



P169M
THE ROBERT F. KENNEDY SCHOOL

2010-2011
SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)

SCHOOL: 75M169
ADDRESS: 110 E. 88TH STREET, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10128
TELEPHONE: (212) 348-6140
FAX: (212) 996-8245

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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: CEP SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT (SDAS).....6

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT.....10

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS.....11

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN.....12

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2010-2011.....13

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM.....14

APPENDIX 2: PROGRAM DELIVERY FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELLs).....16

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION.....18

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS.....19

**APPENDIX 5: NCLB/SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS IDENTIFIED FOR IMPROVEMENT,
CORRECTIVE ACTION, AND RESTRUCTURING.....25**

APPENDIX 6: SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS UNDER REGISTRATION REVIEW (SURRE).....26

APPENDIX 7: TITLE I, PART A – SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS IN TEMPORARY HOUSING (STH).....27

APPENDIX 8: CONTRACTS FOR EXCELLENCE (C4E) SCHOOL-BASED EXPENDITURES.....28

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: P169M **SCHOOL NAME:** Robert F. Kennedy School

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 110 E. 88th Street, New York, N.Y.10128

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: (212) 348-6140 **FAX:** (212) 996-8245

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Susan Finn **EMAIL ADDRESS:** sfinn@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON: _____

PRINCIPAL: Susan Finn

UFT CHAPTER LEADER: Jeff Andrusin

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT: Carmen Ramos

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE:
(Required for high schools) _____

DISTRICT AND NETWORK INFORMATION

DISTRICT: 75 **CHILDREN FIRST NETWORK (CFN):** Network Cluster 754

NETWORK LEADER: Arthur Fusco

SUPERINTENDENT: Gary Hecht

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 member 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/NR/rdonlyres/381F4607-7841-4D28-B7D5-0F30DDB77DFA/82007/A655FINAL1.pdf>).

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
Susan Finn	*Principal or Designee	
Jeff Andrusin	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Carmen Ramos	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
Mary Disalvatore	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
	Student Representative <i>(optional for elementary and middle schools; a minimum of two members required for high schools)</i>	
	CBO Representative, if applicable	
Denise Velazquez	Member/ Parent Coordinator	
	Member/	

(Add rows, as needed, to ensure all SLT members are listed.)

* 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 P169M is to provide a highly stimulating instructional environment, utilizing a wide variety and range of age-appropriate incentives, where severely emotionally challenged students are encouraged to accept and understand responsibility and to make informed choices, while autistic or cognitively delayed students are provided with opportunities to develop to their fullest potential.

Each of our students strives to find a less restrictive setting that will meet their needs. We seek to provide the opportunities and resources that will allow our students to prosper and successfully interact in school, the home and community, and ultimately, to make the transition into productive adulthood.

The Robert F. Kennedy School – P169M is a multi-dimensional, multi-sited program designed to promote the academic, emotional and social growth of each child within our school community; those students with pervasive developmental disorders (PDD or MRDD), autistic spectrum disorders (ASD), or emotional-behavioral disorders (EBD). Our students in special school reduced-size classes range in age from five to 15, while those in our high school inclusion program and in our hospital-based classes may continue to age 21.

The main site of P169M on East 88th Street serves 13 ED classes with 148 students and two autistic classes with 12 students. Also located at the P169M main site is the Queens Children's Psychiatric Center Manhattan Community Service Center operated by the New York State Department of Mental Health as a community resource. There, school-aged children from P169M may receive psychiatric diagnostic services, and in addition, up to 35 of our students also receive therapeutic services.

For the 2010-2011 school-year, P169M also will operate five off-site programs. About 70 early childhood students with emotional, autistic or developmental disorders, receive instruction in self-contained classes at the P169M program located within P155M on 117th Street. At Metropolitan Hospital, P169M coordinates with the Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry to provide about 36 students with both an inpatient program and an adolescent day-treatment (partial Hospital Placement) program. At P102M on 113th Street P169M now serves the needs of 30 early childhood students with autism. New last year, the P169M site at P146M on 106th Street provides self-contained classes for up to 24 elementary-grade students with ASD. Additionally, 15 students are supported by P169M staff in a high school inclusion program at Manhattan Center for Science and Mathematics High School.

M 169 Finn, Sue

Supporting the P169M instructional program is a staff of highly trained and dedicated professionals. The staff consists of 59 teachers, all of whom are state certified and permanently assigned to the school 85 percent having more than two years of classroom experience. They are supported by 62 paraprofessionals, school aides and family workers. Sixteen related service providers insure that every student receives all mandated services in order to maximize the benefits of the educational experience provided by the Robert F. Kennedy School.

Our school provides our autistic students with a functional academic program designed to further social development, communication skills and the capacity to function as independently as possible along with an academic program that parallels the general education curriculum. Utilizing TEACCH (Treatment and Education of Autistic and related Communication-handicapped Children) and ABA (Applied Behavior Analysis) strategies enables our students to modify their behavior while enhancing academic outcomes for greater success.

Our PBIS (positive behavioral intervention and support) system teaches our students how to make positive behavioral choices thereby becoming more successful both in and out of school. We have added the teaching of Emotional Literacy, enabling our students to better express their emotions with words, a more appropriate choice. Our ultimate goal is to teach our students the behaviors necessary to reenter a general education setting. Earning points for positive behaviors reinforces those skills. A series of incentives helps to support these behaviors. The ultimate incentive, of course, is being reevaluated for a less restrictive environment.

Part 100 of the New York State Education Regulations provides the foundation upon which our educational program is built. Students are taught a curriculum consistent with those regulations and held to the high standards of success mandated for all students. The curriculum has been adapted to address the individual needs of each student and ongoing periodic assessment assures that a realistic pace of advancement is maintained in pursuit of rigorous learning objectives. Reading and writing workshops anchor our ELA program while the latest New York State Mathematics curriculum also has been implemented.

The P169M program is enhanced by the participation of community based volunteer groups; *the Tutors of P169* and *the Friends of P169*. The Tutors number 18 and provide one-to-one tutoring for many of our students. Additionally, they are positive role models and work together with our teachers and related service providers. The Friends of P169 provide funding for 50 students to attend Camp Ramapo, a three-week sleep-away summer camp. The Friends also provide grants to our teachers for special projects and help with the funding of our year-end Moving-On ceremony and other special school events. These two groups were established jointly about 30 years ago by community residents who became aware of the special needs of our students shortly after completion of the new PS 169 building on East 88th Street.

The NYPD's 19th Precinct has forged a positive relationship with our school and has been helpful in dealing with both community and school issues. We have utilized the Manhattan District Attorney's office to educate our older students about the hazards of gang involvement and the New York Air National Guard's *Stay On Track* program provides our students with ongoing drug avoidance education and career guidance.

M 169 Finn, Sue

Literacy, Mathematics, Social Studies and Science standards in all of P169M's programs have been the subject of intense effort during the past few years and the effort is bearing fruit. Participation in Columbia University Teachers College Reading and Writing Workshops has been a great success. Similarly, professional development in middle school mathematics instruction provided by a Kaplan Foundation grant at City College has also begun to pay dividends.

Every member of the P169M staff is committed to providing every student with the opportunity to excel. We all believe that every student can learn. Our school-wide objective is to increase teacher effectiveness and parental involvement in search of opportunities for academic success. We are deeply committed, too, to maintaining a safe school environment with reduced numbers of accidents, incidents and suspensions. We want our school to be a place of learning: school skills and behavioral skills, academic and social content. We are actively investing energy and resources into helping the Robert F. Kennedy School evolve into a comprehensive educational venue where students with emotional/behavioral and communication/relationship disorders or other developmental delays are able to maximize their potential.

SECTION III – Cont'd**Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot (SDAS)**

Directions: A pre-populated version of the School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot provided in template format below (Pages 6-9 of this section) is available for download on each school's NYCDOE webpage under "Statistics." Pre-populated SDAS data is updated twice yearly. Schools are encouraged to download the pre-populated version for insertion here in place of the blank format provided.

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT					
School Name:					
District:	75	DBN #:	75M169	School BEDS Code:	307500011169

DEMOGRAPHICS									
Grades Served in 2009-10:	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Pre-K	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> K	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 7
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ungraded			
Enrollment:				Attendance: % of days students attended*					
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10		
Pre-K	0	0	0						
Kindergarten	0	18							
Grade 1	1	1		Student Stability: % of Enrollment					
Grade 2	1	8		(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10		
Grade 3	20	12							
Grade 4	20	12							
Grade 5	18	20		Poverty Rate: % of Enrollment					
Grade 6	32	20		(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10		
Grade 7	36	43			86.1				
Grade 8	32	48							
Grade 9	8	10		Students in Temporary Housing: Total Number					
Grade 10	6	5		(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10		
Grade 11	3	2			16				
Grade 12	0	2							
Ungraded	45	33		Recent Immigrants: Total Number					
				(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10		
Total	209	233			1				
Special Education Enrollment:				Suspensions: (OSYD Reporting) – Total Number					
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10		
Number in Self-Contained Classes	203	226							

DEMOGRAPHICS							
No. in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	0	0		Principal Suspensions	1		
Number all others	3	2		Superintendent Suspensions	2		
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>							
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment: (BESIS Survey)				Special High School Programs: Total Number (As of October 31)			
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	CTE Program Participants	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
# in Trans. Bilingual Classes	0	0		Early College HS Participants	0	0	0
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0					
# receiving ESL services only	16	5		Number of Staff: Includes all full-time staff			
# ELLs with IEPs	14	20		(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
<i>These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.</i>				Number of Teachers	52	54	
Overage Students: # entering students overage for grade				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	37	40	
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	24	23	
	4	2					
				Teacher Qualifications:			
Ethnicity and Gender: % of Enrollment				(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100	100	
American Indian or Alaska Native	1.1	1.3		Percent more than two years teaching in this school	69.2	71.2	
Black or African American	46.9	45.9		Percent more than five years teaching anywhere	65.4	64.8	
Hispanic or Latino	48.3	48.9					
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	0.5	0.9		Percent Masters Degree or higher	90	94	
White	2.9	3.0		Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	89.2	93.6	
Multi-racial							
Male	80.9	78.5					

DEMOGRAPHICS							
Female	13.1	21.5					

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

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY							
SURR School: Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/>		If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:					
Designated as a Persistently Lowest-Achieving (PLA) School: Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/>							
Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2009-10 Based on 2008-09 Performance):							
<u>Differentiated Accountability Phase (Check ✓)</u>				<u>Category (Check ✓)</u>			
				Basic	Focused	Comprehensive	
In Good Standing (IGS)							
Improvement (year 1)							
Improvement (year 2)							
Corrective Action (year 1)							
Corrective Action (year 2)							
Restructuring (year 1)							
Restructuring (year 2)							
Restructuring (Advanced)							
Individual Subject/Area Outcomes	Elementary/Middle Level (✓)			Secondary Level (✓)			
	ELA:			ELA:			
	Math:			Math:			
	Science:			Grad. Rate:			
This school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for each accountability measure:							
Student Groups		Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
		ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad. Rate**
All Students							
Ethnicity							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Black or African American							
Hispanic or Latino							

