELL Programs

Freestanding English as a Second Language										
Number of ELLs by Grade in Each Language Group										
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	TOTAL
Spanish	12	12	19	25	17	14	14	6	7	126
Chinese								1		1
Russian										0
Bengali	3	8	6	12	4	8	4	2	4	51
Urdu						1				1
Arabic	1		4	2	1	2	3	3	1	17
Haitian Creole										0
French	1	1								2
Korean										0
Punjabi										0
Polish										0

Albanian										0
Other	2	2		1		1	1	1		8
TOTAL	19	23	29	40	22	26	22	13	12	206

Programming and Scheduling Information

English Language Learners (ELLs) currently compose 15.7 % of the total student population. They are instructed via "push-in"/"pull-out" model, whereby an ESL teacher visits the mainstream classroom and provides cross-content support to his or her heterogeneous group, during the mandated number of minutes per week. In some cases, ELLs are also "pulled out" and worked with in small groups to ensure adequate progress in all four learning modalities: speaking, listening, reading and writing. Though the language of instruction in all scenarios is English, teachers provide Native language support whenever possible. The students, who have a strong foundation in their first language, are also provided with dual language glossaries. Our ESL teachers use a rich blend of various approaches such as TPR, realia, language learning experience, communicative approach as well as Balanced Literacy. Our school uses the freestanding ESL program, where Ells work with TESOL teachers towards attaining proficiency in English. Once our Ells attain proficiency, we provide extra support through our Academic Intervention Services Team. Former Ells continue to receive small group instruction in ELA and Math.

We are implementing a new program this year called, *Imagine Learning English*. This computer based program is highly individualized and rich in visual graphics. It sets the pace according to the needs of the students as well as verbal scaffolds in the Native language. Supervisors and teachers are able to monitor progress through individualized reports. In addition to this new programs all Ells are given the opportunity to participate in an ESL After- School Program twice a week. We also provide extra instructional support to our struggling Ells during the extended day program, twice a week.

Time is dedicated each week to working with newly arrived students in particular, and the SIFE potentiality of each student is considered when forming instructional groups. The Milestones Newcomer Series by Cengage Learning is employed for students with emerging- low literacy skills, and a focus on developing Basic Intercommunication Skills (BICS) as well as Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) drives the instruction of all new arrivals. After-school programs also run twice a week, throughout the school year, to lend additional support to all our ELL students.

At PS/MS 194 we engage our students in many extra-curricular activities. Some of the extra-curricular activities that find an outlet for students' physical and emotional energies are the school dances, the Ballroom dancing, robotics and music enrichment. Our other competitive sports include soccer, wrestling, basketball, tennis, volleyball, flag football, mixed martial arts, and softball. At times students and staff hold friendly competitions.

Professional Development and Support for School Staff

In 2008-2009 ESL teachers along with the principal set up weekly Data Inquiry meetings. Here, we focused on improving the grammar of Ells to increase their oral and written communication. This work was shared with the entire staff, with the intention of incorporating specific grammar lessons into classrooms school-wide. In addition, mainstream teachers were trained to identify, assess and plan for the needs of ELLs, and to incorporate effective ESL scaffolds, such as graphic organizers and text-representations, within the Balanced Literacy Model. ESL teachers continue to attend quality external seminars, and return to share their new knowledge with the rest of the

school, via written reports and participation in PLT meetings. A special emphasis was put on the authentic assessment of ELLs throughout the year.

Parental Involvement

Parent Involvement at PS/MS 194 starts in the very first month of the school year. "Meet the Teacher Night" has become a tradition at our
school. This is when parents are invited to meet all of their child's teachers, including ESL instructors. At this meeting they hear about all the planned and scheduled learning assignments/activities for the school year.

Another way in which we encourage parents to become involved in our school community is through a program called Learning Leaders. Those parents who are willing to volunteer their time are invited to participate in a three day training, where they are instructed to work in the classroom setting. Many of the bilingual parents work with small groups so that the Ells continue to learn content without being hindered by their limited English. They also lend their support by interpreting and translating for our students, teachers as well as parents.

