



**[MS 326]**

**2010-2011**

**SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN**

**(CEP)**

**SCHOOL: 06M326**

**ADDRESS: 401 W. 164<sup>TH</sup> STREET NYC 10032**

**TELEPHONE: 917-521-1875**

**FAX: 917-521-1750**

**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 (SURR)...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:** 06M326      **SCHOOL NAME:** Writers Today & Leaders Tomorrow

**SCHOOL ADDRESS:** 401 W. 164<sup>th</sup> Street    New York, N.Y. 10032

**SCHOOL TELEPHONE:** 917-521-1875      **FAX:** 917-521-1750

**SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON:** Sharon Weissbrot      **EMAIL ADDRESS:** sweissbrot@scho  
ols.nyc.gov

**POSITION/TITLE**

**PRINT/TYPE NAME**

**SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON:** Robin Samuels

**PRINCIPAL:** Sharon Weissbrot

**UFT CHAPTER LEADER:** Robin Samuels

**PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT:** Ms. Goins

**STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE:**  
*(Required for high schools)* \_\_\_\_\_

**DISTRICT AND NETWORK INFORMATION**

**DISTRICT:** 06      **CHILDREN FIRST NETWORK (CFN):** CFN601

**NETWORK LEADER:** Lawrence Block

**SUPERINTENDENT:** Martha Madera

**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
<b>Sharon Weissbrot</b>	*Principal or Designee	
<b>Robin Samuels</b>	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
<b>Ms. Goins</b>	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
<b>Sylvia Gonzalez</b>	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	
<b>Rosemary Mutiva</b>	Member/Teacher	
<b>Mr. James</b>	Member/ Parent	
<b>Ms. Canela</b>	Member/Parent	
	Member/Parent	
	Member/	
	Member/	
	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.

---

MS 326 is located in District Six, in Washington Heights section of Manhattan and services about 370 students in grades six, seven and eight. MS 326 occupies part of a facility that was formerly occupied by IS 164 which was phased out in June 2006 due to poor academic performance over a number of years. MS 326 has been in existence since September 2004 and experienced the removal of the entire leadership team in August 2006. The present Principal assumed the leadership of the school at the end of August 2006. The State Education Department recognized the school in May 2010 for having been removed from SURR status for math and SINI status for English Language Learners. As per the New York State Education Department, the school is "in good standing" for 2010. The NYC Department of Education gave MS 326 an "A" grade on the 2009-10 Progress Report Card and stated that the school was in the 20<sup>th</sup> percentile of all middle schools in New York City. MS 326 received an "A" grade on both the 2008-2009 and the 2007-8 Progress Report cards. This was a huge jump upward from the first progress report issued in February 2006 when the school was an "F" with a score of 22.9 percent.

MS 326 is a unique school in many different ways. This includes our dedicated staff, our diverse student population and the quality of the instructional programs offered to the students. We work very hard to make our school an inviting place to teach and to learn. Our students report to school early to study math and stay late to work on their projects and participate in the 21<sup>st</sup> century grant instructional program. MS 326 offers the core curriculum and the visual and performing arts which builds engagement, enthusiasm, motivation and success in our students. Staff is deployed effectively through efficient scheduling to make full use of their particular talents. The past year has seen the continuous departure of teachers who failed to impact effectively on student achievement and who refused to improve their pedagogical skills in the classroom.

Most of the classes in MS 326 have more boys than girls as the school has maintained the 60:40 ratio of boys to girls for the past four years. However, during the 2009-10 school year, there was a significant decrease in the number of over-aged students who were held over multiple times. This pattern is continuing in 2010-2011. Budgeting decisions are managed very efficiently to support instruction for the students and professional development for the staff in all subject areas. Despite the four percent cuts to the budgets during the past three years, MS 326 continues to provide an educational program that starts at 7:00 am and continues through 6:00 pm on a daily basis. Through the effective use of resources, we provided additional instruction for our students on Saturdays and during week-long breaks in the student calendars. Our school participates in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Grant which pays for an after school instructional program in math and literacy.

The school has an inclusive culture in which every child matters regardless of their performance levels or behavior. Special education students are supported in ways that enable them to close the achievement gap through an inclusion program as well as self-contained classes. We received double extra credit for moving our special needs populations in math on the 2009-10 Progress Report. However, we continue to lag behind our peer schools in moving our general and special needs populations in ELA. We failed to make AYP for ELA on the 2009-2010 NY State Report Card which will be issued in January 2011.

Our teachers engaged inquiry during the 2009-2010 school year and continue to do so during the 2010-2011. This year witnessed a change from common planning to professional learning teams. During the period of January 2010 until the end of March 2010, MS 326 witnessed a large influx of new arrivals from Spanish speaking countries in all grades. This resulted in the tilting of the bilingual classes from one with intermediate speakers of English to predominately beginner classrooms. Our ELL population has increased from 34% in 2008 to almost 47% in May 2010. This development will require the hiring of an additional ESL teacher for 2010-2011. It is important to note that while the ELL population has increased tremendously over the past two years, the number of long term ELL's have decreased slightly. The majority of our ELL population consists of students who are in English speaking schools for four years or less. This increase in the bilingual population created a need for another ESL teacher.

The principal sets high standards for selecting new staff. Teachers are observed both formally and informally in order to improve the delivery of instruction. Student attendance is monitored closely and any absences are actively pursued. Much of the teaching is based on an atmosphere of trust that encourages students to talk about their work, make suggestions and become actively engaged in their learning. The principal takes tenure decisions seriously and those teachers, who do not measure up to the expectations of the school, leave our school to explore other employment options.

MS 326 works together with two CBO's: Columbia Presbyterian Hospital and the ACDP (Association of Progressive Dominicans). Columbia Presbyterian Hospital operates a medical clinic on the third floor that meets the needs of the students as well as a dental clinic on the first floor which is presently being expanded to service more students. Research has shown that students' medical needs are often met through various programs but dental services are often overlooked or postponed due to the high cost of the services. Poor dentition leads to poor health problems, poor self-esteem and affects a child's ability to communicate effectively. As part of a new three year 21<sup>st</sup> Century grant, Children's Aid Society will become part of our family and provide support for our parental involvement program. The Association of Progressive Dominicans will continue to operate an after school recreational program as well as an instructional program.

The school communicates clearly with parents and involves them from the start in their child's learning at the middle school level. MS 326 communicates with parents and caregivers through monthly progress reports, report cards, phone conversations, outreach efforts by school staff, parent association meetings and informal meetings. The school provides workshops of interest to parents through its connection with Columbia Presbyterian Hospital and other community based organizations. Parents reported that they feel welcomed at the school and appreciate the ready access they have to staff. The parent coordinator is available to help parents and parents have high praise for the work of the school and the dedication of the staff as reported on the Environmental Surveys.