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY							
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander							
White							
Multiracial							
Other Groups							
Students with Disabilities							
Limited English Proficient							
Economically Disadvantaged							
Student groups making AYP in each subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Key: AYP Status							
√	Made AYP	X	Did Not Make AYP	X*	Did Not Make AYP Due to Participation Rate Only		
√ ^{SH}	Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target	-	Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status				
<p><i>Note: NCLB/SED accountability reports are not available for District 75 schools.</i></p> <p>*For Progress Report Attendance Rate(s) - If more than one attendance rate given, it is displayed as K-8/9-12.</p> <p>**http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/nyc/APA/Memos/Graduation_rate_memo.pdf</p>							

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY			
Progress Report Results – 2008-09		Quality Review Results – 2008-09	
Overall Letter Grade		Overall Evaluation:	Well Developed
Overall Score		Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	Well Developed
School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)		Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	Well Developed
School Performance (Comprises 25% of the Overall Score)		Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	Well Developed
Student Progress (Comprises 60% of the Overall Score)		Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	Well Developed
Additional Credit		Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	Well Developed
<p><i>Note: Progress Report grades are not yet available for District 75 schools.</i></p>			

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/Teacher 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 your school's 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?
-

The School's Leadership Team reviewed the 2009/2010 School Comprehensive Education Plan as well as the Quality Review Reports for 2006-2007, 2007-2008 and 2008-2009, the 2009-2010 Learning Environment Survey Report New York State Standardized Assessments, other Periodic Assessments, the New York State Alternate Assessment results, attendance data, On-line Occurrence Reporting System (OORS) and School Wide Information System (SWIS) data in order to evaluate the success of the school's programs and student achievement.

Recent changes in the school's programs were also reviewed and analyzed: in particular, the opening of a new site at P146M, the continuing increase in the ratio of alternate assessment classes to standard assessment classes, the implementation of the newly expanded District 75 Emotional Literacy initiative and the ongoing assessment of our PBIS-driven behavior management system. All interested parties were kept abreast of the results.

Most indicators pointed to gains in the key areas of school safety and behavior-management, and parental and community involvement. Furthermore, indicators of academic achievement available at the end of the 2008-09 school-year continued to reflect the school's continuing efforts at further boosting students' scholastic competency.

The year-ago data showed that P169M student scores on the City and State ELA examinations rose in the following areas from 2007-08. The percentage of students on Level 1 decreased across all grade levels. Grade 6 had zero students on Level 1. There were increases in Level 2 by at least 5% to as high as 15%. There was also an increase in Level 3 across all grade levels. Additionally, across all grade levels there was a 14% decrease of students on Level 1 with a 7% increase in both Level 2 and Level 3. Improvement in student performance on standardized Mathematics testing is shown by the following. Zero students scoring on Level 1 in grade 3. A 45% decrease in Level 1 at the 4th grade level with increases in Level 2, 3 and 4. Improvements additionally in grades 5, 7 and 8 with grade 6 still needing some improvement.

Unfortunately our data for the 2009-2010 school year dropped as did many schools across the city due in large part to a change in the benchmarks. ELA testing showed 43% of our students achieving Level

M 169 Finn, Sue

2 or above and only 31% of our students achieving Level 2 or above in Mathematics. With an increased focus on the benchmarks for each grade level and further emphasis on appropriate Academic Intervention services, we believe that our students will increase their test performance comparable to or exceeding their pace in the past.

Attendance has also been on an improving track. Average daily attendance at all P169 sites rose from 82.86 percent in the 2007-08 school year to 83.67 percent during 2008-09 and 84.01 percent for 2009-10.

Academically prepared high school-aged students who have demonstrated improvements in their impulse control and general behavior have been enrolled in our inclusion program that places EBD students in general education classes at Manhattan Center for Science and Mathematics High School. These students receive appropriate support from paraprofessional staff, consulting special education teachers, and related service providers. Creating new inclusion opportunities for our elementary- and middle school-aged students remains an important but as yet unfulfilled objective.

The P169M community is committed to ensuring that all of our students meet basic literacy and mathematics competency requirements, develop adequate communication and social skills, and master the ability to integrate themselves successfully into the community at large. Highlights of this year's efforts toward those ends will include school-wide participation in literacy fairs, athletic competitions and continued academic improvement.

At P169M, 99% of our 220 EBD students (all sites included) participate in standardized assessment. Of these, a significant number scored below competency levels on one or more standardized assessments. As a result, they are eligible for (A)cademic (I)ntervention (S)ervices designed to help boost the performance of students and meet promotional criteria. For students at risk of not meeting State standards and/or New York City promotional criteria, AIS are offered during the regular school day. These services include the following: block scheduling, extended literacy periods, student tutoring by staff and volunteers, attendance intervention, enhanced computer assisted instruction, and teacher-student and/or counselor-student individual conferencing.

In the spirit of the New Continuum of Services where Special Education is defined as a spectrum of support services rather than a "place" where "special needs" students must be educated, classes at all P169M sites are organized around a continuum of student/staff ratios designed to meet individual needs as prescribed in each student's Individualized Education Plan (IEP). Ratios may vary depending on the nature and severity of classification. Also age and academic functioning levels help determine placement. Placement at P169M may be in classes with ratios (students : teachers : paraprofessionals) of 6:1:1, 8:1:1, 12:1:1, or inclusion in a general education class with Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS).

The overall evaluation of P169M in the 2006-2007 Quality Review was "This is a well-developed school," a result that reflected three of five "well developed" commendations and two "proficient" recognitions for its work in the five designated "Quality Statement" areas. In 2007-2008, the Quality Review again summarized the school's performance as "well developed," but added that the school "... has made good progress in addressing the issues identified in the previous Quality Review report." Indeed, P169M was commended for being "well developed" in all five of the Quality Statement areas.

Nevertheless, the School Leadership Team was acutely aware that the ultimate objective was to be recognized as "outstanding" (the very top tier) rather than "well developed," and to that end had set its

sights on improving further the areas identified in the Review as needing tweaking: further professional development in order to boost the staff's comfort level "in handling data and analyzing recently introduced assessments" and in reducing dependence upon "coaches and administration to support them in using data."

With the Quality Review for the 2008-2009 school-year, that top-tier "outstanding" category was eliminated and the remaining four scoring categories: "underdeveloped," "underdeveloped with proficient features," "proficient," and "well developed" were broadened to encompass the full spectrum of New York City schools' performance. Once again, P169M was recognized as "well developed" both overall and individually in all five Quality Statement areas. Nevertheless, it was no small solace to the entire staff when Christina Lewis, the lead reviewer, commented upon taking her leave that if the "outstanding" category had been continued, this year P169M would have received that rating. P169M was exempt from Quality Review during the 2009-2010 academic year.

That last Quality Review did identify a few areas in which further improvement would prove beneficial, however: "develop strategies that enable students to be more reflective about their work, and assess their own progress..." work toward "agreed goals to improve and enhance their [teacher] practice, based on the professional teaching standards." "Continue to develop teacher's confidence and ability to plan and teach lessons in all subjects that are fully differentiated and engage students in their learning."

As reported in the school's 2008-2009 Comprehensive Education Plan, the 2007-2008 Learning Environment Survey indicated an apparent unacceptably low level of family involvement with the education of the children attending P169M. Distressing to be sure, but these results were not unexpected. Despite significant efforts by the P169M administration, parent coordinator and instructional staff, only a paltry eight percent of the school's parents responded to the survey. Of the few who did, 70 percent expressed overall satisfaction with the school's programs and home-school communication, but about 30 percent indicated varying degrees of dissatisfaction with their child's academic progress, with school-to-home communication, and with regard to the perceived safety of students in school.

These results struck a resounding chord with the School Leadership Team and instigated a redoubled resolve to address issues related to the home-school partnership and parental involvement. Now that the results of the 2008-2009 Learning Environment Survey have finally become available, a marked improvement in family involvement was the reward for the SLT's efforts at family outreach. Roughly double the year-earlier parent participation rate (14%, still far below the NYC average) was but one of the indicators of perceived improvement at P169M. In all the major categories: Academic Expectations, Communications, Engagement, and Safety & Respect, survey responses pointed to improvements in the school's performance.

On the assessment front, the students at P169M continue to make slow but steady progress with fewer students scoring on level one on reading and mathematics assessments. Nevertheless, there are still far too many failing to achieve levels three and four. Strengthening curriculum and Academic Interventions for struggling learners remains a top priority for the SCEP team in the formulation of its annual goals.

With regard to our behavioral initiatives, our school's extensive PBIS program and the difference that it has made in our school community and for our students both inside and outside of school has resulted in a continuing decline in serious incidents and resultant administrative actions and suspensions. The

school's staff-student personal interaction initiative, a "check-in – check-out" system of establishing closer, more trusting lines of communication between students and staff has contributed to the improved air of safety. Beyond such "secondary" PBIS initiatives, the school has moved into the realm of "tertiary" intervention with direct home-school communication and support.

Helping to support the improved learning-community environment, too, the school's involvement in the District 75 Emotional Literacy initiative can be seen in the colorful (and more importantly, meaningful) "mood meters" that adorn the walls of most classrooms as students and staff alike come to terms with their feelings and the effect that plays on interpersonal relationships as well as the day-to-day variability of academic performance.

Among the barriers that have slowed the school's progress toward achievement of both academic and behavioral objectives are:

- **Still-too-limited parental involvement.**
- **Well-meaning but often conflicting/overlapping mandates for special services that reduce class time exposure.**
- **Inadequate funding for extended-day activities -- instructional and recreational.**

Meeting the challenge of limited parental participation has been primarily the responsibility of our tireless Parent Coordinator who works hand-in-hand with the administration, instructional and related service staff to reach out to parents with new and innovative ideas for boosting attendance at PA meetings, SLT meetings, parent-teacher conferences, IEP-review meetings, etc. Guest speakers and topics of interest, food, child-care, and paid transportation are all initiatives that have been implemented. Even day-to-day contact with parents to offer strategies and suggestions for everything from homework help to engaging their children in meaningful conversations or encouraging participation in appropriate out-of-school activities has become a whole-staff priority.

Many of our students arrive at P169M with a legacy of add-on services that both overwhelm our related services staff and also cut deeply into the all-too-limited classroom time needed for mastery of school skills and content knowledge. These services may have been well-meaning; designed to support struggling students in less restrictive settings than exists at P169M. Here limited class sizes with dual or even triple adult instructional teams support students in ways that would be impossible in general education settings, not to mention almost universal counseling services and other specialized staff built into the very structure of the program.

A school-wide behavior management system staffed with full-time professionals often means that added paraprofessional support is redundant, while speech and other services that call for removing students from their instructional setting as often as three or four times each week wreak havoc with content-area competency. In response, and with the support of District 75, P169M seeks to develop methods of meeting the intense needs of our students in less obtrusive ways: providing services with push-in rather than pull-out (from classrooms) strategies; having a small team of crisis management paraprofessionals available for reassignment as needs arise, rather than the many more who would have to be assigned on a full-time one-to-one basis for students who rarely require that added support; group sessions to supplement individualized services rather than individualized attention only; and most importantly, actively monitoring student progress with an eye toward removing services as students develop the ability to cope successfully without them.