Another vital element of parental involvement is the PTA, which evaluates the needs of the parents by conducting a survey in all home languages. As a result of this survey in 2008-2009 a Parent Literacy Saturday Program was formed. In this program parents were given an opportunity to learn basic reading and writing skills in English. Another component of this program was computer literacy, where parents learned to become computer literate.

In addition, the PTA led by the Parent Coordinator conducted various workshops throughout the school year. Some of the topics included how to help your child prepare for the ELA and Math exams and 100 Book Challenge; all workshops have translators on hand to assist the non-English speaking parents.

Also, in June 2009 we held an orientation for all incoming Kindergarten students and parents. This orientation helped familiarize both parents and students with academic expectations as well as eased their anxieties. Parents were given an overview of the curriculum, supply list and programs offered to Ells as well a tour of the building.

PartIV: Assessment Analysis

A. Assessment Analysis

OVERALL NYSESLAT* PROFICIENCY RESULTS (*LAB-R FOR NEW ADMITS)										
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	TOTAL
Beginner(B)	4	3	1	3	2	5	2	2	0	22
Intermediate(I)	5	6	12	11	5	1	2	3	5	50
Advanced (A)	5	7	13	19	10	11	11	5	5	86
Proficient (P)	2	7	2	7	5	9	7	3	2	44

Total Tested	16	23	28	40	22	26	22	13	12	202

NYSESLAT Modality Analysis										
Modality Aggregate	Proficiency Level	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
LISTENING/SPEAKING	B	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
	I	0	8	1	0	2	1	1	1	0
	A	3	4	11	13	4	4	9	4	5
	P	48	8	16	24	15	11	12	7	6
READING/WRITING	B	15	6	5	3	2	1	2	2	0
	I	0	7	9	10	4	1	1	2	4
	A	3	4	4	19	11	6	9	5	3
	P	48	4	10	8	4	10	12	3	4

Grades	NYSESLAT 2009:Reading and Writing				NYSESLAT 2009: Listening & Speaking				TOTAL
	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Proficient	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced	Proficient	
ALL	10%	25%	35%	29%	2%	7%	34%	56%	2
K-1	14%	29%	19%	38%	0%	19%	36%	45%	2
2-4	7%	33%	45%	16%	1%	3%	32%	64%	1
5-6	15%	6%	32%	47%	9%	6%	34%	51%	3
7-8	9%	26%	35%	30%	0%	4%	39%	57%	2

One significant pattern that emerges is that the lowest percentage of Ells becoming proficient (15%) is among students in grades2-4.
While almost a quarter (22%) if our students passed the NYSESLAT, the greatest number of Ells becoming proficient are from grades
5-6 (34%).
Another way in which this data analysis affects our instructional decisions is the realization that we have to re-focus on our Ells in grades 2-4 where the lowest number of Ells are becoming proficient.
We evaluate the success of our programs for Ells by using a variety of yardsticks, including NYSESLAT, ELA, TCRWP and Simulation Exams.

NYS ELA										
Grade	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Levels 3 and 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
3	6	16.7	14	38.9	15	41.7	1	2.8	16	44.4
4	1	5.3	8	42.1	10	52.6	0	0.0	10	52.6
5	1	5.3	8	42.1	10	52.6	0	0.0	10	52.6
6	1	5.0	6	30.0	13	65.0	0	0.0	13	65.0
7	0	0.0	6	66.7	3	33.3	0	0.0	3	33.3
8	0	0.0	9	75.0	3	25.0	0	0.0	3	25.0
All Grades	9	7.8	51	41.3	54	47.0	1	0.9	55	47.8