As of August 2006, MS 326 had little or no technology and this was an area that the SED identified as in need of improvement. Through effective budgeting each year, technology has increased in the school. At the end of 2009-10, the existing computers from the computer lab were distributed to classrooms to create hubs of computers and new computers were brought for the graphic arts program. Funds were used to buy smartboards and laptops for a number of classrooms. Professional development was provided to the teachers in using smartboards to engage students in learning.



## 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					
<b>School Name:</b>	MS 326-Writers Today & Leaders Tomorrow				
<b>District:</b>	06	<b>DBN #:</b>	06M326	<b>School BEDS Code:</b>	310600010326

DEMOGRAPHICS									
<b>Grades Served in 2009-10:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-K	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 7
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 8	<input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 11	<input type="checkbox"/> 12	<input type="checkbox"/> Ungraded			
<b>Enrollment:</b>				<b>Attendance: % of days students attended*</b>					
(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		89.7	89.5	90.3		
Kindergarten	0	0	0						
Grade 1	0	0	0	<b>Student Stability: % of Enrollment</b>					
Grade 2	0	0	0	(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10		
Grade 3	0	0	0		89.3	89.7	TBD		
Grade 4	0	0	0						
Grade 5	0	0	0	<b>Poverty Rate: % of Enrollment</b>					
Grade 6	114	80	110	(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10		
Grade 7	183	123	121		95.7	83.5	TBD		
Grade 8	164	174	134						
Grade 9	0	0	0	<b>Students in Temporary Housing: Total Number</b>					
Grade 10	0	0	0	(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10		
Grade 11	0	0	0		7	36	TBD		
Grade 12	0	0	0						
Ungraded	3	2	7	<b>Recent Immigrants: Total Number</b>					
				(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10		
Total	464	379	372		30	12	39		
<b>Special Education Enrollment:</b>				<b>Suspensions: (OSYD Reporting) – Total Number</b>					
(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	12	20	12	Principal Suspensions	35	12	TBD		
No. in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	23	35	31	Superintendent Suspensions	11	20	TBD		
Number all others	25	22	31						
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>									

DEMOGRAPHICS							
<b>English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:</b> (BESIS Survey)				<b>Special High School Programs: Total Number</b> (As of October 31)			
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	
# in Trans. Bilingual Classes	0	39	76	CTE Program Participants	0	0	0
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0	Early College HS Participants	0	0	0
# receiving ESL services only	177	102	80	<b>Number of Staff: Includes all full-time staff</b>			
# ELLs with IEPs	0	13	44	(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	40	39	TBD
<b>Overage Students: # entering students overage for grade</b>				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	9	9	TBD
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	0	0	TBD
	17	12	TBD				
				<b>Teacher Qualifications:</b>			
<b>Ethnicity and Gender: % of Enrollment</b>				(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	94.9	TBD
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	Percent more than two years teaching in this school	22	59.0	TBD
Black or African American	18.8	19.3	18.5	Percent more than five years teaching anywhere	50.0	46.2	TBD
Hispanic or Latino	80.4	80.7	79.8				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	0.2	0	0.3	Percent Masters Degree or higher	80.0	69.0	TBD
White	0.6	0	1.1	Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	100	97.0	TBD
Multi-racial							
<b>Male</b>	57.8	60.4	61.0				
<b>Female</b>	42.2	39.6	39.0				

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

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY	
SURR School: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:
Designated as a Persistently Lowest-Achieving (PLA) School: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2009-10 Based on 2008-09 Performance):</b>	

## NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

<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)			

<b>Individual Subject/Area Outcomes</b>	<b>Elementary/Middle Level (✓)</b>		<b>Secondary Level (✓)</b>	
	ELA:	√	ELA:	
	Math:	√	Math:	
	Science:	√	Grad. Rate:	

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

<b>Student Groups</b>	<b>Elementary/Middle Level</b>			<b>Secondary Level</b>			
	ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad. Rate**	Progress Target
<b>All Students</b>	√	√	√				
<b>Ethnicity</b>							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Black or African American	√	√	-				
Hispanic or Latino	√sh	√					
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander							
White	-	-					
Multiracial							
<b>Other Groups</b>							
Students with Disabilities	√sh	√	-				
Limited English Proficient	√sh	√					
Economically Disadvantaged							
<b>Student groups making AYP in each subject</b>	6	6	1				

**Key: AYP Status**

√	Made AYP	X	Did Not Make AYP	X*	Did Not Make AYP Due to Participation Rate Only
√ <sup>SH</sup>	Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target	-	Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status		

*Note: NCLB/SED accountability reports are not available for District 75 schools.*

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

\*\*[http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/nyc/APA/Memos/Graduation\\_rate\\_memo.pdf](http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/nyc/APA/Memos/Graduation_rate_memo.pdf)

**CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY**

<b>Progress Report Results – 2008-09</b>		<b>Quality Review Results – 2008-09</b>	
<b>Overall Letter Grade</b>	A	<b>Overall Evaluation:</b>	None
<b>Overall Score</b>	102.8	<b>Quality Statement Scores:</b>	
<b>Category Scores:</b>		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	
School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)	11.6	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	
School Performance (Comprises 25% of the Overall Score)	23.6	Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	
Student Progress (Comprises 60% of the Overall Score)	55.6	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	
Additional Credit	12	Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	
<i>Note: Progress Report grades are not yet available for District 75 schools.</i>			

## SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

**Directions:** Conduct a comprehensive review of your school's educational program informed by the most current quantitative and qualitative data available regarding student performance trends and other indicators of progress. Include in your needs assessment an analysis of information available from New York State Education Department and New York City Department of Education accountability and assessment resources, i.e., School Report Cards, Progress Reports, Quality Review and Quality Review Self-Assessment documents, periodic assessments, ARIS, as well as results of Inquiry/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?
- 

An analysis of the 2009-2010 progress report revealed that MS 326 is on a course of continued improvement. The State Education Department recognized the school in May 2010 for having been removed from SURR status for math and SINI status for English Language Learners. As per the New York State Education Department, the school is "in good standing" for 2010. The NYC Department of Education gave MS 326 an "A" grade on the 2009-10 Progress Report Card and stated that the school was in the 20<sup>th</sup> percentile of all middle schools in New York City. MS 326 also received an "A" grade on both the 2007-2008 and the 2008-9 Progress Report cards. This is a huge jump upward from the preliminary progress report issued in February 2006 when the school was an "F" with a score of 22.9 percent. However, preliminary data from the 2009-2010 State report card indicated that we did not make AYP in ELA but made it in math and science. While the State Education Department used the cutoff scores from 2008-9 to determine AYP, our students did not do well on the ELA exams this year which were more rigorous than in years past.

Our peer index for the 2009-2010 progress report was 2.24 and this reflects the fact that the average MS 326 student was a low level 2 in the fourth grade in math and ELA. Overall, we are moving students in math but we are not making the same type of progress in ELA. Therefore, there is a need to look at the progress of our students in ELA for all students as well as the subgroups.