It is no secret that successful completion of the New York State mandated curriculum from kindergarten through high school graduation requires students to devote more time to focused academic involvement than is available during the regular school day – often from one to several hours more. Daily homework assignments and periodic long-term reading, research and writing projects characterize the typical student's journey from pre-school to adulthood. Insuring that students have the support required to be

appropriately engaged in these supplementary but essential learning experiences requires significant home-school cooperation and parental involvement, things all-to-often lacking in the lives of P169M students.

Completed homework assignments are an area that needs to be improved for the students at P169M. Providing students with both the incentive to be engaged in their studies beyond the limited class time of the average school day as well as the instructional expertise to make their efforts productive may require funding after-school activities that mix academic with recreational programming. That requires appropriate staff, transportation and probably food service as well. None of those things are free, but without such programs the likelihood is small that our students will spend as much time on their school work as typical students in general education.

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 2010-11 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, Persistently Lowest-Achieving (PLA), 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 be aligned to the school's annual goals described in this section.

GOAL #1: By June 2011, there will be an increase in the number of parents – we expect a 30 percent increase in the number of parent participants on the P/A – taking an active role in school activities and volunteering to participate on the PA and/or the School Leadership Team (SLT).

Rationale: Engaging parents/guardians in appropriate, supported training opportunities, it is hoped and expected, will help strengthen the home-school partnership and result in a greater percentage of P169M students meeting promotional requirements on standardized ELA and mathematics assessments. It is expected that with increased parental awareness and active participation in their children's education, incidents of unexcused absenteeism and tardiness, serious detractors from academic performance, will be reduced. To date, our pro-active and imaginative Parent Coordinator has had only limited success in engaging parents in the desired home-school partnership.

GOAL #2: By June 2011, a five percentage-point increase in the number of students in grades 3 to 8 approaching, reaching, or surpassing grade-level standards (i.e., level 2 or above) on the New York State Standardized ELA assessments.

Rationale: We remain focused on improved student performance. The most recently available "high-stakes" test results – from the 2008/09 school year – showed further improvement from prior years, but remain far short of acceptable and while the 2009/10 test results are not yet available, it is unlikely that the goal of significant improvement was attained. Our short term objective remains boosting performance of the majority of students up to or above grade level standards on their ELA assessments. During the 2009/10 school year **Academic Intervention Services** added **Achieve 3000**

support for up to four of our middle grades standard assessment classes. Our Inquiry Team continued its focus on literacy development, this year sifting its attention to the writing skills deficits exhibited by eighth grade students. It is expected that the implementation of writing-process based activities have helped prepare these students as they depart for the rigors of the high school curriculum.

Goal #3: By June 2011, there will be a five percentage point jump in the number of P169M students in grades 3 to 8 scoring at or above level 2 on the New York State standardized mathematics assessments.

Rationale: Similar to goal #2, we remain committed to boosting the number of students scoring on or above grade level on standardized mathematics assessments. Therefore, our Inquiry Team focus during the 2007-2008 school year was on sixth grade mathematics instruction, with particular emphasis on operations and number sense. This year again, sixth and seventh grade instruction was supported by technology-enriched instructional support programs, targeted professional development and supplementary mathematics programs directed at lifting the performance of these students on their standardized assessments. Hence, for the duration of the 2010-2011 school-year, **A**cademic **I**ntervention **S**ervices in Mathematics will involve all middle (6th to 8th) grades students. Our AIS will be employing several newly acquired instructional technology-based mathematics tools including: Jump Start, Mighty Math – Number Heroes and the MathBlaster series for students in grades 1 to 12.

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 2010-11 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, PLA, 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): Family/Community Involvement

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>By June 2011, there will be an increase in parent involvement in school activities, with the number of adult parent/guardians participating in the PA and/or School Leadership Team jumping by at least 30 percent or more as evidenced by attendance at scheduled meetings and events.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p>Parent/Guardian meetings will be scheduled at the school and will include guest speakers (DOE or other) to inform parents and provide useful parenting strategies related to improving school performance (academic and behavioral) of their children. The parent coordinator will facilitate these meetings with the direct support of the school administration. Meetings will be scheduled bi-monthly beginning in October.</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include human and fiscal resources, with specific reference to scheduled FY'11 PS and/or OTPS budget categories, that will support the actions/strategies/ activities described in this action plan.</i></p>	<p>PA and SLT funding will be made available for these low-cost endeavors.</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>Larger numbers of parent participants, an increase of at least one parent at each successive monthly PA and/or SLT meeting will be an immediate indicator of success, followed – longer term – by reduced student behavioral incidents (as indicated by SWIS and OORS reports) and by improved students performance on ELA and Math assessments.</p>

ELA/Reading

Subject/Area (where relevant):

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2011, there will be a five percentage point (or more) increase in the number of students in grades 3 to 8 scoring on level 2 or above on standardized ELA assessments at P169M.,</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>The 8th grade (departmentalized) ELA teacher, Stacey Klass, will receive follow-up training from <i>Scholastic</i>, while our elementary instructional team of Siobhan McNulty and Dwayne Newell will receive <i>McGraw Hill</i> training. Jeff Andrusin has been trained in and will implement <i>Achieve 3000</i> for our middle grades classes. All will be treated, as well, to continuous instructional and technologic support throughout the school year as they supplement the NYS grade level curriculums with Academic Intervention Services (both during regular instructional periods and during extra professional assignment periods). This targeted instruction will focus on the poorest performing 25 percent of the students in these grades. Supplemental instruction will be scheduled daily by the staff with students receiving this extra support at least twice-weekly. Instruction and student progress will be closely monitored by the school’s Inquiry Team – the focus of which has been remedial reading and writing instruction.</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include human and fiscal resources, with specific reference to scheduled FY’11 PS and/or OTPS budget categories, that will support the actions/strategies/ activities described in this action plan.</p>	<p>Funding for <i>Read 180</i> has been ear-marked by D75 for schools with student performance persistently below grade-level standards. <i>Achieve 3000</i> has also been funded by District 75. School-based curricular funds will supplement Inquiry Team allocations for the SRA materials and program training. The UFT chapter has included AIS as an appropriate school-based option for Circular 6 mandated professional activities. The staff involved were selected based upon their proven track records in ELA instruction and have volunteered for this assignment.</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<p>Improvements in all content areas that benefit from improved reading ability are anticipated – higher quarterly cumulative averages should be seen on the report cards of the targeted population. Scantron interim assessment results will be monitored as administered throughout the year with the expectation of a three-month grade-equivalent reading level gain for every two months of supplementary instruction. Improved academic performance should also enhance self-esteem and thus yield reduced numbers of behavioral incidents.</p>

Mathematics

Subject/Area (where relevant):

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2011, there will be a five percentage point rise in the number of P169M students in grades 3 to 8 scoring on level 2 or above on standardized mathematics assessments.</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>The 6th grade self-contained/common branch teachers, Thomas Worjroh, Renae Dobbs and Julia Facey and the 7th grade teachers, Melissa White and Karl Danticat, will be joined by elementary grade instructors Siobhan McNulty and Dwain Newell in receiving initial and follow-up training from D75 Mathematics Coaches, as well as continuous instructional and technologic support throughout the school year as they supplement the NYS grade level curriculum with Academic Intervention Services (both during regular instructional periods and during extra professional assignment periods). This targeted instruction will focus on the poorest performing 25 percent of the students in these grades. Supplemental instruction will be scheduled daily by the staff with students receiving this extra support at least twice-weekly.</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include human and fiscal resources, with specific reference to scheduled FY'11 PS and/or OTPS budget categories, that will support the actions/strategies/ activities described in this action plan.</p>	<p>Funding for the newly acquired mathematics instructional software was ear-marked by the NYC DOE through the 2007-08 Inquiry Team budget allocation. The UFT chapter has included AIS as an appropriate school-based option for Circular 6 mandated professional activity. The staff involved were selected based upon their proven track records in mathematics instruction and have volunteered for this assignment.</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p>	<p>Improved academic performance in mathematics and related subjects such as science and technology should also enhance self-esteem and yield reduced numbers of behavioral incidents. Scantron interim assessment results will be monitored as administered throughout the year with the expectation of a three-month grade-equivalent math performance level gain for every two months of supplementary instruction. Improved academic performance should also enhance self-esteem and thus yield reduced numbers of behavioral incidents.</p>

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2010-2011

Directions: All schools must complete Appendices 1, 2, 3, & 7. All Title I schools must complete Appendix 4. All schools identified under NCLB or SED for School Improvement, including Improvement (year 1), Improvement (year 2), Corrective Action (CA) (year 1), Corrective Action (year 2), Restructuring (year 1), Restructuring (year 2), Restructuring (Advanced), and SURR, must complete Appendix 5. All Schools Under Registration Review (SURR) must also complete Appendix 6. **Please refer to the accompanying CEP guidance for specific CEP submission instructions and timelines.** (Important Notes: Last year's Appendix 7 – School-level Reflection and Response to System-wide Curriculum Audit Findings – has sunset as a requirement. Last year's Appendix 9 has been moved to Appendix 7 for 2010-2011. Appendix 8 will not be required for this year.)