NYS Math										
Grade	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Levels 3 and 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
3	1	2.6	6	15.4	23	59.0	9	23.1	32	82.1
4	0	0.0	5	23.8	15	71.4	1	4.8	16	76.2
5	1	4.5	4	18.2	10	45.5	7	31.8	17	77.3
6	2	10.0	2	10.0	10	50.0	6	30.0	16	80.0

7	0	0.0	5	45.5	4	36.4	2	18.2	6	54.5
8	0	0.0	2	16.7	7	58.3	3	25.0	10	83.3
All Grades	4	3.2	24	19.2	69	55.2	28	22.4	97	77.6

****

Part C: Title III, Part A: Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students- School Year 2008-2009

Form TIII- A (1)(a)

Grade Levels: 1-8 Number of Students to be Served: 198 LEP
Number of Teachers: 10

School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview

Title III, Part A LEP Program

Language Instruction Program

In 2008-2009, PS/MS 194 will utilize Title III, Part A funding to help students meet the Adequate Yearly Progress required by the No Child Left Behind (NCLB), Title III legislation. It will additionally increase student achievement on the NYSESLAT, ELA and Math Exams by funding a year long two day after school program from grades 1-8. Certified teachers from our current staff, will be implementing skills and strategies using differentiated instruction to accommodate all proficiency levels.

Professional Development Program

The 2008-2009 ESL Professional Development program focused primarily on three concepts: the authentic assessment of ELLs, to more equitably track their progress; the school-wide education on the LAP policy; and the increased involvement of ELLs' parents. This will mean sending ESL, AIS, and classroom teachers to quality ELL assessment and instruction seminars on weekends and after school, and allowing for ESL and AIS/classroom teachers to collaboratively map curriculum and plan assessments. It will also mean training and professional development for the facilitators of the ongoing Parental Involvement Program.

Form TIII – A(1)(b)

Title III LEP Program
School Building Budget Summary

Category	Proposed Expenditure
Instructional Program	
Extended Day ESL Enrichment Program Title III Budget • 11 Teachers X $41.98 X 3 Hours X 22 Weeks October - April	$30477.48
Supplies and Materials	N/A
Professional Development •Teacher Per Session -Facilitator of the Professional Development to Title III Parent Involvement Sessions	**N/A**
• Training rate professional development for teachers of the Title III programs	**N/A**

Title III Immigrant Program
School Building Budget Summary

Category	Proposed Expenditure
Parental Communication Services	**N/A**

Community Participation Parent Participation	**N/A** **N/A**

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.

Data was collected from the Home Language Surveys to determine the dominant language in the homes of our ELL population as well as meetings with school administrators, the child study team and the parent coordinator.

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.

Our school concluded that, other than English, Spanish, Bengali, Arabic and Urdu are the first languages spoken in students' homes (in this order).

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.

We plan to have school letters translated into the various languages as well as English (back-to-back) as needed. These services will be provided by parent volunteers, school staff, as well as outside vendors, depending on the language required.

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.

During Parent Teacher Association meetings, on Parent Teacher Conference day/night, outside contractors will be hired to do parent/teacher interpretation. In-house staff will be used for this as well.

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.

When letters are sent home to notify parents of the various meetings, the letter will also state the oral interpretation of services will be provided.

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

All Title I schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:
- *All* Title I schools must address requirements in Part A and Part B of this appendix.
- Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP) schools must complete Part C of this appendix.
- Title I Targeted Assistance (TAS) schools must complete Part D of this appendix.

Part A: TITLE I ALLOCATIONS AND SET-ASIDES

	Title I	Title I ARRA	Total
1. Enter the anticipated Title I Allocation for 2009-10:	1,273,342	406,558	1,679,900
2. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside for Parent Involvement:	12,733		
3. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside to Improve Parent Involvement (ARRA Language):		4,065	
4. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified:	63,667		
5. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect – HQ PD (ARRA Language):		20,328	
6. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Professional Development:	127,334		
7. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect (Professional Development) (ARRA Language):		40,655	

8. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2008-2009 school year: _____98.3__

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

We are providing those teachers ,who are not highly qualified, funding to take courses to become highly qualified.