The response data for the 2009-2010 environmental surveys revealed that 97% of the parents responded along with 87% of the teachers which reflected a 20% increase in the number of teachers responding to the survey over the 2008-2009 response levels. There was a slight increase (3%) in the number of students completing the surveys. Teachers continue to report that safety/respect is an issue and that there is an issue with communication at the school.

The response data for 2009-10 environmental surveys revealed that the number of parents responding to the surveys exceeded the city's average response rate of 49% for parents. This was due to an increase in parent involvement at the school, increased parent satisfaction with the school, and the efforts of the parent coordinator to promote parental participation in the completion of the surveys.

The parents, students and teachers rated the school 8.4 out of a possible 10 in academic expectations (84.6% of the peer horizon and 82.6% of the city horizon). This was an increase of 0.2 over the 2008-9 scores. In terms of communication, the three groups rated the school 7.3 out of a possible 10 in communication (74.1% of the peer horizon and 72.0% of the city horizon). The level of

communication remained the same during the 2008-2010 period and did not increase despite the creation of inquiry teams and more teacher collaboration. In terms of engagement, the parents, teachers and students rated the school at 8.0 (89.7% of the peer horizon and 88% of the city horizon). There was an increase of 0.5 over the 2008-9 year in student engagement. However, in terms of safety and discipline, our environmental surveys revealed a score of 7.6 out of possible 10 in engagement (76% of the peer horizon but only 59.3% of the city horizon) which was a drop of 0.2 below the 2008-9 levels.

MS 326 is on the course of continued improvement as evidenced by the fact that the data from the 2009-10 progress reports revealed a school that has made consistent strides during the past four years. However, while we have made progress in ELA over the past four years, we did not make AYP on the NY State's preliminary report card for the 2009-2010. With the introduction of New York State standardized tests with increased rigor, the percentage of students not meeting minimum requirements as well as the number of students performing at level 2 in literacy increased. The ease of the standardized tests during the past few years have allowed a number of students to pass to the next grade when they were really not prepared for the rigor of the next grade. Many of these students are being held over during 2010-2011 academic year due to the fact that they did not meet promotional requirements in grades six, seven or eight.

In comparing the school to the peer horizon in terms of students making exemplary gains in literacy and math, MS 326 did better than 80% of middle schools in the city. However, when looking at the percentage of the MS 326 students at level 3 and 4 in literacy, MS 326 scored at 17.9% of the peer horizon and 10.6% of the city horizon. Our median student performance in ELA was 2.32 and this was 26.4% of the peer horizon and 10.6% of the city horizon. This reveals that our students did not perform well on the ELA exam as compared to the schools in our peer horizon and the city horizon. The median growth percentile for ELA was 65.0 which was 41.3% of the peer horizon but only 38.6% of the city horizon. The percentage of students in the school's lowest third manifesting median growth percentile was 79. This was 47.0% of the peer horizon and 57.4% of the city horizon.

Our ELL population increased last year to over 46% of the total student population and almost 45% of the ELL students were classified as newcomers (less than three years). Additionally, there was an increase in the number of SIFE students (students with interrupted formal education). At the start of the 2010-2011 school year, there are about 42 identified SIFE students which amounts to almost 30% of the total ELL population. We fully expect additional students to be identified as SIFE when we complete the BESIS report.

An analysis of the math scores revealed that the percentage of MS 326 students at level 3 and 4 in math, MS 326 scored at 36.1% which was 41.8% of the peer horizon and 20.5% of the city horizon. Our median student performance in math was 2.77 which was 46.4% of the peer horizon and 29.2% of the city horizon. This reveals that our students performed better in math than they did on the ELA exam as compared to the schools in our peer horizon as well as the rest of the city. The median growth percentile for math was 78.0 which was 84.3% of the peer horizon and 80.9% of the city horizon. The percentage of students in the school's lowest third manifesting median growth percentile was 85 which was 86.6% of the peer horizon and 91.9% of the city horizon.

The New York State Education Department reset the cutoff scores for the 2009-2010 standardized tests. Therefore, we can infer limited information in comparing scores from previous years when the tests were easier, students had to get far fewer answers correct to pass the exam and the cutoff scores for each level was very low which allowed students to move to the next level without the necessary skills.

TOTAL SCHOOL FOR THE ELA TEST								
Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010		25		64		11	0	0
2009	1	.03	204	59.5	138	40.2	0	0
2008	35	8	298	68	103	23.7	2	.5
2007	90	17	337	65	88	17.0	1	0.6

A review of the ELA performance data for all tested students in the sixth grade revealed that only 7% of the students performed on grade level and that 25% of the students were level 1 with a large increase in the number of students performing at level 2. It is important to note that the cutoff scores for level 1 were higher than in previous years. In the past, these students would have scored a level 2.

GRADE SIX ELA RESULTS								
Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	26	25	71	68	8	7	0	0
2009	0	0	44	60	30	40	0	0
2008	6	5.7	80	76	19	18	0	0
2007	17	11.0	121	78.1	16	10.3	1	0.6

An analysis of the sub-group of special education students revealed that none of the sixth graders scored on level 3 or a level 4. This year witnessed more students failing to meet minimum requirements in ELA due to increased rigor of the tests and higher cutoff scores.

GRADE 6 ELA SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS								
Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	9	56	7	44	0	0	0	0
2009	0	0	20	80	5	20	0	0
2008	0	0	21	100	0	0	0	0

An analysis of the ELL data for grade six revealed that there was drop in the performance levels of the students. It is also important to note that many of these students have been in an English Language Speaking School for less than three years but took a grade level exam in English Language Arts. This factor affects the number of students achieving a level 3 from year to year. An analysis of the scores in 2010 revealed a significant jump in the number of level 1 students and a decrease in the number of level 2 students which is due to the change in the cutoff scores and increased rigor of the exams.

#### GRADE 6 ELA English Language Learners

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	16	45	17	49	2	6		
2009	0	0	30	91	3	9	0	0
2008	18	38.3	17	36.2	12	25.5	0	0

The overall results indicated a negative change in the ELA performance of the grade 6 students from 2009 to 2010. An examination of the 2009-2010 instructional program and professional development opportunities for sixth grade teachers supported a need to raise the academic rigor of the literacy program to help close the achievement gap and prepare for the common core standards. It is important to note that the grade continued to lag behind the seventh and eighth grade performance

levels on the ELA test. One reason for this fact is that the sixth graders are taught ELA by CB licensed teachers. During the 2009-2010 year, two CB licensed teachers left the school and it is expected that an additional two teachers will retire at the end of June 2011.