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: TITLE I, PART A – SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS IN TEMPORARY HOUSING (STH) – REQUIREMENT
FOR ALL SCHOOLS**

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

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

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

Grade	ELA	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	At-risk Services: Guidance Counselor	At-risk Services: School Psychologist	At-risk Services: Social Worker	At-risk Health-related Services
	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS				
K	1	1	N/A	N/A				
1	2	2	N/A	N/A				
2	4	4	N/A	N/A				
3	12	12	N/A	N/A	2		2	
4	13	13	4	4	5	2	4	
5	20	20	6	5	5	2	3	
6	21	21	6	6	10	4	8	
7	22	22	7	8	19	9	9	1
8	28	28	9	8	31	3	5	
9	6	6			6			
10	4	4			2			
11	1	1			2			
12	1	1			2			

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.).
<p>ELA: <i>Read 180</i></p> <p><i>SRA: Reading Mastery & Corrective Reading</i></p> <p><i>Renzulli® Next-Book™</i></p>	<p>A technology-based program of small group instruction and individualized and guided programmed learning on the computer. Between two to five sessions per week.</p> <p>A comprehensive curriculum direct instruction-based reading intervention employing authentic literature and computer-based tightly sequenced, carefully planned lessons that address a variety of reading deficits. To be employed daily.</p> <p>A web-based inquiry-driven data-base dynamic, personalized environment designed to encourage reading and research, communication and reporting.</p>
<p>Mathematics:</p>	<p>A supplemental technology-based program of small group math instruction and individualized and guided programmed learning on the computer. Between two to five sessions per week building upon the standard curriculum: Everyday Math or Impact Mathematics, but improving competencies with the additional guided practice included in the attention grabbing arcade-game-like backdrops in <i>Knowledge Adventure: Jump Start, KidWorks, MathBlaster</i> and <i>Mighty Math</i>.</p> <p>These instructional computer-software titles were selected by the Inquiry team after a year-long investigation into the deficits exhibited by the targeted population and an assessment of readily available tools designed to address those deficits. These programs combine self-teaching ‘programmed learning opportunities with self-adjusting degrees of difficulty based upon student performance, as well as a wide-range of exercises and supplementary instructional materials designed to support direct instruction.</p> <p>Additionally, the Web-based <i>Destination Math®</i> offers personalized supplemental math instruction through a highly interactive, online learning environment and is at the heart of our individualized computer programmed learning and small group instruction. Between two to five sessions per week.</p>
<p>Science:</p>	<p>Tutorial during 3X per week science instruction. Additional science support provided during weekly science-oriented supplementary programming that employs: Tek Deck (miniature vehicles used to demonstrate Newton’s laws of motion), D75 “Hands on Science” support including experimentation with lessons on osmosis and diffusion employing filtration and food coloring.</p>

Social Studies:	<p>Tutorial 3X per week during the scheduled ELA block. Introduction to current and historical events awareness via <i>Star Reporter</i>, a computer based newspaper publishing program designed to engage secondary-level students in the process of social research even as they enhance their ELA skill set. Mr. Rouse, the teacher with primary responsibility for secondary-level social studies instruction and eighth-grade exit projects will coordinate this activity with his colleagues. He also provides supplemental instruction to the eighth grade students through participation in intra-school Debate League preparation and competition.</p>
At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:	<p>TCI (Therapeutic Crisis Intervention – Developed by Cornell University under a grant from the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, TCI is a crisis prevention and intervention model that assists schools in preventing crises from occurring, deescalating crises that have the potential for injury to children and staff, and teaches young people adaptive coping skills) and LSCI (Life Space Crisis Intervention – an advanced, therapeutic strategy developed by Drs. Long and Fecser of the Life Space Crisis Intervention Institute. This is an internationally recognized professional training and certification program based upon 27 specific skills needed to respond successfully to a young person in crisis). (1X to 3X per week – and additionally as required. Students develop new coping skills and learn self-regulation techniques.</p>
At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	<p>TCI and LSCI 1X to 3X per week – and additionally as required. Students develop new coping skills and learn self-regulation techniques.</p>
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	<p>TCI and LSCI 1X to 3X per week – and additionally as required. Students develop new coping skills and learn self-regulation techniques.</p>
At-risk Health-related Services:	<p>Clubs every Friday as well as 3X per week before and after school: Students participate in Basketball, Rugby, Volleyball, cooking, beading, and healthy eating instruction – Pizza club.</p>

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

NCLB/SED requirement for all schools

Part A: Language Allocation Policy (LAP) – Attach a copy of your school’s current year (2010-2011) Language Allocation Policy to this CEP.

Part B: Title III: Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students – School Year 2010-2011

Directions: In anticipation of the allocation of Title III funding to your school for 2010-11 at the same funding level as 2009-10, indicate below whether there will be any revisions for 2010-11 to your school’s approved 2009-10 Title III program narrative and budget. Note: Only revised Title III plans will be reviewed this year for DOE and SED approval.

- There will be no revisions to our school’s approved 2009-10 Title III program narrative and budget (described in this section) for implementation in 2010-11 (pending allocation of Title III funding).
- We have made minor revisions to our school’s approved 2009-10 Title III program narrative for 2010-11 (pending allocation of Title III funding). The revised Title III program narrative is described in Section II below.
- We have made minor revisions to our school’s approved 2009-10 Title III budget for 2010-11 (pending allocation of Title III funding). The revised Title III budget is described in Section III below.
- Our school’s 2009-10 Title III program narrative and budget have been revised for 2010-11 (pending allocation of Title III funding). The new Title III plan is described in Sections’ II and III below.

Section I. Student and School Information

Grade Level(s) 3-8 Number of Students to be Served: 33 LEP _____ Non-LEP

Number of Teachers 2 Other Staff (Specify) _____

School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview

Section II. Title III, Part A LEP Program Narrative

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

Two ESL teachers work collaboratively with content-area teachers across the curriculum to ensure ELLs are receiving appropriate language instruction. Our ESL teachers utilize both the “push-in” and “pull-out” models for English instruction. Students are seen during regularly scheduled academic periods.

Title III Supplemental After-School Instructional program at P169M

The ELLs participating in P169M's freestanding ESL program are Spanish and Chinese-Mandarin dominant. The current total number of students attending P169M is 273, of whom 42 are ELLs, 15 percent of the total. The ethnic background of students at P169M is as follows: 4 Native Americans, 3 Asians, 143 Hispanics, 113 Black (non Hispanic), and 8 Caucasians and 2 other. Currently, 19 ELLs are served in standardized assessment and they are all Spanish dominant. The ELL students participating in standardized assessment are: two 3rd graders, six 5th graders, four 6th graders, two 7th graders, two 8th graders and three high school students. There are 23 alternate assessment ELL students two of whom are Chinese-Mandarin dominant. These alternate assessment ELLs are: K – one, 1st – four; 2nd – four; 3rd – five; 4th – one; 5th – five; 6th – one and 7th – two.

P169M serves 23 ELLs with 12:1:1 student-to-teacher-to paraprofessional ratios; five ELLs with 8:1:1 ratios; 13 ELLs with 6:1:1 ratios; and one ELL student mandated for SETSS. NYSESLAT results indicate that P169M has 17 students who were deemed beginner level, 9 students who were deemed intermediate level, and 6 students who were deemed advanced, one who was deemed proficient; the remainder of the children did not complete the entire exam and therefore have scores that are invalid. Also, data obtained from math and reading NYSAA scores indicates that ELLs participating in our alternate assessment program are progressing as well as their non-ELL counterparts. 70 percent of our alternate assessment students placed at level 3 or better in ELA, and 80 percent of alternate assessment students placed at level 3 or better in math. Seventy-five percent of our students placed at level 2 on the NYS ELA exam with 1 student scoring at level 1. Half of our students placed at level 2 on the NYS math exam with 2 students scoring a level 1.

P169M runs a Title III ESL Saturday Academy instructional program serving a maximum of 24 students in grades K-8, consisting of as many as four classes with 6:1:1 or 12:1:1 student : teacher : paraprofessional staffing ratios, dependant on student IEP mandates. The class(es) will meet for five hours each Saturday, from 8:30 AM to 1:30 PM., for a total of five weeks beginning in January and ending in April. The class(es) will be conducted in English by certified ESL teachers and Special Education teachers who will use appropriate ESL methodologies and scaffolding techniques, supported by research, such as the natural approach (Krashen, S., 1985), TPR (Asher, J., 2003), the language experience approach (Wales, M.L., 1994), and Quality Teaching for English Learners (QTEL) scaffolds (Walqui, 2005). Technology will be infused into instruction to enhance student learning, and as a solution to the problem of access and equity for ELLs with severe disabilities (Birmbaum, B., 2003). Instruction will address the New York State ESL, ELA, and content area learning standards (e.g., the Career Development/Occupational Studies (CDOS)) and will make all necessary accommodations to insure that the needs of students are met, whether participating in standardized assessment or alternate assessment programs.

The goal of instruction in the Title III Saturday Academy program at P169M is to provide additional support and opportunities for ELL students with severe emotional / behavioral disabilities compounded, in some instances, by moderate to severe learning disabilities and/or cognitive impairments, to increase their listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills in English. Teachers will address the NYS ELA standard of listening, reading, writing, and speaking for information and understanding through the use of laptop computers and software packages designed for our student population which includes “Writing with Symbols.” Also, teachers will use the learning experience format to deliver instruction that is differentiated, thematic, and that affords students an opportunity to generalize, apply, and put their skills into practice across content areas and in a variety of situations, as suggested by the New York State Education’s Office of English Language Learners in their resource book entitled “The Teaching of English Language Arts to English Language Learners: A Resource Guide for All Teachers.”

P169M serves ELL students with severe emotional / behavioral disabilities between the ages of seven and 16 at our elementary and middle school sites, and through high school grades at our Metropolitan Hospital adolescent psychiatric day-treatment agency site and at our inclusion program at Manhattan Center for Science and Mathematics High School. A major goal of instruction for these students is to prepare them for competitive and supported employment. Possessing adequate and appropriate communication and socialization skills, self-directed supports, and the ability to make sound choices in the work place are the greatest predictors of success in the work-world for individuals with such severe emotional and learning disorders (Hughes, C. & Carter, E., 2000, Martin, J., Mithaug, D., Oliphint, J., Husch, J., & Frazier, E., 2002). Therefore, P169M ‘s supplemental Saturday instructional program will help better prepare its ELL students for the work-world by addressing the students’ listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills in English and their employability skills. Student performance on the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT) and the Brigance™ Employability Skills Inventory, and teacher-made pre and post checklists will be used to determine the impact of support for ELLs in the Title III Saturday program.

During the school day, ELL students at P169M participate in all academic and PBIS behavior support initiatives:

- Core academic subjects and standardized assessments
- Supplementary AIS instruction including Computer Aided Instruction
- Self-elected recreational activities ranging from athletics to miniature skate-board (TEK-DECK) racing.
- Intramural and interscholastic (PSAL) athletic competition, including C.H.A.M.P.S.
- Interscholastic academic competitions including D75 Debate competition and the “Teaching Matters” Election-Connection

The Title III instructional Saturday program will support and supplement Part 154 instruction delivered during the school day by providing additional language-learning support to students that will benefit them in their academic, recreational and behavioral/socialization programs. The theme of the Saturday program will be ***Communicating in the World of Work***. Instruction will be heavily weighted with language needed in the work world.

Students will participate in engaging activities that help them hone their ability to communicate such things as:

- How to search and apply for employment,
- How to negotiate the interview process,
- How/when to notify employers in case of illness or other personal emergencies,
- How to determine employer expectations and how to satisfy them,
- Know when and how to request, command, reject, comment, etc.,
- And finally, develop a facility for using and understanding work-related terminology (verbal, written, and symbolic).

Professional Development Program – Describe the school’s professional development program for teachers and other staff responsible for the delivery of instruction and services to limited English proficient students.

Title III Supplemental Professional Development Activities at P169M

P169M plans to use Title III funds to create a Title III Study Group for the professional development component of its plan. The professional development group will study both the academic- and work-related communication needs of ELL students who will participate in the Title III after school program. The study group will be aligned to the “Inquiry Team” project already in existence at the school (focused on strengthening standards-based instruction and improved academic outcomes) and will focus on creating a standards-based professional development resource kit to enhance staff preparation and planning for instruction of ELLs in preparation for students to enter the work world and/or improve the communication skills necessary for success in their current academic classes.