Part B: Title I School Parental Involvement Policy and School Parent Compact

School Parental Involvement Policy

I. General Expectations

PS/MS 194 agrees to implement the following statutory requirements:

1. The school will put into operation programs, activities and procedures for the involvement of parents, consistent with section 1118 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Those programs, activities and procedures will be planned and operated with meaningful consultation with parents of participating children.
2. The school will ensure that the required school-level parental involvement policy meets the requirements of section 1118(b) of the ESEA, and includes, as a component, a school-parent compact consistent with section 1118(d) of the ESEA.
3. The school will incorporate this parental involvement policy into its school improvement plan.
4. In carrying out the Title I, Part A parental involvement requirements, to the extent practicable, the school will provide full opportunities for the participation of parents with limited English proficiency, parents with disabilities, and parents of migratory children, including providing information and school reports required under section 1111 of the ESEA in an understandable and uniform format and, including alternative formats upon request, and, to the extent practicable, in a language parents understand.
5. The school will involve the parents of children served in Title I, Part A programs in decisions about how the 1 percent of Title I, Part A funds reserved for parental involvement is spent.
6. The school will be governed by the following statutory definition of parental involvement, and will carry out programs, activities and procedures in accordance with this definition:
    - Parental involvement means the participation of parents in regular, two-way, and meaningful communication involving student academic learning and other school activities, including ensuring—
        - that parents play an integral role in assisting their child's learning;
        - that parents are encouraged to be actively involved in their child's education at school;
        - that parents are partners in their child's education and are included, as appropriate, in decision-making and on advisory committees to assist in the education of their child; the carrying out of other activities, such as those described in section 1118 of the ESEA.
        - The school will inform parents and parental organizations of the purpose and existence of the Parental Information and Resource Center in the State.

II. Description of How the School Will Implement Required Parental Involvement Policy Components

1. PS/MS 194 will take the following actions to involve parents in the joint development of its school parental involvement plan under section 1112 of the ESEA:
2. PS/MS 194 will take the following actions to involve parents in the process of school review and improvement under section 1116 of the ESEA: Open House, Concerts, Award Ceremonies, and Art Shows
3. PS/MS 194 will provide the following necessary coordination, technical assistance, and other support in planning and implementing effective parental involvement activities to improve student academic achievement and school performance: curriculumn Workshop, Learning Leaders training and AIS programs.

4. PS/MS 194 will take the following actions to conduct, with the involvement of parents, an annual evaluation of the content and effectiveness of this parental involvement policy in improving school quality. The evaluation will include identifying barriers to greater participation by parents in parental involvement activities (with particular attention to parents who are economically disadvantaged, are disabled, have limited English proficiency, have limited literacy, or are of any racial or ethnic minority background). The school will use the findings of the evaluation about its parental involvement policy and activities to design strategies for more effective parental involvement, and to revise, if necessary (and with the involvement of parents) its parental involvement policies. Distributing parent surveys prepared and collected by the DOE, then reviewed by the SLT along with a staff survey prepared by the DOE.
5. PS/MS 194 will build the schools' and parent's capacity for strong parental involvement, in order to ensure effective involvement of parents and to support a partnership with the parents, and the community to improve student academic achievement, through the following activities specifically described below:
    a. The school will provide assistance to parents of children served by the school, as appropriate, in understanding topics such as the following, by undertaking the actions described in this paragraph –
        I.the State's academic content standards
        II. the State's student academic achievement standards
        III. the State and local academic assessments including alternate assessments, the requirements of Part A, how to monitor their child's progress, and how to work with educators: workshops, conferences with the use of computers, overhead projectors and handouts.
    b. The school will provide materials and training to help parents work with their children to improve their children's academic achievement, such as literacy training, and using technology, as appropriate, to foster parental involvement, by: Dial-A-Teacher workshop, Math workshop, Exit Project, Science workshop , Robotics Workshop, Journal/Literacy workshop and HIV Curriculumn, Ect.
    c. The school will, with the assistance of its parents, educate its teachers, pupil services personnel, principal and other staff, in how to reach out to, communicate with, and work with parents as equal partners, in the value and utility of contributions of parents, and in how to implement and coordinate parent programs and build ties between parents and schools, by: Incorporating community outreach with Parent Coordinator, PTA/TITLE I meetings, Curriculum workshops, Informative workshop, Events workshops:Movie Night, Family Night, Luncheons and Spring Dance.
    d. The school will take the following actions to ensure that information related to the school and parent- programs, meetings, and other activities, is sent to the parents of participating children in an understandable and uniform format, including alternative formats upon written request, and, to the extent practicable, in a language the parents can understand: monthly school calendar, monthly PTA/Tittle I flyers, PTA/Tittle I notices (all above are done in a bilingual format, when possible).