**Seventh grade ELA Results:**

An analysis of all tested seventh grade students revealed that there was an increase in the number of level 1's from zero students in 2009 to 35 students in 2010. Furthermore, 2010 witnessed a significant drop in the number of level 3/4 students from 50% to 13%. In 2010, there were 14 students who achieved level 3 as compared to 56 students in 2009 which is a decrease of 37 percent. Similar to the sixth grade results, the 2010 scores witnessed a change in the cutoff scores which forced students who previously were low level 2's into the level 1 category. With a peer index of 2.24 (based on fourth grade ELA scores), many of the students were challenged by the rigor and cutoff scores of the 2010 test

**GRADE 7 ELA All students**

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	35	33	57	54	14	13		
2009	0	0	56	50	56	50	0	0
2008	12	7	112	65	48	28	0	0
2007	46	25.4	112	61.9	23	12.7	0	0

An analysis of the subgroups results, mirrored the results of all students with an increase in the number of students performing at level 1 and a decrease at level 3. During 2010, the special education subgroup results revealed an decrease from 27% to 12% in the number of students performing at level 3.

**Grade 7 ELA Special Education**

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	8	30.0	15	58.0	3	12.0		
2009	0	0	19	73.0	7	27.0	0	0
2008	4	17.4	13	56.5	6	26.1	0	0
2007	8	47.1	8	47.0	1	5.9	0	0

**GRADE 7 ELA ELL's**

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	25	57.0	19	43.0	0	0	0	0
2009	0	0	36	75.0	12	25.0	0	0
2008	10	17.5	44	77.2	3	5.3	0	0
2007	36	64.3	20	35.7	0	0	0	0.6

**Eighth Grade ELA Results:**

In analyzing the eighth grade student performance levels from 2009 to 2010, there was a increase in the number of level 1 students and a decrease in the number of students performing at level 3.

However, it is important to note that grade 8 had the lowest number of students performing at level 1. An analysis of the subgroups revealed that there was an increase in the number of special education and ELL students performing at level 1.

#### GRADE 8 ELA All Students

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	20	18	77	69	14	13		
2009	1	1	106	67	52	33	0	0
2008	17	11	104	66	36	23	2	1
2007	27	15	104	57.8	49	27.2	0	0

Similar to the data in seventh grade, the special education students increased their level 1's and increased their level 2's and decreased the number of students performing on grade level. The ELL population saw a 38% decrease in level 1's with one student, who is a long term absence, achieving a level 1.

#### GRADE 8 ELA Special Education

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	5	36.0	10	64.0	0	0	0	0
2009	0	0	23	92	2	8.0	0	0
2008	3	21.4	9	64.3	2	14.3	0	0

#### GRADE 8 ELA ELL's

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	13	33.0	24	62	2	5.0	0	0
2009	1	2.0	54	96	1	2.0	0	0
2008	15	26.8	36	64.3	5	8.9	0	0

#### Constraints towards continued progress:

- As the State raises the rigor and implements the national standards, it is expected that our students will initially do poorly on the tests.
- We have a large number of SIFE students.
- Poor image of school in the community which affects enrollment. During 2009-2010, the continuous loss of students to other schools have leveled off and parents are beginning to select MS 326 as one of their two choices.
- Budget cuts amounting to 4% each year for the past three years.
- The continued creation of charter schools which attract the higher functioning students. MS 326 becomes a last choice for students who did not make any screened or charter schools.
- Our student population consisted of a large number of special education students and a reduction in the total register of general education students in the school for 2009-10. The percentage of special education students approached 19% during 2009-2010.
- The total ELL population approached 47% during 2009-10 which has an impact on student performance and is an increase of 7% over the 2008-9 levels.

**Math:**

A review of the math scores for the school revealed an increase in the number of students performing at level 1 and a decrease in the number of students performing at level 3 and 4. It is important to note that there has been continuous increase in the number of students performing at level 4.

TOTAL SCHOOL								
Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	61	16	196	51.0	100	26.0	31.0	8
2009	19	5	107	28.0	242	63.0	15.0	4
2008	50	11	192	41.8	204	44.4	14.0	3
2007	171	33	262	51.0	81	15.6	4.0	.08
2006	117	34.1	172	50.1	54	15.7	0	0
2005	95	45.5	93	44.5	19	9.1	2.0	1.0

An analysis of the grade 6 math results for all students revealed an increase in the number of students performing at level 1 but a steady increase in the number of students functioning at level 4 during the period from 2009-2010. It is also important to note that the number of sixth graders performing at levels 3 and 4 were much lower than the other grades and that there were more sixth graders performing at level 1 than in the other two grades.

**GRADE 6 Math All students**

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	26	22	64	53.0	22	18.0	9	7
2009	8	10	38	45.0	36	43.0	2	2
2008	26	23	43	38.3	40	35.7	3	2.6
2007	54	34	78	49.0	26	16.0	2	1.3

There is also a similar pattern when looking at the subgroups. An analysis of the sixth grade special education sub-group between 2007-10 revealed an increase level 3's/4's and a decrease of in level 1's. However, when comparing the scores from 2009 to 2010, there was a decrease in the number of level 3 students and an increase in the number of level 1 students due to the change in the cutoff scores.

**GRADE 6 Math Special Education**

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	5	37.0	8	44.0	3	19.0	0	0
2009		20.0		52.0		24.0		4
2008	16	24.6	35	53.9	14	21.5	0	0
2007	38	65.5	18	31.0	2	3.4	0	0

An analysis of the sixth grade ELL data revealed that there was a decrease in the number of Level 3 students and an increase in the level 1's. It is important to note that many of the students in the transitional bilingual classes took the math exams in their native language.

**GRADE 6 Math ELL's**

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	22	44.0	19	38.0	9	18	0	0
2009	5	13.0	21	56.0	12	31.0	0	0
2008	18	38.3	17	36.2	12	25.5	0	0
2007	35	60.3	18	31.0	5	8.6	0	0

**Seventh Grade Math Scores:**

An analysis of the seventh grade results during the period of 2007-2009 reflected a very positive trend in the performance of all tested students on the math tests. However, 2010 witnessed higher cutoff scores which resulted in a significant decrease in the number of level 3 students and an increase in the number of students at level 1 and level 2.

**GRADE 7 Math All Students**

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	15	12.0	52	40.0	50	38.0	13	10.0
2009	4	3.0	18	15.0	88	73.0	9	9.0
2008	8	4.4	79	43.8	88	49.0	5	2.8
2007	41	23.0	106	59.0	30	17.0	2	1.1

Similar to the entire population, the special education and the ELL student data demonstrated an decrease in level 3's and an increase in level 1 and 2 in 2010.

**GRADE 7 Math Special Education**

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	9	37	12	44	5	19	0	0
2009	4	11	9	32	15	57	0	0
2008	4	16	15	60	6	24	0	0
2007	8	47.1	8	47.1	1	5.9	0	0

**GRADE 7 Math ELL's**

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	3	6	12	25	31	65	2	4.0
2008	8	4.4	79	43.8	88	49	5	2.8
2007	41	23	106	59	30	17	2	1.1

**Eighth Grade Math:**

The eighth grade results revealed that there was significant increase in the number of students performing at level 1 and level 2 and a decrease in the number of students at level 3. However, it is important to note that there was a significant increase in the number of students performing at level 4. This reflects the fact that those students who knew the content material well were not affected by the shift in cutoff scores.