This professional development initiative is aligned to the instructional Saturday Academy program and will provide technical support and resources to teachers in the Saturday program, as well as to other staff who work with ELL students at P169M. The study group format of our planned professional development is in alignment with research findings that equate successful professional development and application of what’s gained during PD to the classroom to teachers having a leadership role in their own training (Galbraith, P. & Anstrom, K., 1995), as well as supported by the Action Research Process and teacher-initiated/led action research and implementation (Sagor, ASCD, 2000). The Title III Study Group will meet once a week for two hours per day, for 10 weeks after school. Two teachers and two paraprofessionals who work with the ELLs at P169M, along with a supervisor, will participate in this PD.

Section III. Title III Budget

School: 75M169 BEDS Code: 307500011169

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

Allocation:		
Budget Category	Budgeted Amount	Explanation of Proposed Expenditure
Instructional Saturday Program: Professional staff, per session, per diem (Note: schools must account for fringe benefits)		
1 Supervisor Per Session: (25 hrs @ \$52.21/hr) 5 hours x 5 Saturdays	\$1305	Administrative services provided by the supervisor of the Title III ESL Saturday Academy program.
2 ESL teachers: (25 hrs @ \$49.89/hr) 5 hours x 5 Saturdays	\$2495	Instructional services provided by the ESL teachers for the ESL Saturday Academy program.
Two Bilingual paraprofessional: (25 hrs @ \$28.98) 5 hours x 5 days	\$1450	Instructional support and interpretive services provided by a bilingual paraprofessional for the Title III ESL Saturday Academy program, and after-school ESL PD.
2 Teachers of ELL students 25 hrs @ \$49.89/hr) 5 hours x 5 Saturdays	\$2495	Instructional services provided by Special Education teachers for the ESL Saturday Academy program.
Professional Development: 1 Supervisor Per Session (7 hrs \$52.21) 3.5 hours x 2 days	\$365	Supervisor for Title III-funded after-school ESL PD.
2 ESL teacher/trainer: (7 hrs @ \$49.89 /hr – trainer rate) 3.5 hours x 2 days	\$700	Teacher/trainer for Title III-funded after-school ESL PD.
2 teachers of ELL students: (7hrs@ \$22.72/hr – trainee rate) 3.5 hours x 2 days	\$405	Teacher participants in Title III-funded after-school ESL PD.
2 paraprofessionals who work with ELL students: (7 hrs @ \$28.98/hr – trainee rate)	\$320	Paraprofessional participants in Title III-funded after-school ESL PD.
Transportation: 24 metrocards x 5 sessions	\$540	Travel to and from school on 5 Saturdays for each child.

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

Requirement under Chancellor's Regulations – for all schools

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

Part A: Needs Assessment Findings

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

The School's Administrative Team, our bilingual Parent Coordinator, our ESL teachers, and our counseling staff reviewed the home language surveys of the entire student body as well as all school-to-home communications: written and logged-verbal, whether available in translation or not, for the 2009-10 school year. Moreover, the entire IEP/CSE identification and remediation of needs process was reviewed to insure that families would be provided with all relevant information in their preferred language as required by Federal, State and Local statute and relevant case law.

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.

It was determined that because every school-to-home communication has value, and because a relatively large percentage of the parents/guardians of our students are limited English proficient (about 30 percent or 80 families according to the home language survey included with every new student intake), every written mass-communication (such as those reminding families of the dates of holidays, testing dates, P/T conference dates, PA meeting dates, special assembly programs, picture-days, trip notifications, etc.) would be sent home in translation. Additionally, any family-specific written communication would be sent in translation if required, either by the home language survey, by the family's request, or at the suggestion of a staff member familiar with the language needs of the family. These procedures would then involve either the DOE Translation and Interpretation Unit for which a two- to three-week turn-around is normally required for each translated document, or for more timely service, appropriately trained and authorized school staff.

Moreover, every verbal communication would also involve translation/interpretive services as indicated by the home language survey or simply to accommodate a family's request. This would involve volunteer staff members fluent in the language needed for effective communication.

At this time, the only languages (other than English) needed for school-to-home communication at P169M were found to be Spanish and Mandarin (Chinese). Teachers of students whose families are not English speaking are both informed and provided with contact information both in the school and at relevant community support services in order to insure adequate home-school communication is effective and uninterrupted. Staff members fluent in Spanish and Chinese have received the required DOE training in translation and interpretive services. This information has been disseminated to all staff members who have need or desire to communicate with families. A summary of the requirements included in Chancellor's Regulations A-660 (including A-663) listed in the P169M Staff Handbook and will be included in the staff orientation before the beginning of each new school year (this year – September 7, 2010).

Part B: Strategies and Activities

1. Describe the written translation services the school will provide, and how they will meet identified needs indicated in Part A. Include procedures to ensure timely provision of translated documents to parents determined to be in need of language assistance services. Indicate whether written translation services will be provided by an outside vendor, or in-house by school staff or parent volunteers.

As indicated above, several staff members are fluent and literate in the necessary languages. Moreover, two staff members have received the required DOE translation and interpretive services training to be approved for insuring site-based preparation of translated documents for school-to home communication on a timely basis. On an as-needed basis, a budgetary item has been established to insure the ability to pay per-session for these staff members to complete translation of written communications so that non-English speaking families are apprised of school-related activities in timely fashion, thereby maximizing their opportunity for full participation.

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.

Because of the “real-time” nature of oral communication, interpretive services have been and will continue to be provided by volunteer staff fluent in the languages required by the families with which communication is desired. Since this is largely done during school hours, no additional funding is required. It should be noted that our Parent Coordinator is funded independently (DOE) for her time during after-hours meetings, both group and individual, and she is DOE-trained and certified for translation and interpretation in one of the languages (Spanish) required by most of the P169M non-English speaking families. Additionally, three Chinese-speaking staff members, two of whom were originally hired for interim placement instructional support for a Chinese-speaking students and the third is a licensed China Tour Operator, make possible timely communication with our Mandarin-speaking families.

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>.

Families are informed of their rights to have school-to-home communication provided in the language of choice directly through written notice sent in translation, as an inclusion in both the Parent Handbook and monthly PA newsletter published by the P169M office of the Parent Coordinator, and through direct verbal communication with the school counselor assigned to each and every student in this special education program. Necessary documents including Special Education Services, as well as building emergency services and procedures are all available in English and in translation, provided by the office of translation services at the DOE.

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

All Title I schools must complete this appendix.

N.A. for P169M

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 Basic	Title I ARRA	Total
1. Enter the anticipated Title I, Part A allocation for 2010-11:			
2. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside for Parent Involvement:			
3. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified:		*	
4. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Professional Development:		*	

5. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2009-2010 school year: _____
6. 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.

* Federal waiver granted; additional set-asides for Title I ARRA are not required for these areas.

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

Directions: Attach a copy of the school's **Parent Involvement Policy (PIP)**, which includes the **School-Parent Compact**.

Explanation – School Parental Involvement Policy: In support of strengthening student academic achievement, each school that receives Title I, Part A funds must develop jointly with, agree on with, and distribute to, parents of participating children a written parental involvement policy that contains information required by section 1118(a)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The policy establishes the school's expectations for parental involvement and describes how the school will implement a number of specific parental involvement activities, including the required **Title I Annual Parent meeting**. A sample template was created by the Office of School Improvement in collaboration with the New York State Education Department and Office for Family Engagement and Advocacy and is available in the nine major languages on the NYCDOE website. It is **strongly recommended** that schools, in consultation with parents, use the sample template as a framework for the information to be included in their parental involvement policy. Schools, in consultation with parents, are encouraged to include other relevant and agreed upon activities and actions as well that will support effective parental involvement and strengthen student academic achievement. The school parent involvement policy must be provided to all parents and disseminated in the major languages spoken by the majority of parents in the school.

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

Part C: TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM SCHOOLS

Section I: Schoolwide Program (SWP) Required Components

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.

2. Schoolwide reform strategies that:
 - a) Provide opportunities for all children to meet the State's proficient and advanced levels of student academic achievement.
 - b) Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically-based research that:
 - Increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as extended school year, before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities.
 - Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.
 - Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.
 - Address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of low academic achieving children and those at risk of not meeting the State academic content standards and are members of the target population of any program that is included in the Schoolwide Program. These programs may include counseling, pupil services, mentoring services, college and career awareness/preparation, and the integration of vocational and technical education programs.
 - Are consistent with and are designed to implement State and local improvement, if any.

3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.

4. High-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals (and, where appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff) to enable all children in the Schoolwide Program to meet the State's student academic standards.

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

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

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.
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.
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.

Section II: "Conceptual" Consolidation of Funds in a Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP)

Explanation/Background:

Title I Schoolwide Program schools are expected to use the flexibility available to them to integrate services and programs with the aim of upgrading the entire educational program and helping all students reach proficient and advanced levels of achievement. In addition to coordinating and integrating services, Schoolwide Program schools may combine most Federal, State and local funds to provide those services. By consolidating funds from Federal, State, and local sources, a Schoolwide Program school can address its needs using *all* of the resources available to it. This gives a school more flexibility in how it uses available resources to meet the identified needs of its students.

Consolidating funds in a Schoolwide Program means that a school treats the funds it is consolidating like they are a single "pool" of funds. In other words, the funds from the contributing programs in the school lose their individual identity and the school has one flexible pool of funds. The school uses funds from this consolidated Schoolwide pool to support any activity of the Schoolwide Program without regard to which program contributed the specific funds used for a particular activity. To consolidate funding in a Schoolwide Program, the school does not literally need to combine funds in a single account or pool with its own accounting code. Rather, the word "pool" is used **conceptually** to convey that a Schoolwide Program school has the use of all consolidated funds available to it for the dedicated function of operating a Schoolwide Program without regard to the identity of those funds.

Consolidating Federal funds in a Schoolwide Program has the following additional advantages:

- Consolidating Federal funds eases the requirements for accounting for funds from each specific program separately, because a Schoolwide school is not required to distinguish among funds received from different sources when accounting for their use.
- A school that consolidates Federal funds in its Schoolwide Program is not required to meet most of the statutory and regulatory requirements of the specific Federal programs included in the consolidation (e.g., semi-annual time and effort reporting for Title I). However, the school must ensure that it meets the intent and purposes of the Federal programs included in the consolidation so that the needs of the intended beneficiaries are met.

Most, if not all, Schoolwide Program (SWP) schools in NYC are already conceptually consolidating their Federal, State, and Local funds, even though the Galaxy system reports the allocations in separate accounting codes.

To be eligible for the flexibility consolidation of Federal funds enables, a Schoolwide Program school must identify in its Schoolwide plan (CEP) which programs are included in its consolidation and the amount each program contributes to the consolidated Schoolwide pool. Additionally, the school plan must document that it has met the intent and purposes of each program whose funds are consolidated. For example, IDEA, Part B allows SWP schools to consolidate a portion of the funds received under Part B of IDEA, so long as students with disabilities included in such Schoolwide Programs receive special education and related services in accordance with a properly developed Individualized Education Program (IEP), and are afforded all of the rights and services guaranteed to children with disabilities under IDEA. The intent and purpose of the IDEA is to ensure that all children with disabilities have available to them a free appropriate public education designed to meet their individual needs. A Schoolwide Program may demonstrate that it meets the intent and purpose of this program by ensuring that, except as to certain use of funds requirements, all the requirements of the IDEA are met, and that children with disabilities are included in school-wide activities. High-quality professional development required for all staff and designed to result in improved learning outcomes for all children, including children with disabilities, is one example of a schoolwide activity that meets the intent and purposes of the IDEA.