III. Discretionary School Parental Involvement Policy Components

The School Parental Involvement Policy may include additional paragraphs listing and describing other discretionary activities that the school, in consultation with its parents, chooses to undertake to build parents' capacity for involvement in the school and school system to support their children's academic achievement, such as the following discretionary activities listed under section 1118(e) of the ESEA:

1 involving parents in the development of training for teachers, principals, and other educators to improve the effectiveness of that training;
2 providing necessary literacy training for parents from Title I, Part A funds, if the school district has exhausted all other reasonably available sources of funding for that training;
3 paying reasonable and necessary expenses associated with parental involvement activities, including transportation and child care costs, to enable

parents to participate in school-related meetings and training sessions;
4 training parents to enhance the involvement of other parents;
5 in order to maximize parental involvement and participation in their children's education, arranging school meetings at a variety of times.
6 adopting and implementing model approaches to improving parental involvement;
7 developing appropriate roles for community-based organizations and businesses, including faith-based organizations, in parental involvement activities; and
8 providing other reasonable support for parental involvement activities under section 1118 as parents may request.

IV. Adoption

This School Parental Involvement Policy has been developed jointly with, and agreed on with, parents of children participating in Title I, Part A programs, as evidenced by _____. This policy was adopted by PS/MS 194 on 05/31/06 and will be in effect for the period of 1 year. The school will distribute this policy to all parents of children on or before September 30, 2008.

School-Parent Compact

PS/MS 194, and the parents of the students participating in activities, services, and programs funded by Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) (participating children), agree that this compact outlines how the parents, the entire school staff, and the students will share the responsibility for improved student academic achievement and the means by which the school and parents will build and develop a partnership that will help children achieve the State's high standards. This school-parent compact is in effect during school year 2007-08.

Required School-Parent Compact Provisions

School Responsibilities
PS/MS 194 will:

1. Provide high-quality curriculum and instruction in a supportive and effective learning environment that enables the participating children to meet the State's student academic achievement standards as follows: Everyday Math, Summer Enrichment programs, Read 180, Saturday Academy Classes, AIS Programs, Balanced literacy-Lucy Caulkins, 100 Book Challenge and Impact Mathematics.
2. Hold parent-teacher conferences (at least annually in elementary schools) during which this compact will be discussed as it relates to the individual child's achievement. Specifically, those conferences will be held during the month of November and February/March.
3. Provide parents with frequent reports on their children's progress. Specifically, the school will provide reports as follows: Report cards and Progress reports (Grades 7-8).
4. Provide parents reasonable access to staff. Specifically, staff will be available for consultation with parents as follows: Parents will go through a hierarchy; Teacher, Parent Coordinator then Administration to set-up a meetings with teachers.
5. Provide parents opportunities to volunteer and to observe classroom activities, as follows: class trips, Learning Leaders training, open school week (November & March).