## GRADE 8 All Tested

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	17	13.0	80	59.0	28	21.0	10	7.0
2009	7	4.0	52	29.0	116	65.0	4	2.0
2008	16	9.8	66	40.5	76	46.6	6	3.7
2007	75	42.0	78	44.0	25	14.0	0	0

The special education students increased their level 1's in 2010 while the level 3's decreased.

## GRADE 8 Math Special Education

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	6	24.0	16	64.0	3	12.0	0	0
2009	2	8.0	17	68.0	6	24.0	0	0
2008	4	25.0	9	56.3	3	18.8	0	0
2007	17	81.0	4	19.0	0	0	0	0

Similar to the results for the special education subgroup, the ELL's saw an increase in level 1's and a decrease in level 3's.

## GRADE 8 Math ELL's

Year	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	12	21.0	34	56.0	14	23	0	0
2009	4	6.0	19	30.0	40	63	1	1.0
2008	8	13.3	16	26.7	33	55	3	5.0
2007	28	60.9	13	28.3	5	10.9	0	0

### Significant Aids to continuous Improvement

- Ongoing professional development from AUSSIE to address differentiation strategies as well as to provide support in implementing the 3<sup>rd</sup> edition of Impact Math.
- Increasing the academic rigor of math instruction in the classroom.
- Teachers work collaboratively with their colleagues in unwrapping the math curriculum.
- Regular meetings between AP's, literary and math coaches and individual teachers to review student progress and set goals for students as well as whole class goals. Math consultant works with the math teacher.
- Title III funds were used to provide small group instruction for the ELL's in math and literacy during Saturday Academy and in the morning prior to the start of the school day.

### Constraints towards continued progress:

- As the State raises the rigor and implements the national standards, it is expected that our students will initially do poorly on the tests.
- Budget cuts of 4% for the last three years.
- Poor image of school in the community which affects enrollment. However, the data is beginning to show that the continuous drop in registers have begun to level off.

- Our student population consisted of a large number of special education students and a reduction in the total register of general education students in the school for 2008-9. The percentage of special education students approached 19% in 2009-2010.
- The total ELL population approached 47% during 200-10 which has an impact on student performance. Many of the students arrived in January 2010 and had limited exposure to math in their native countries. The performance levels of the ELL's continue to be an area of need for this school.

#### **SCIENCE:**

The N Y State report card for 2009-10 reported that MS 326 met AYP in science. A review of the science test results for the 2009-2010 revealed that there was a decrease in level 1's and an increase in level 3's. Similar to the results on the ELA test, the ELL's continue to lag behind the general education population. There is a need to increase the rigor of the science curriculum, introduce interim measurements, ensure that there is reliability across the grades and increase the teacher collaboration in science through professional learning committees. Additionally, there is a need to improve the quality and quantity of laboratory exercises in preparation for the eighth grade NY State science examination. To that end, we used the GE funds to support the development of the three science labs.

#### **SOCIAL STUDIES:**

An analysis of the results of the 2010 NY State social studies test revealed that around 60% of the students scored at level 2 while 34% scored level 1. Only 3% of the students scored level 3 and 4. These results are very similar to the results from the 2008 social studies exam. The 2008 results revealed that the Black population had 18% at level 1, 75% at level 2 and 7% at level 3. In comparison, there 36% Latino students at level 1, 62% at level 2 and only 2% at level 3. This data reflects the results of the ELA with the general education students outperforming the special education as well as the ELL's. Since the social studies test requires reading and writing in response to document based questions, the fact that the ELL's did not perform as well as the general education monolingual students is not a surprise. While the social studies eighth grade exam does not figure into NCLB accountability scores, it is still an indicator of the fact that the students have not improved their performance over a two year period. The test was administered the first week in June which may affect the student outcomes as the students are preparing for graduation and not thinking about the exam. There is a need to establish interim measurements in social studies, increase teacher collaboration, increase academic rigor and begin looking at student work in social studies in order to improve student performance levels.



## **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, 25% of the English Language Learner students who achieved a level one on the 2010 NY State math test, will demonstrate a growth of 10% between the pre and post unit math tests.**

A review of the data revealed that 45 (75%) of the total students N= 60 who scored at level 1 on the 2010 math test were English Language Learners. We expect that 20% of these students (N = 9) who scored level 1 will demonstrate a growth of 10% between the pre- and post math unit tests. (20% of 45 students is 9).

**Goal #2: By June 2011, we will decrease the number of level 1 students by 4% and increase the number of level 2 students by 4% on the 2011 ELA exam by having a school wide focus on writing.**

After conducting our needs assessment, we determined that we needed to address the writing needs of the students in order to decrease the number of level 1 students and increase the number of level 2 students.

**Goal # 3: By June 2011, there will be a .5% decrease in the number of Principal and Superintendent suspensions through an incorporation of an advisory program.**

A review of suspension data revealed that the number of Superintendent and Principal suspensions increased to slightly over 8%. Through the implementation of an advisory program in the morning, it is expected that there will be a decrease of .5% among the general and special education populations by June 2011

**Goal # 4: By June 2011, students will have 91.5% attendance year to date at a minimum.**

A review of the attendance data revealed that attendance was 90.3% for the 2009-2010 year. The overall attendance rate increased during the 2009-2010 school year after being below 90% for the past five years. Students need to be in school to learn and therefore, it is expected that there will be an increase of 1% to reach the attendance rate of 91.5% for all students by June 1, 2011

**Goal # 5: By June 2011, 90% of the teachers will be engaged in discussions about the common core standards and will be involved in updating the curriculum maps to reflect increased rigor and higher level thinking skills associated with the common core standards.**

The State Education Department adopted the common core standards in July 2010 which require students to perform at a higher level. Teachers need to update their lessons to reflect the new standards.