Directions: In this section, please indicate which Federal, State, and/or local Tax Levy program funds are consolidated in your school’s Schoolwide Program, the amount each program contributes to the consolidated Schoolwide pool, and verification that the school has met the intent and purposes of each program whose funds are consolidated.

Program Name	Fund Source <i>(i.e., Federal, State, or Local)</i>	Program Funds Are “Conceptually” ¹ Consolidated in the	Amount Contributed to Schoolwide Pool	Check (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) in the left column below to verify that the school has met the intent and purposes ² of each program whose
--------------	------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Reminder: To consolidate funding in a Schoolwide Program, the school does not literally need to combine funds in a single account or pool with its own accounting code. Rather, the word “pool” is used conceptually to convey that a Schoolwide Program school has the use of all consolidated funds available to it for the dedicated function of operating a Schoolwide Program without regard to the identity of those funds. Most Schoolwide Program (SWP) schools in NYC are conceptually consolidating all of their Federal, State, and Local funds, even though the Galaxy system reports the allocations in separate accounting codes.

Note: The intent and purposes of the Federal programs indicated on the above chart are as follows:

- **Title I, Part A – Schoolwide Programs:** To upgrade the entire educational program in the school in order to improve the academic achievement of all students, particularly the lowest-achieving students.

		Schoolwide Program (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>)			(Refer to Galaxy for FY'11 school allocation amounts)	funds are consolidated. Indicate page number references where a related program activity has been described in this plan.	
		Yes	No	N/A		Check (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>)	Page #(s)
Title I, Part A (Basic)	Federal						
Title I, Part A (ARRA)	Federal						
Title II, Part A	Federal						
Title III, Part A	Federal						
Title IV	Federal						
IDEA	Federal						
Tax Levy	Local						

-
- **Title II, Part A:** To increase student academic achievement through strategies such as improving teacher and principal quality; increasing the number of highly qualified teachers, principals, and assistant principals in schools; and holding LEAs and schools accountable for improvements in student academic achievement.
 - **Title III, Part A:** To help ensure that children with limited English proficiency become proficient in English, develop high academic attainment in English, and meet the same challenging State academic content and achievement standards in the core academic subjects that all other children are expected to meet. Another purpose of this program
 - is to increase the capacity of schools to establish, implement and sustain high-quality language instruction programs and English language development programs that assist schools in effectively teaching students with limited English proficiency. Title III, Part A is also designed to promote the participation of parents and communities of limited English proficient children in English language instruction programs.
 - **Title IV:** To support programs that prevent violence in and around schools; prevent the illegal use of alcohol, tobacco and drugs; and involve parents and communities in efforts to foster a safe and drug-free learning environment that supports student achievement.
 - **IDEA:** To ensure that all children with disabilities have available to them a free appropriate public education designed to meet their individual needs.

Part D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS

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

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

APPENDIX 5: NCLB/SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS IDENTIFIED FOR IMPROVEMENT, CORRECTIVE ACTION, OR RESTRUCTURING

N.A. for P169M

This appendix must be completed by all schools designated for school improvement under the State’s Differentiated Accountability system, including Improvement (year 1), Improvement (year 2), Corrective Action (CA) (year 1), Corrective Action (year 2), Restructuring (year 1), Restructuring (year 2), Restructuring (Advanced), and SURR schools.

NCLB/SED Status: _____ **SURR³ Phase/Group (If applicable):** _____

Part A: For All Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring

1. For each area of school improvement identification (indicated on your pre-populated School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot, downloadable from your school’s NYCDOE webpage under “Statistics”), describe the school’s findings of the specific academic issues that caused the school to be identified. For schools in Corrective Action (year 1) that underwent an External School Curriculum Audit (ESCA) during the 2009-10 school year, please include the findings from that process in your response for this section.
2. Describe the focused intervention(s) the school will implement to support improved achievement in the grade and subject areas for which the school was identified. Be sure to include strategies to address the needs of all disaggregated groups that failed to meet the AMO, Safe Harbor, and/or 95% participation rate requirement. Note: If this question was already addressed elsewhere in this plan, you may refer to the page numbers where the response can be found. For schools in the Corrective Action phase, please include the specific corrective action being implemented for the school, as required under NCLB. For schools in the Restructuring phase, please include a description of the restructuring option/strategies being implemented for the school.

School Under Registration Review (SURR)

Part B: For Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, or Restructuring

1. As required by NCLB legislation, a school identified for school improvement must spend not less than 10 percent of its Title I funds for each fiscal year that the school is in school improvement status for professional development. The professional development must be high quality and address the academic area(s) identified. Describe how the 10 percent of the Title I funds for professional development (amounts specified in Part A of Appendix 4) will be used to remove the school from school improvement.
2. Describe the teacher-mentoring program that will be incorporated as part of the school's strategy for providing high-quality professional development.
3. Describe how the school will notify parents about the school's identification for school improvement in an understandable and uniform format and to the extent practicable, in a language that the parents can understand.

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

N.A. for P169M

All SURR schools must complete this appendix.

SURR Area(s) of Identification: _____

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

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

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

APPENDIX 7: 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>

This is a NON-TITLE 1 school.

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 STH population may change over the course of the year).
2. Please describe the services you are planning to provide to the STH population with the Title I set-aside funds.
3. Based on your current STH population and services outlined, estimate the appropriate set-aside amount to support the needs of the STH population in your school.

Part B: FOR NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

1. Please identify the number of Students in Temporary Housing who are currently attending your school (please note that your STH population may change over the course of the year).

Currently, 11 students registered at P169M are living in Temporary Housing.

2. Please describe the services you are planning to provide to the STH population with the Title I set-aside funds.
N/A: school does not receive any set-aside funds
3. Some Non-Title I schools receive a specific allocation based on the reported number of students living in temporary housing. If your school received an allocation (please refer to the current Title I Funds Summary of School Allocation Memorandum), include the amount your school received in this question. If your school did not receive an allocation and needs assistance, please contact an STH liaison in the borough Integrated Service Center (ISC) or Children First Network.
 - o **N/A: As a non-geographic, administrative district, students in D 75 schools identified as STH, receive support from the STH Content Expert in each borough. The District 75 STH liaisons work with these content experts to ensure that homeless students are provided with the necessary interventions. These services include educational assistance and**

attendance tracking at the shelters, transportation assistance, and on-site tutoring. D 75 students are eligible to attend any programs run through the STH units at the ISC.

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

This appendix will not be required for 2010-2011.

Please Note: Since the system-wide expectation is that schools will maintain effort for 2008-09/2009-10 programs funded with Contract for Excellence dollars in 2010-11, schools will not be required to complete a new version of CEP Appendix 8 this year. Please see the FY11 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 2010-11)

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT

School Name:	P.S. M169 - Robert F. Kennedy						
District:	75	DBN:	75M169	School		307500011169	

DEMOGRAPHICS

Grades Served:	Pre-K		3	v	7	v	11	v
	K	v	4	v	8	v	12	
	1	v	5	v	9	v	Ungraded	v
	2	v	6	v	10	v		

Enrollment				Attendance - % of days students attended:			
<i>(As of October 31)</i>	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	<i>(As of June 30)</i>	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Pre-K	0	0	0				NR
Kindergarten	18	3	1				
Grade 1	1	2	3	Student Stability - % of Enrollment:			
Grade 2	8	2	5	<i>(As of June 30)</i>	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Grade 3	11	9	15			72.3	70.0
Grade 4	12	17	14	Poverty Rate - % of Enrollment:			
Grade 5	20	20	17	<i>(As of October 31)</i>	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Grade 6	20	27	31		86.1	0.0	NA
Grade 7	43	35	28	Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:			
Grade 8	48	53	35	<i>(As of June 30)</i>	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Grade 9	10	11	13		16	12	28
Grade 10	5	8	8	Recent Immigrants - Total Number:			
Grade 11	2	5	2	<i>(As of October 31)</i>	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Grade 12	2	3	0		1	1	0
Ungraded	33	83	90				
Total	233	278	262				

Special Education				Suspensions (OSYD Reporting) - Total Number:			
<i>(As of October 31)</i>	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	<i>(As of June 30)</i>	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
# in Self-Contained Classes	226	264	0	Principal Suspensions	1	0	17
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	0	0	0	Superintendent Suspensions	2	2	1
Number all others	2	3	255				

English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment: (BESIS Survey)				Special High School Programs - Total Number:			
<i>(As of October 31)</i>	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	<i>(As of October 31)</i>	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
# in Transitional Bilingual Classes	0	0	TBD	CTE Program Participants	N/A	0	0
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	TBD	Early College HS Program Participants	0	0	0

Number of Staff - Includes all full-time staff:							
<i>(As of October 31)</i>	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10				
# receiving ESL services only	5	31	TBD	Number of Teachers	52	54	0
# ELLs with IEPs	20	49	TBD	Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	37	40	0
These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.				Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	24	23	0

Overage Students (# entering students overage for				Teacher Qualifications:			
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	4	2	10	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100.0	100.0	0.0
				% more than 2 years teaching in this school	71.2	75.9	0.0
				% more than 5 years teaching anywhere	65.4	64.8	0.0
Ethnicity and Gender - % of Enrollment:							
(As of October 31)	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	% Masters Degree or higher	90.0	94.0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1.3	1.4	1.5	% core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers	89.2	93.6	0.0
Black or African American	45.9	39.9	41.6				
Hispanic or Latino	48.9	52.9	52.3				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific	0.9	0.7	1.1				
White	3.0	4.7	3.4				
Male	78.5	78.8	80.2				
Female	21.5	21.2	19.8				

2009-10 TITLE I STATUS

	Title I						
	Title I						
	Title I						
	Non-Title						
Years the School				2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

SURR School (Yes/No)		If yes,					
-----------------------------	--	---------	--	--	--	--	--

Overall NCLB/Differentiated Accountability Status (2009-10) Based on 2008-09 Performance:

	Phase		Category		
	In Good		Basic	Focused	Comprehensive
	Improvement Year 1				
	Improvement Year 2				
	Corrective Action (CA) – Year				
	Corrective Action (CA) – Year				
	Restructuring Year 1				
	Restructuring Year 2				
	Restructuring Advanced				

Individual Subject/Area AYP Outcomes:

<u>Elementary/Middle Level</u>		<u>Secondary Level</u>	
ELA:		ELA:	
Math:		Math:	
Science:		Graduation Rate:	

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

Student Groups	<u>Elementary/Middle Level</u>			<u>Secondary Level</u>			Progress Target
	ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad Rate**	
All Students							
Ethnicity							