6. Involve parents in the planning, review, and improvement of the school's parental involvement policy, in an organized, ongoing, and timely way.
7. Involve parents in the joint development of any School-wide Program plan (for SWP schools), in an organized, ongoing, and timely way.
8. Provide information to parents of participating students in an understandable and uniform format.
9. On the request of parents, provide opportunities for regular meetings for parents to formulate suggestions, and to participate, as appropriate, in decisions about the education of their children. The school will respond to any such suggestions as soon as practicably possible.
10. Provide to each parent an individual student report about the performance of their child on the State assessment in at least math, language arts and reading.
11. Provide each parent timely notice when their child has been assigned or has been taught for four (4) or more consecutive weeks by a teacher who is not highly qualified within the meaning of the term in section 200.56 of the Title I.

Parent Responsibilities

We, as parents, will support our children's learning in the following ways:

1 Monitoring attendance.
2 Making sure that homework is completed.
3 Monitoring amount of television their children watch.
4 Participating, as appropriate, in decisions relating to my children's education.
5 Promoting positive use of my child's extracurricular time.
6 Staying informed about my child's education and communicating with the school by promptly reading all notices from the school or the school district either received by my child or by mail and responding, as appropriate.
7 Serving, to the extent possible, on policy advisory groups, such as being the Title I parent representative on the school's School Improvement Team, the Title I Policy Advisory Committee, the District wide Policy Advisory Council, the State's Committee of Practitioners, the School Support Team or other school advisory or policy groups.

Student Responsibilities

We, as students, will share the responsibility to improve our academic achievement and achieve the State's high standards. Specifically, we will:

1 Do my homework every day and ask for help when I need to.
2 Read at least 30 minutes every day outside of school time.
3 Give to my parents or the adult who is responsible for my welfare all notices and information received by me from my school every day.

SIGNATURES:

_____	_____	_____
SCHOOL	**PARENT(S)**	**STUDENT**
_____	_____	_____
DATE	**DATE**	**DATE**

Part C: TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM SCHOOLS

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

1. A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school that is based on information on the performance of children in relation to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards.

Please see the needs assessment on pages 9 and 10.

2. School-wide reform strategies that:
   a) Provide opportunities for all children to meet the State's proficient and advanced levels of student academic achievement.
   All students are involved with the 100 Book Challenge to improve reading quantity and quality, PBIS to improve behavior, Balanced Literacy, EDM or Impact Mathematics and have a well rounded program including art, music and physical education. As can be seen on pages 9 and 10, this focus for the past 3 years has led to impressive results for all students.
   b) Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically-based research that:
      - Increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as extended school year, before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities.
      - Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.
      - Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.
      - Address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of low academic achieving children and those at risk of not meeting the State academic content standards and are members of the target population of any program that is included in the Schoolwide Program. These programs may include counseling, pupil services, mentoring services, college and career awareness/preparation, and the integration of vocational and technical education programs.
      - Are consistent with and are designed to implement State and local improvement, if any.

   We have increased the amount of learning time by holding after-school programs for 180 students on Wednesday and Thursday for the months of January-April. A Saturday program is planned for 120 students from January-April.

3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.
   98% of staff are considered highly qualified. The remaining 3 staff members are assisted with tuition reimbursement to become highly qualified.

4. High-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals (and, where appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff) to enable all children in the School-wide Program to meet the State's student academic standards.
   Literacy coaches and Math coaches provide on-going, full-time support of teachers to improve instruction with the goal of improving student academic standards.

5. Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.
   By creating a safe, organized, effective school, there is little to no turnover of staff and the number of applications far surpasses the number of available positions in any given year.

6. Strategies to increase parental involvement through means such as family literacy services.
   The Title I parent advisory committee works with the principal and parent coordinator to develop strategies for improving parental involvement. This has included literacy and technology instruction and programs for families.

7. Plans for assisting preschool children in the transition from early childhood programs, such as Head Start, Even Start, Early Reading First, or a State-run preschool program, to local elementary school programs.