**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):** Math

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p><b>Goal #1: By June 2011, 25% of the English Language Learner students who achieved a level one on the 2010 NY State math test, will demonstrate a growth of 10% between the pre and post unit math tests.</b></p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>By June 2011, we expect that 20% of the 45 students (N = 9) who scored level 1 will demonstrate a growth of 10% between the pre- and post math unit tests. (20% of 45 students is 9).</p>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b> 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><b>Use of Data:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AP/math coach will collect and analyze on a six week basis unit tests per student about five times during the year (September-May).</li> <li>• Administration/coach will analyze data by student, class and grade each administration of unit tests</li> </ul> <p><b>Curriculum and Instruction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training on unit tests for math teachers by AP's.</li> <li>• <b>Involvement in the NYC pilot study to raise rigor in assessments in math</b></li> <li>• Accelerated feedback to ELL's, special education and lowest 1/3 students to improve performance levels</li> </ul> <p><b>Development of Staff:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultants working with teachers from September-May</li> <li>• Attendance at CFN sponsored workshops in math (coach, teachers, AP) during the fall and spring semesters</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training by IFL staff</li> </ul> <p><b>Personal Leadership:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principal blocks time daily to interact with students and informally observe teaching and learning during math instruction</li> <li>• Principal reviews quantitative and qualitative data and meets with coach/AP's on a weekly basis to identify support needed by individual teacher and grade</li> <li>• Principal participates with the math teachers during common core planning.</li> </ul> <p><b>Use of Resources:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schedules that allow for common planning time as well as time for math teachers to engage in inquiry.</li> <li>• After school program on weekdays and Saturday to provide additional math instructional support for bilingual students. (October-April) by licensed teachers. Budgeted through Title III and 21<sup>st</sup> Century Grants</li> <li>• Teachers meeting after school to collaborate through GE funds.</li> <li>• Staffing of AP's, coaches partially funded through Title I, IDEA and FSF</li> <li>• Programming to enable teachers to meet during common planning time and to visit lab sites and classrooms of colleagues to observe best practice and participate in debriefings in order to provide collaborative feedback.</li> <li>• IFL training funded through the NYC math pilot.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b>  <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Using five interim assessments (approximately every six weeks) students will make on the average an improvement of two points on the unit tests.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence to Support the Goal:</b>  Establish a chart of baseline data which includes the results of unit test assessments as well as the post test. This information will provide evidence of students gaining two points between the first assessment and the last assessment.</p>

**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):** English Language Arts

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p><b>Goal #2: By June 2011, we will decrease the number of level 1 students by 4% and increase the number of level 2 students by 4% on the 2011 ELA exam by having a school wide focus on writing.</b></p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p><b>By June 2011, we will decrease the number of level 1 students by 4% and increase the number of level 2 students by 4% on the 2011 ELA exam by having a school wide focus on writing.</b></p>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b> 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><b>Use of Data:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collect and analyze data from writing tests per student about five times during the year (September-May).</li> <li>• Analyze data by student, class and grade each rubric at end of each unit of study in ELA.</li> <li>• Accelerated feedback to ELL's, to improve performance levels.</li> </ul> <p><b>Development of Staff:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultants working with teachers in the classrooms from September-May</li> <li>• Attendance at CFN sponsored workshops in literacy (coach, teachers, AP) during the fall and spring semesters</li> </ul> <p><b>Curriculum and Instruction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training on improving student writing for literacy teachers by AP's and literacy coach.</li> <li>• Accelerated feedback to ELL's, special education and lowest 1/3 students to improve performance levels.</li> <li>• Ongoing revision of the ELA curriculum to increase rigor.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Personal Leadership:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principal blocks time daily to interact with students and informally observe teaching and learning during ELA instruction</li> <li>• Principal reviews quantitative and qualitative data and meets with coach/AP's on a weekly basis to identify support needed by individual teacher and grade</li> <li>• Principal participates on the Common Core Planning Team</li> </ul> <p><b>Use of Resources:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schedules that allow for common planning time as well as time for literacy teachers to engage in inquiry via FSF</li> <li>• After school program on weekdays and Saturday to provide additional literacy instructional support for bilingual students. (October-April) by licensed teachers. Use of Title I funds and 21<sup>st</sup> century funds to pay for consultant who will work with literacy teachers</li> <li>• Staffing of AP's, coaches, teachers through FSF, IDEA and Title I</li> <li>• Programming to enable teachers to meet during common planning time and to visit lab sites and classrooms of colleagues to observe best practice and participate in debriefings in order to provide collaborative feedback.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b>  <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p><b>Evidence to Support the Goal:</b>  Establish a chart of baseline data which includes the results of the writing rubric assessments as well as the post test. This information will provide evidence of students making a one jump between the first assessment and the last assessment.</p>

**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):** Suspensions

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p><b>Goal # 3: By June 2011, there will be a .5% decrease in the number of Principal and Superintendent suspensions among general and special education populations through an incorporation of an advisory program.</b></p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p><b>By June 2011, it is expected that there will be a decrease of .5% among general and special education populations by June 2011 through the implementation of an advisory program.</b></p>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b> 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><b>Use of Data:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collect and analyze on a monthly basis suspension data during the year (September-May).</li> <li>• Analyze data by student, class and grade based on each infraction</li> </ul> <p><b>Curriculum and Instruction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training on rituals and routines and engaging students in learning by AP's.</li> <li>• Assembly programs and individual classroom discussions on high expectations for student behaviors</li> <li>• Introduction of an advisory/question of the day program.</li> <li>• Accelerated feedback to ELL's, special education and lowest 1/3 students to improve performance levels.</li> </ul> <p><b>Development of Staff:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultants working with teachers in the classrooms from September-May</li> <li>• Faculty Conferences as well individual teacher conferences with AP's</li> <li>• Special education paraprofessionals will work with their respective students to help them interact with other students and increase student outcomes</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Personal Leadership:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principal blocks time daily to interact with students and informally observe teaching and learning during informal walk-throughs</li> <li>• Principal reviews quantitative and qualitative data and meets with coach/AP's on a weekly basis to identify support needed by individual students</li> </ul> <p><b>Use of Resources:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schedules that allow for common planning time for guidance counselors to meet</li> <li>• Staffing of AP's, coaches, teachers, counselors, crisis paraprofessionals through FSF, IDEA and Title I</li> <li>• Programming to enable teachers to meet during common planning time and to visit lab sites and classrooms of colleagues to observe best practice and participate in debriefings in order to provide collaborative feedback on working with high needs students</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b>  <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Using monthly statistics from the suspension site, we will track the number of suspensions and type of infractions</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence to Support the Goal:</b>  Establish a chart of baseline data which includes the results of suspensions based on students/infraction code.</p>

**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):** Attendance

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p><b>Goal # 4: By June 2011, students will have 91.5% attendance year to date at a minimum.</b></p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>By June 2011, it is expected that there will be an increase of 1% to the overall attendance data for the entire school.</p>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b> 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><b>Use of Data:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collect and analyze on a monthly basis student attendance by student, class and grade (September-May).</li> <li>• Identify students in need of intervention and discuss at attendance committee meetings</li> <li>• Refer students to ACS and close 407's</li> <li>• Analyze data from CFN attendance person on a monthly basis</li> </ul> <p><b>Curriculum and Instruction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At risk counseling for high risk students to help them stay in school and avoid dropping out due to poor attendance.</li> <li>• Hallway posters depict daily attendance per class</li> </ul> <p><b>Development of Staff:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PD for all staff on attendance procedures</li> <li>• PD on identifying high risk students by attendance teacher</li> <li>• Daily conferences with teachers about students who are absent.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Use of Resources:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attendance teacher is assigned two days a week to support the attendance intervention programs funded through AIDP.</li> <li>• Hiring of school aides to contact parents of students who are absent through FSF</li> <li>• School aides collect attendance rosters and scan them daily funded through FSF.</li> <li>• Social Worker funded through Title I participates on attendance committee.</li> </ul> <p><b>Personal Leadership:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principal blocks time daily to interact with students and informally observe attendance on a weekly basis.</li> <li>• Principal participates on the attendance committee</li> <li>• Principal analyzes attendance on a daily basis.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b>  <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p><b>Evidence:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of monthly attendance data students by individual students, class and grade.</li> <li>• Agendas and sign-in sheets from attendance meetings.</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence to Support the Goal:</b>  Establish a chart of baseline data which includes the results of the monthly attendance data by student, class and grade.</p>