American Indian or Alaska Native							
Black or African American							
Hispanic or Latino							
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander							
White							
Multiracial							
Students with Disabilities							
Limited English Proficient							
Economically Disadvantaged							
Student groups making							

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results – 2009-10		Quality Review Results – 2009-10					
Overall Letter Grade:	D	Overall Evaluation:					NR
Overall Score:	36.1	Quality Statement Scores:					
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data					
School Environment:	4.1	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals					
<i>(Comprises 15% of the</i>		Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals					
School Performance:	4.9	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals					
<i>(Comprises 25% of the</i>		Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise					
Student Progress:	25.6						
<i>(Comprises 60% of the</i>							
Additional Credit:	1.5						

KEY: AYP STATUS		KEY: QUALITY REVIEW SCORE					
v = Made AYP		U = Underdeveloped					
vSH = Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target		UPF = Underdeveloped with Proficient Features					
X = Did Not Make AYP		P = Proficient					
– = Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP		WD = Well Developed					
		NR = Not Reviewed					

* = 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

**OFFICE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS
GRADES K-12 LANGUAGE ALLOCATION POLICY
SUBMISSION FORM**

DIRECTIONS: This submission form assists schools with gathering and organizing the quantitative and qualitative information necessary for a well-conceived school-based language allocation policy (LAP) that describes quality ELL programs. This LAP form, an appendix of the CEP, also incorporates information required for CR Part 154 funding so that a separate submission is no longer required. Agendas and minutes of LAP meetings should be kept readily available on file in the school. Also, when preparing your school's submission, provide extended responses in the green spaces. Spell-check has been disabled in this file, so consider typing responses to these questions in a separate file before copying them in the submission form.

Part I: School ELL Profile

A. Language Allocation Policy Team Composition

Network Cluster 4	District 75	School Number 169	School Name Robert F. Kennedy
Principal Susan Finn		Assistant Principal I. Halpern	
Coach Dr. Scarcella		Coach	
Teacher/Subject Area Mr. Andrusin		Guidance Counselor Ms. Doman	
Teacher/Subject Area Mr. Magill		Parent	
Teacher/Subject Area Ms. Lovas		Parent Coordinator Ms. Velazquez	
Related Service Provider		Other	
Network Leader Arthur Fusco		Other	

B. Teacher Qualifications

Please provide a report of all staff members' certifications referred to in this section. Press TAB after each number entered to calculate sums and percentages.

Number of Certified ESL Teachers	2	Number of Certified Bilingual Teachers	0	Number of Certified NLA/Foreign Language Teachers	
Number of Content Area Teachers with Bilingual Extensions		Number of Special Ed. Teachers with Bilingual Extensions	0	Number of Teachers of ELLs without ESL/Bilingual Certification	

C. School Demographics

Total Number of Students in School	267	Total Number of ELLs	42	ELLs as Share of Total Student Population (%)	15.73%
------------------------------------	------------	----------------------	-----------	-----------------------------------------------	---------------

Part II: ELL Identification Process

Describe how you identify English Language Learners (ELLs) in your school. Answer the following:

1. Describe the steps followed for the initial identification of those students who may possibly be ELLs. These steps must include administering the Home Language Identification Survey (HLIS) which includes the informal oral interview in English and in the native language, and the formal initial assessment. Identify the person(s) responsible, including their qualifications, for conducting the initial screening, administering the HLIS, the LAB-R (if necessary), and the formal initial assessment. Also describe the steps taken to annually evaluate ELLs using the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT).
2. What structures are in place at your school to ensure that parents understand all three program choices (Transitional Bilingual, Dual Language, Freestanding ESL)? Please describe the process, outreach plan, and timelines.

3. Describe how your school ensures that entitlement letters are distributed and Parent Survey and Program Selection forms are returned? (If a form is not returned, the default program for ELLs is Transitional Bilingual Education as per CR Part 154 [[see tool kit](#)].)
4. Describe the criteria used and the procedures followed to place identified ELL students in bilingual or ESL instructional programs; description must also include any consultation/communication activities with parents in their native language.
5. After reviewing the Parent Survey and Program Selection forms for the past few years, what is the trend in program choices that parents have requested? (Please provide numbers.)
6. Are the program models offered at your school aligned with parent requests? If no, why not? How will you build alignment between parent choice and program offerings? Describe specific steps underway.

English Language Learners are identified during the initial evaluation which occurs at the Committee on Special Education (CSE) or at their former school. It is at that time that parents are asked to fill out a Home Language Identification Survey and, if the student is eligible he/she will be administered the Language Assessment Battery Revised (LAB-R). The LAB-R will be used to determine the child's level of English proficiency. If, for some reason, a child has not been identified during their initial CSE evaluation, then the school's ESL teachers along with an appropriate translator will complete the Home Language Identification Survey and the ESL teacher will administer the English LAB-R to determine English language proficiency; and if necessary the Spanish LAB-R will be administered by one of our ESL teachers, who is also a Spanish speaker. If the student is an English Language Learner, then they will receive appropriate services and they will have the NYSESLAT (New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test) administered once a year to measure their English language proficiency level. At the start of our school year we host Curriculum Night and during this event, parents are informed of the ESL program we offer; this year Curriculum Night was held on October 8, 2010. Parents are provided with literature in their language that describes the programs we offer. At that time, parents are given information to help guide them through our program model which is both a push-in and pull-out program.

Part III: ELL Demographics

A. ELL Programs

This school serves the following grades (includes ELLs and EPs)
Check all that apply

<input type="checkbox"/> K	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	
<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 8	<input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12

Provide the number of classes for each ELL program model at your school. For all-day programs (e.g., Transitional Bilingual Education, Dual Language, and Self-Contained ESL), classes refer to a cohort of students served in a day. For push-in ESL classes refer to the separate periods in a day in which students are served.

ELL Program Breakdown														
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	To t #
Transitional Bilingual Education <small>(60%:40% → 50%:50% → 75%:25%)</small>														0
Dual Language <small>(50%:50%)</small>														0
Freestanding ESL														
Self-Contained														0
Push-In														0
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

B. ELL Years of Service and Programs

Number of ELLs by Subgroups					
All ELLs	42	Newcomers (ELLs receiving service 0-3 years)	24	Special Education	42
SIFE	0	ELLs receiving service 4-6 years	17	Long-Term (completed 6 years)	1

Enter the number of ELLs by years of identification and program model in each box. Enter the number of ELLs within a subgroup who are also SIFE or special education.

ELLs by Subgroups										
	ELLs (0-3 years)			ELLs (4-6 years)			Long-Term ELLs (completed 6 years)			Total
	All	SIFE	Special Education	All	SIFE	Special Education	All	SIFE	Special Education	
TBE	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Dual Language	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
ESL	<input type="text" value="24"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="24"/>	<input type="text" value="17"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="17"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="42"/>
Total	<input type="text" value="24"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="24"/>	<input type="text" value="17"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="17"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="42"/>

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

C. Home Language Breakdown and ELL Programs

Transitional Bilingual Education														
Number of ELLs by Grade in Each Language Group														
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOTAL
Spanish														0
Chinese														0
Russian														0
Bengali														0
Urdu														0
Arabic														0
Haitian														0
French														0
Korean														0
Punjabi														0
Polish														0
Albanian														0
Yiddish														0
Other														0
TOTAL	0													

Dual Language (ELLs/EPs)																				
K-8																				
Number of ELLs by Grade in Each Language Group																				
	K		1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		TOTAL	
	EL	EP	EL	EP																
Spanish																			0	0

**Dual Language (ELLs/EPs)
K-8**

Number of ELLs by Grade in Each Language Group

	K		1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		TOTAL	
	EL L	EP																		
Chinese																			0	0
Russian																			0	0
Korean																			0	0
Haitian																			0	0
French																			0	0
Other																			0	0
TOTAL	0																			

**Dual Language (ELLs/EPs)
9-12**

Number of ELLs by Grade in Each Language Group

	9		10		11		12		TOTAL	
	ELL	EP								
Spanish									0	0
Chinese									0	0
Russian									0	0
Korean									0	0
Haitian									0	0
French									0	0
Other									0	0
TOTAL	0									

This Section for Dual Language Programs Only

Number of Bilingual students (students fluent in both languages):	Number of third language speakers:
Ethnic breakdown of EPs (Number):	
African-American:	Asian:
Hispanic/Latino:	Other:
Native American:	White (Non-Hispanic/Latino):

Freestanding English as a Second Language

Number of ELLs by Grade in Each Language Group

	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOTAL L
Spanish	2	6	5	4	2	12	4	4		1				40
Chinese			2											2
Russian														0
Bengali														0
Urdu														0
Arabic														0
Haitian														0
French														0
Korean														0

Freestanding English as a Second Language

Number of ELLs by Grade in Each Language Group

	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOTAL
Punjabi														0
Polish														0
Albanian														0
Other														0
TOTAL	2	6	7	4	2	12	4	4	0	1	0	0	0	42

Part IV: ELL Programming

A. Programming and Scheduling Information

1. How is instruction delivered?
 - a. What are the organizational models (e.g., Departmentalized, Push-In [Co-Teaching], Pull-Out, Collaborative, Self-Contained)?
 - b. What are the program models (e.g., Block [Class travels together as a group]; Ungraded [all students regardless of grade are in one class]; Heterogeneous [mixed proficiency levels]; Homogeneous [proficiency level is the same in one class])?
2. How does the organization of your staff ensure that the mandated number of instructional minutes is provided according to proficiency levels in each program model (TBE, Dual Language, ESL)?
 - a. How are explicit ESL, ELA, and NLA instructional minutes delivered in each program model as per CR Part 154 (see table below)?
3. Describe how the content areas are delivered in each program model. Please specify language, and the instructional approaches and methods used to make content comprehensible to enrich language development.
4. How do you differentiate instruction for ELL subgroups?
 - a. Describe your instructional plan for SIFE.
 - b. Describe your plan for ELLs in US schools less than three years (newcomers). Additionally, because NCLB now requires ELA testing for ELLs after one year, specify your instructional plan for these ELLs.
 - c. Describe your plan for ELLs receiving service 4 to 6 years.
 - d. Describe your plan for Long-Term ELLs (completed 6 years).
 - e. Describe your plan for ELLs identified as having special needs.