8. Measures to include teachers in the decisions regarding the use of academic assessments in order to provide information on, and to improve, the achievement of individual students and the overall instructional program.
   Teachers are included in the school's Tier III committee that designs and plans school-wide assessments and the use of the information. Teachers also meet in grade level groups to review data from state assessments and simulations and how to utilize the information effectively.

9. Activities to ensure that students who experience difficulty mastering the proficient or advanced levels of the academic achievement standards are provided with effective, timely additional assistance. The additional assistance must include measures to ensure that students' difficulties are identified on a timely basis and to provide sufficient information on which to base effective assistance.
   The school has developed two child study teams to review the cases of specific students who are having difficulties with either behavior or academics.

10. Coordination and integration of Federal, State, and local services and programs, including programs supported under NCLB, i.e., violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, vocational and technical education, and job training.
    Sapis and Guidance counselors work with the school's PBIS committee to design behavioral programs, violence prevention programs, and nutrition programs.

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

N/A School is in Good Standing

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

N/A SCHOOL IN GOOD STANDING

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

Upon examination of the Findings from Audits of the Written, Tested, and Taught Curriculum in ELA and Mathematics, our Tier III Team discovered the need to revisit and redevelop our existing ELA curriculum maps. The Team also determined the necessity for goal setting and collaboration when improving the maps. Presently, we have begun the process of rewriting our ELA curriculum maps on each grade level, K-8. These edited maps will reflect the NYS ELA Standards and Performance Indicators. The maps will also be vertically and horizontally aligned.

After a thorough assessment of our ELA program, K-8, we found significant gaps in the curricula. Little to no continuity of reading and writing instruction was found in grades 7 and 8. A similar lack of continuity was discovered in reading for grades K-6.

In order to address these issues, our school has committed itself to developing and implementing ELA curriculum maps on each grade level, K-8. Currently, each grade level is working on a yearlong map, addressing content, skills, strategies, and student outcomes. Future professional development will include vertical alignment of these maps. Cluster grades (K-2, 3-5, and 6-8), will meet to examine the continuity of learning. The final stage in the development of our ELA curriculum maps will reflect the K-8 Learning Continuum.

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

X Applicable ☐ Not Applicable

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

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.

1B. Mathematics

Background

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

Specific Math Alignment Issues:

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

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

<u>Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 1B:</u>

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

Mathematics teachers in Grades 3-8 (EDM 3-5 and Impact Math 6-8) along with AIS staff met at weekly grade level meetings to examine Pre-March and Post-March NYS Standards for mathematics. They assessed which skills/content strands were not covered or were misaligned (not taught Pre-March) in the respective EDM and Impact math textbooks. In addition teachers for grades (3-5) refer to EDM alignment notes distributed by NYCDOE to help teachers and math coaches identify opportunities for addressing Pre-March/Post March NYS performance indicators. They then examined pacing guides to smoothly and logically integrate these topics into their pre-march plans and accessed outside resources for support material.

K-2 math staff developers met to examine if the NYS standards for math were covered in the EDM program and it was concluded that EDM does in fact address the state standards within every unit of the lesson along with the end of unit exams. Also, since grades K-2 do not have any formal assessments other than end of unit exams, it was determined that pre-, mid-year, and post math exams will have to be created in order to continue to formally monitor students progress through acuity.