**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):** Common Core Standards

<p><b>Annual Goal</b> Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p><b>Goal #5: 90%of the teachers will be engaged in discussions about the common core standards and will be involved in updating the curriculum maps to reflect increased rigor and higher level thinking skills associated with the common core standards.</b></p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b> Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<p>By June 2011, 90% of the teachers will be engaged in discussions about the common core standards..</p>
<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b> 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><b>Use of Data:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attendance at weekly common core meetings</li> </ul> <p><b>Development of Staff:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IFL Consultants working with math teachers September-May</li> <li>• AUSSIE trainers working with staff in their classrooms</li> </ul> <p><b>Personal Leadership:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principal reviews quantitative and qualitative data and meets with coach/AP's on a weekly basis to discuss increased rigor in the classrooms</li> </ul> <p><b>Use of Resources:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schedules that allow for common planning time as well as time for teachers to engage in inquiry.</li> <li>• Staffing of AP's, coaches, lead teachers through FSF and Title I</li> <li>• Programming to enable teachers to meet during common planning time and to visit lab sites and classrooms of colleagues to observe best practice and participate in debriefings in order to provide collaborative feedback.</li> </ul>

<b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b> <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i>	<b>Evidence:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Updated curriculum maps.</li></ul>

## **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			N/A	N/A				
1			N/A	N/A				
2			N/A	N/A				
3			N/A	N/A				
4								
5								
6	60	60	20	10	0	0	71	0
7	100	95	40	0	0	0	74	0
8	120	90	60	20	0	0	50	0
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

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

**Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services**

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	<b>Description:</b> Provide a brief description of <b>each</b> of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).
<b>ELA:</b>	<b>Small group instruction and one to one tutoring during the school day, before and after school and Saturdays using Great Leaps, Just Words, Read 180.</b>
<b>Mathematics:</b>	<b>Small group instruction and one to one tutoring during the school day, before and after school and Saturdays using Options and other math materials</b>
<b>Science:</b>	<b>Small group instruction after school for students using materials from Urban Advantage program as well as instruction for bilingual students. Instructional support given to students in preparing exit projects and preparation of projects for science fair.</b>
<b>Social Studies:</b>	<b>Small group instruction and one to one tutoring focusing on (1) research for exit projects; (2) support for content in class. Support given to students during lunch and after school by social studies teacher.</b>
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:</b>	<b>Small group and one to one tutoring using guidance materials as well as advisory for high school.</b>
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:</b>	<b>School psychologist doesn't service students at MS 326 as school has a clinic from Columbia Presbyterian Hospital. Any student at risk is referred to the clinic and the child is assigned to provider who develops a treatment plan</b>
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:</b>	<b>School Social worker provides services to students individually and in groups based on need during the school day. She also sees individual students before school</b>
<b>At-risk Health-related Services:</b>	<b>MS 326 in conjunction with the Columbia Presbyterian maintains a fully equipped medical clinic which is able to address the needs of the student body for emergency care as well as preventive care. Parents sign permission forms which enable the clinic medical personnel to treat the students. HIPPA laws prevent hospital from disclosing their case load.</b>

**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) 6-8 Number of Students to be Served: 150 LEP 0 Non-LEP

Number of Teachers 4 Other Staff (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

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

We have three transitional bilingual (Spanish) classes, one on each grade level. During the 2009-2010 school year, our school witnessed a huge influx of new comers with limited skills in English across the grades. Many of the students are low functioning with limited academic skills. Generally, students are identified by the use of NYSESLAT test data, list notice data and home language surveys. Parents are given orientation meetings in which they can choose an appropriate program after they see a video. Flexible grouping based on continuous assessment is at the heart of this approach and students are moved as their linguistic functioning in English improves. Each student will have a standards-based ESL portfolio. This will reflect his or her progress in using English throughout the year and help us make necessary adjustments to the LAP. We will also draw upon LAB and NYSESLAT assessments, running record, and item analyses in placing students and moving them to more advanced groups. In the school year 2010-2011, we expect to have at least 3% of our students moving to monolingual classes. Many of the incoming sixth grade students are at the

intermediate and advance levels as compared with the existing population in the seventh and eighth grades who are mostly beginners to the English language.

Our school is presently staffed with two certified ESL, a bilingual math and a bilingual science teacher. We hold professional development sessions to help teachers augment their skills so that they will all be able to use ESL techniques within all content area lessons to meet the individual needs of our ELL children. Transitional Bilingual Classes receive ESL instruction from licensed ESL teachers and content area instruction from certified bilingual teachers. Native Language Arts follows the workshop and balanced literacy models, and we adhere to the Native Language Arts Performance Standards. All students in bilingual classes receive a minimum of four periods of Native (Spanish) Language Arts per week. We have ESL teachers pushing into classes as well as pulling out students based on proficiency level based on NYSESLAT. The program is supervised by the Principal.

Beginning English Language Learners in the seventh and eighth grades, many of whom are new arrivals to the United States, receive instruction in Spanish for 80% of the time and in English for 20% of the time. The incoming sixth grade is more proficient in English. During the course of the year, we will adjust this ratio. As students begin to reach Intermediate proficiency, their content-area learning incorporates more English by using differentiated instruction, project based learning activities as well as language development in the content area including word strategies. They also have the opportunity to participate in after-school English classes given by their teachers. In January, the Spanish-English ratio for former Beginning English learners changes to 50:50; they begin learning science in English. They continue to take Spanish Language Arts five times a week. In March, the Spanish-English ratio changes again: students learn both Spanish and Science in English, so the ratio becomes 40% Spanish and 60% English. As students begin to reach advanced proficiency, their content-area learning incorporates more English by using the strategies outlined above. All year round they also have the opportunity to participate in after-school classes given by their teachers. Advanced English Language Learners have a 75 % English and 25% Spanish ratio. All of their content-area instruction is in English, and their Language Arts classes follow city and regional curricular guidelines with some added language supports.