P169M uses both the Push-in and Pull-out models to deliver instruction to our English language learners. Our students are both graded and ungraded and have the following staffing ratios indicated on their IEPs: 6:1:1, 8:1:1, and 12:1:1. Our groups are developed based on their IEP mandates. Our staff ensures that the mandated number of instructional minutes is met by grouping students according to proficiency level and their instructional ratio. Our beginning and Intermediate students in grades k-8 receive 360 minutes per week, our advanced k-8 students receive 180 minutes per week, and our x-coded students are served per their IEP. ESL, ELA, and NLA instruction is based on the NYS standards for ESL, ELA, and NLA. Students who are at the beginning level of ESL in grades k-8 receive their ELA as part of their ESL program while students who are advanced ELLs receive their ELA from their homeroom teachers. Our students' native language is supported through both NLA books and an alternate placement paraprofessional who speaks the child's language. Our ESL teachers in collaboration with the content area teachers plan, either when pushing in to the classroom or pulling students out of the classroom, together to address specific needs for each child participating in P169s ELL program. The instructional methods are primarily scaffolding, TPR, and cooperative learning. Our students are paired with either a paraprofessional or student to aid in language development. Instruction is differentiated according to specific student needs and is done so through scaffolding the materials. Presently, we do not have any SIFE (students with interrupted formal education) students. At such time that we do we will provide the following: CALLA instructional framework, scaffolding, cooperative learning, and peer tutoring. For our ELLs in the US school system for less than three years, we have intensive English language blocks where students are immersed in language rich lessons, which utilize the following strategies, TPR, whole language, graphic organizers, and think, pair, share. Our ELLs receiving service between 4 to 6 years are encouraged to transition their skill set from BICs to CALP with the help of specific academic interventions, which include tutoring, study groups, utilizing ESL methodology. Long term ELLs are supported through the collaboration of the homeroom teachers and the ESL

B. Programming and Scheduling Information--Continued

5. Describe your targeted intervention programs for ELLs in ELA, math, and other content areas (specify ELL subgroups targeted). Please list the range of intervention services offered in your school for the above areas as well as the language(s) in which they are offered.
6. Describe your plan for continuing transitional support (2 years) for ELLs reaching proficiency on the NYSESLAT.
7. What new programs or improvements will be considered for the upcoming school year?
8. What programs/services for ELLs will be discontinued and why?
9. How are ELLs afforded equal access to all school programs? Describe after school and supplemental services offered to ELLs in your building.
10. What instructional materials, including technology, are used to support ELLs (include content area as well as language materials; list ELL subgroups if necessary)?
11. How is native language support delivered in each program model? (TBE, Dual Language, and ESL)
12. Do required services support, and resources correspond to ELLs' ages and grade levels?
13. Include a description of activities in your school to assist newly enrolled ELL students before the beginning of the school year.
14. What language electives are offered to ELLs?

The ESL teachers push-in to specific subject area classrooms to plan with the subject area teacher regarding scaffolding material and using other ESL methodologies to address vocabulary specific to the different content areas. Our ESL teachers offering tutoring and AIS to our ELLs who have reached proficiency on the NYSESLAT. This year we are using the push-in program model to a larger degree than in prior years to foster greater collaboration between all the academic professionals involved with our ELLs. The pull-out program will be used less than in previous years as we find that the engagement of all the teachers involved with our ELLs yields better academic outcomes. All of our students are encouraged to participate in our afterschool physical education programs and our sleep away summer camp program. We ensure that our ELLs are included by contacting their parents in their preferred language. Our school has subscriptions to the following web based resources to support the academic goals of our students: Enchanted Learning, BrainPop, Learning A-Z, and we use PECs (Picture Exchange Communication) for our ELLs. Native language support is delivered to our students through the use of native language books and through our alternate placement paraprofessionals. Our ELLs are grouped according to grades and proficiency level to support their individual language needs. Prior to the start of the academic year, our staff identifies our incoming ELL students and communicates with their parents in their preferred language to inform them of the programs we have available and to provide them with information specific to their child's program. We do not offer language electives at P169.

C. Schools with Dual Language Programs

1. How much time (%) is the target language used for EPs and ELLs in each grade?
2. How much of the instructional day are EPs and ELLs integrated? What content areas are taught separately?
3. How is language separated for instruction (time, subject, teacher, theme)?
4. What Dual Language model is used (side-by-side, self-contained, other)?
5. Is emergent literacy taught in child's native language first (sequential), or are both languages taught at the same time (simultaneous)?

Paste response to questions 1-5 here

D. Professional Development and Support for School Staff

1. Describe the professional development plan for all ELL personnel at the school. (Please include all teachers of ELLs.)
2. What support do you provide staff to assist ELLs as they transition from elementary to middle and/or middle to high school?
3. Describe the minimum 7.5 hours of ELL training for all staff (including non-ELL teachers) as per Jose P.

We offer professional development for our staff during each staff development day and during our monthly staff meetings. The topics of our professional development sessions pertaining to the education of ELLs will include NYS ESL standards, balanced literacy, math teaching -- ESL through content areas, for both standardized assessment and alternate assessment students. The entire staff of P169 is expected to attend the following dates scheduled for professional Development with regard to the education of ELLs at P169: September 7, 2010 November 2, 2010, and June 9, 2011. Our ESL teachers work with each of our teachers who have ELLs in their classrooms to develop action plans which include conferences, tutoring and scaffolding to help our students transition from different educational settings. Our staff is encouraged to participate in the Jose P. training offered by the District's professional development office. All appropriate training documentation is kept on file with the school's payroll secretary.

E. Parental Involvement

1. Describe parent involvement in your school, including parents of ELLs.
2. Does the school partner with other agencies or Community Based Organizations to provide workshops or services to ELL parents?
3. How do you evaluate the needs of the parents?
4. How do your parental involvement activities address the needs of the parents?

P169 offers parents of ELLs ongoing information in their home languages regarding the program models and strategies we employ. We keep our parents informed of all activities and events through our newsletter with specific columns related specifically to our ELL population. We periodically conduct workshops for our parents that address the needs of our school population. We host a parent breakfast where the parents are asked via a survey what types of workshops they would like to have during the course of the year. This year we have had the following workshops: Understanding Mental health Services, Behavior Management for the Autistic Child at Home, and Behavior Management for the E.D. Child at Home, and Communicating with PECs Workshop. We partner with the following agencies to help deliver workshops and other valuable information to our parents: New York Public Library, NYFAC (New York Families for Autistic Children), YAI, Sinergia and Resources for Children with Special Needs. We evaluate the needs of our parents through surveys, Curriculum Day event, parent/teacher conferences and Individual Education planning meetings. As a result of our ongoing dialogue with parents we develop workshops that address their specific issues and needs.

Part V: Assessment Analysis

A. Assessment Breakdown

Enter the number of ELLs for each test, category, and modality.

OVERALL NYSESLAT* PROFICIENCY RESULTS (*LAB-R FOR NEW ADMITS)														
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOTAL
Beginner(B)		1	3	6		5	2	2	1					20
Intermediate(I)				1	1	6	1		1	0				10
Advanced (A)						0	1	1		1				3
Total	0	1	3	7	1	11	4	3	2	1	0	0	0	33

NYSESLAT Modality Analysis														
Modality	Proficiency	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12

Aggregate	Level													
LISTENING /SPEAKING	B		1	2	2		2		2					
	I			1	4	1	5	1						
	A				1		3	3		1				
	P						1		1	1	1			
READING/ WRITING	B		1	3	6		7	2	2	1				
	I				1	1	4	1		1				
	A								1					
	P							1			1			

NYS ELA					
Grade	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total
3					0
4					0
5	4		1		5
6	2	1			3
7					0
8	1				1
NYSAA Bilingual Spe Ed			5	6	11

NYS Math									
Grade	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Total
	English	NL	English	NL	English	NL	English	NL	
3									0
4									0
5	3		1		1				5
6	1		2						3
7									0
8			1						1
NYSAA Bilingual Spe Ed	1		2		2		6		11

NYS Science									
	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Total
	English	NL	English	NL	English	NL	English	NL	
4	2		4		2		1		9
8			1						1
NYSAA Bilingual Spe Ed			1		1		4		6

NYS Social Studies

	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Total
	English	NL	English	NL	English	NL	English	NL	
5	3								3
8	3								3
NYSAA Bilingual Spe Ed	1				1		2		4

New York State Regents Exam				
	Number of ELLs Taking Test		Number of ELLs Passing Test	
	English	Native Language	English	Native Language
Comprehensive English				
Math				
Math				
Biology				
Chemistry				
Earth Science				
Living Environment				
Physics				
Global History and Geography				
US History and Government				
Foreign Language				
Other				
Other				
NYSAA ELA				
NYSAA Mathematics				
NYSAA Social Studies				
NYSAA Science				

Native Language Tests								
	# of ELLs scoring at each quartile (based on percentiles)				# of EPs (dual lang only) scoring at each quartile (based on percentiles)			
	Q1 1-25 percentile	Q2 26-50 percentile	Q3 51-75 percentile	Q4 76-99 percentile	Q1 1-25 percentile	Q2 26-50 percentile	Q3 51-75 percentile	Q4 76-99 percentile
ELE (Spanish Reading Test)								
Chinese Reading Test								

1. Describe what assessment tool your school uses to assess the early literacy skills of your ELLs (e.g., ECLAS-2, EL SOL, Fountas and Pinnell, DRA, TCRWP). What insights do the data provide about your ELLs? How can this information help inform your school’s instructional plan? Please provide any quantitative data available to support your response.
2. What is revealed by the data patterns across proficiency levels (on the LAB-R and NYSESLAT) and grades?
3. How will patterns across NYSESLAT modalities—reading/writing and listening/speaking—affect instructional decisions?
4. For each program, answer the following:
 - a. Examine student results. What are the patterns across proficiencies and grades? How are ELLs faring in tests taken in English as compared to the native language?
 - b. Describe how the school leadership and teachers are using the results of the ELL Periodic Assessments.
 - c. What is the school learning about ELLs from the Periodic Assessments? How is the Native Language used?
5. For dual language programs, answer the following:
 - a. How are the English Proficient students (EPs) assessed in the second (target) language?
 - b. What is the level of language proficiency in the second (target) language for EPs?
 - c. How are EPs performing on State and City Assessments?
6. Describe how you evaluate the success of your programs for ELLs.

Our school uses ECIAS-2 and AABLES which helps us to properly group our students and informs our instruction. NYSESLAT and LAB-R data indicate that the majority of our ELLs are placed at the beginner level in all of our grade levels. NYSESLAT scores inform both the choice of materials and our program models. Our students take all of their exams in English. The pattern that emerged from our 2010 NYSESLAT scores is that our students are progressing well in speaking, but are lagging behind in listening, reading, and writing. We use the NYSESLAT scores to tailor our instruction for our ELLs. Our assessments indicate that our students would benefit from greater attention to Cognitive Academic language proficiency which will be addressed through content area instruction. The native language is used to help scaffold material for students to transfer their native language proficiency to the target language. We evaluate our ELL program by our students overall ability to function academically and socially in the target language.

Additional Information

Please include any additional information that would be relevant to your LAP and would further explain your program for ELLs. You may attach/submit charts. This form does not allow graphics and charts to be pasted.

Paste additional information here

Signatures of LAP team members certify that the information provided is accurate.

Name (PRINT)	Title	Signature	Date (mm/dd/yy)
	Principal		
	Assistant Principal		
	Parent Coordinator		
	ESL Teacher		
	Parent		
	Teacher/Subject Area		
	Teacher/Subject Area		
	Coach		
	Coach		
	Guidance Counselor		
	Network Leader		
	Other <u>ESL Teacher</u>		
	Other		
	Other		
	Other		