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

☐ Applicable x Not Applicable

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

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

KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION

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

2A – ELA Instruction

Classroom observations in audited schools show that direct instruction was the dominant instructional orientation for ELA instruction in almost 62 percent of K–8 classrooms. (In direct instruction, the teacher may use lecture- or questioning-type format. It includes instances when the teacher explains a concept, reads to students, or guides students in practicing a concept.) Direct instruction also was observed

either frequently or extensively in approximately 54 percent of the high school ELA classrooms visited. On a positive note, high academically focused class time (an estimate of the time spent engaged in educationally relevant activities) was observed frequently or extensively in more than 85 percent of K–8 classrooms visited, though this number fell slightly to just over 75 percent of classrooms at the high school level. Student engagement in ELA classes also was observed to be high – observed frequently or extensively 71 percent of the time in Grades K–8, but this percentage shrank to 49 percent at the high school level. Finally, independent seatwork (students working on self-paced worksheets or individual assignments) was observed frequently or extensively in approximately 32 percent of the K–8 ELA classrooms visited and just over 34 percent of classrooms in high school.

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

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

Our Tier III Team both agreed and disagreed with the Findings from Audits of the Written, Tested, and Taught Curriculum in ELA and Mathematics, specifically in the area of ELA Instruction. In many, if not all, of our elementary level classrooms, direct instruction is not the dominant instructional orientation for ELA instruction. At PS/MS 194, we utilize the Point of Entry Model; engaging students in whole-group instruction, followed by small-group/independent practice, concluding with whole-group reflection. While this is the dominant instructional method in our school, the Team determined gaps existed at the middle school level.

At the middle school level, implementation of the Point of Entry Model is being addressed through vigorous professional development, including interclass visitations, demonstration lessons, and discussions about best literacy practices at Professional Learning Team meetings.

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

X 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?

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

2B – Mathematics Instruction

Auditors noted that although high academically focused class time was observed either frequently or extensively in 80 percent of K–8 mathematics classes, it was observed at this level only in 45 percent of the high school mathematics classes. Further, a high level of student engagement was observed either frequently or extensively in 52 percent of Grades K–8 and 35 percent of Grades 9–12 mathematics classrooms. *School Observation Protocol* (SOM[2]) and SEC results also shed light on some of the instructional practices in the mathematics classroom. The SOM noted that direct instruction in K-8 mathematics classes was frequently or extensively seen 75 percent of the time in Grades K–8 (and 65 percent of the time in Grades 9–12). Student activities other than independent seatwork and hands-on learning in the elementary grades were rarely if ever observed. Technology use in mathematics classes also was very low.

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

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

The process our school has engaged in to assess whether this finding is relevant to our school's educational program is through observation, carried out by administrators, coaches and AIS staff members.

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

☐ Applicable X 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?

Our school follows the Point of Entry Model which allows for direct instruction, cooperative learning groups as well as independent work. Mathematics classrooms are equipped with calculators for each student. They also have access to computers in their classrooms. We have 12 Smart Boards being used in our buiding.

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

KEY FINDING 3: TEACHER EXPERIENCE AND STABILITY

[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.

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 has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.
The principal of the school examined the hiring of staff for the past 2 years.

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

☐ Applicable X 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?
Based on the examination of hiring for the past two years, our school has hired only 3-4 new teachers per year on a staff of over 90 teachers. In our current school year, we have 3 new teachers.

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

KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS
Interview data (from classroom teachers and principals) indicate that professional development opportunities regarding curriculum, instruction, and monitoring progress for ELLs are being offered by the districts, however, they are not reaching a large audience. Many teachers interviewed did not believe such professional development was available to them. A number of district administrators interviewed mentioned the presence of QTEL (Quality Teaching for English Learners) training, but few classroom teachers seemed aware of this program. Although city, district and some school-based policies (e.g., Language Allocation Policy) and plans for ELL instruction do exist, rarely were they effectively communicated to teachers through professional development and other avenues.

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

4.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.
We are in the process of interviewing staff members to determine their knowledge of the different opportunities that exist for them both at the school and elsewhere.

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?

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

KEY FINDING 5: DATA USE AND MONITORING—ELL INSTRUCTION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

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

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?

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

KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

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

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

☐ Applicable ☐ Not Applicable

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

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

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

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

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?

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.

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.)

8 Students are currently registered as Students in Temporary Housing.

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

These students receive extra guidance and support from our counseling staff and administration.