Parents of students have the option of choosing bilingual or monolingual classes. All of their lessons are in English and in order to provide support for their language, an ESL teacher pushes in and collaborates with the subject area teacher. We use differentiated instruction to address the language needs of these learners, as well as push-in models, literacy classes, and content-area classes. In addition to the regular instructional program, we also target our ELL population for Saturday Academy and after school programs, in which we reinforce native and English-language skills. There are numerous extracurricular activities that are available for the ELL population. All students at MS 326 are able to participate in the after school graphic design program which integrates technology and design. Students are taught how to design posters and magazine covers. In addition to an after school science club, there is a CHAMPS gym program for both boys and girls. Students are able to participate in violence prevention program through basketball and cheerleading, an art program to develop art portfolios/marketing portfolios for high school admissions. On Saturdays, there are programs for students interested in applying for specialized high school programs as well as various academic classes to address specific needs.

#### I. Parent/community involvement:

In order for parents to understand all three program choices, they are invited to meet with the ESL Coordinator within a week of their children's admission to learn about the school programs and facilities it offers its students. They are also shown a NYC Department of Education video explaining in detail the choices of program their children have as ELLs in a New York City school. This video is shown in a variety of languages, including Spanish. Apart from being shown the video and meeting personally with the staff in these meetings, the parents are also invited to discuss its content and the TBP and ESL programs with each other as well as with the ESL Coordinator. The school's parent coordinator helps assist the ESL

coordinator and the parent if there are any questions or concerns about a child's placement. The programs offered at the school are aligned with parents' requests.

Information materials are also available in the parent's home language. Parent conferences are conducted in the fall and the spring to orient parents regarding program requirements, instructional standards and assessments. In addition, after six weeks into the marking period, a progress report indicating student performance levels will be sent home in the language of the parent.

II. Project Jump Start (Programs and activities to assist newly enrolled ELL students):

Newly enrolled students are administered the LAB-R to ascertain their functional levels in English and Spanish. Depending on their level, they will be placed in a group for ESL instruction. Beginner speakers of English will also receive 37.5 minute of instruction with a licensed ESL teacher while students that fall into other groups (intermediate or students who need to take the ELA exam) will be serviced by other teachers. All ELL's have the opportunity to attend after school programs as well as Saturday academy. Since the bilingual classes are small, the student-teacher ratio is low which allows for focused instruction Letters were sent to parents of all newly enrolled students prior to the start of the school year describing the school, expectations, uniform requirements and upcoming programs for parent orientation in Septemb

**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.

---

Teachers of bilingual classes attend professional development along with their monolingual counterpart during common preps, after school and provided by outside resources. Bilingual teachers are expected to provide the same standard based instruction as monolingual teachers. A consultants from Susan Radley Accelerated Learning works with all of the bilingual classes and their teachers to improve performance levels. The bilingual science teacher will attend workshops focused on AMNH as well as science content. In collaboration with the literacy coach and ESL Coordinator, bilingual teachers will participate in study groups using journal articles and books addressing the needs of the ELL. During the summer the coach and teachers will research resources for the study groups. Planning meetings are held once a week to enable our teachers to identify and target the language needs of our students based on assessment of student work. Professional Development is also provided to all teachers who teach ELLs, which include ELA, Math, Science and Arts teachers.

Teachers will be provided seven ½ mandated hours of professional development in teaching English Language Learners.

09/07/10	two hours	Bilingual Accountability Procedures; NYSESLAT testing; Looking at Data
10/8/10	one hour	ESL strategies to increase student outcomes
11/02/10	Two hours	Looking at student work and next steps
11/05/10	one hour	ESL strategies
12/04/10	one hour	Interventions to support academic language
6/02/11	one hour	Assessment of data

**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.

---

**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.

---

**Section III. Title III Budget**

School: MS 326 BEDS Code: 310600010326

<b>Allocation Amount:</b>		
<b>Budget Category</b>	<b>Budgeted Amount</b>	<b>Explanation of expenditures in this category as it relates to the program narrative for this title.</b>
<b>Professional salaries (schools must account for fringe benefits)</b> - Per session - Per diem	\$ 28,860	<b>(Example: 540 hours of per session for math and literacy teacher and science program to support ELL Students: 555 hours x \$49.89 (current teacher per session rate with fringe) = \$27,688.95) After school (math and science) and Saturday Academy (literacy)</b>
<b>Purchased services</b> - High quality staff and curriculum development contracts.		
<b>Supplies and materials</b> - Must be supplemental. - Additional curricula, instructional materials. Must be clearly listed.	\$ 1171.05	<b>Supplemental novels Supplemental math materials</b>
<b>Educational Software (Object Code 199)</b>		
<b>Travel</b>		
<b>Other</b>		

<b>TOTAL</b>	\$28,860.00	
--------------	-------------	--

### APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

#### *Requirement under Chancellor's Regulations – for all schools*

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

#### **Part A: Needs Assessment Findings**

---

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

When a parent comes to MS 326, he/she is greeted by the Parent Coordinator who has an office near the main entrance to the building. Ms. Nunez will speak to the parent, ascertain how we can better serve the parent and provide assistance. Ms. Nunez is bilingual in both Spanish and English. For new entrants, Ms. Nunez will bring the parent to Ms. Kreichman, our ESL coordinator who will have the parent complete the Home Language Survey to ascertain parent's language preference. Signs exist in the building notifying parents to their right for written translations in their native language. Regular mail to parents about school activities is written both in Spanish and English and other languages, where applicable.

Based on information from the home language survey, information regarding the language the parent speaks and writes is entered into ATS. Our data specialist reviews the data on a regular basis to check on missing or incorrect information in ATS. In house translators translate all correspondence using clear and simple language for all outgoing correspondence. In those cases where we do not have the internal expertise to translate a document, letters are sent to the translation section of the DOE and they will translate it. Information regarding parent language abilities are located in ATS. Parents speak either English or Spanish and all notices are sent home with both languages. Additionally, the secretary regularly runs a report in ATS which indicates missing information. She is then able to follow up if the parent language is not listed in ATS. Eighty percent of our parent population speaks Spanish and nineteen percent of parents speak English only. Every document is printed in both Spanish and English. There is a small percentage of parents who speak other languages i.e. French, Haitian Creole, Arabic and we make sure that letters go home to these parents in their native languages. Our parent coordinator and secretary are bilingual speakers of English and Spanish. Additionally, a large number of the staff at MS 326 are able to converse with parents in their own language about their child's academic needs.

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.

A review of the home language surveys indicated that the majority of parents speak and read Spanish only. Many staff members speak Spanish which is the major language in the school's community. We do have speakers of Haitian Creole and French in the school.

Communication between school and the community is always in both languages, Spanish and English. All public meetings and parent association meetings are conducted in both languages. There is always the chance that we might have speakers of other languages i.e. Arabic, French, Haitian Creole, American Sign Language. If these cases do arise, we will contact the Office of Translation Services to help us. District 75 will be contacted if we need a speaker of American Sign Language.

## **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.

All correspondence to parents is provided in English and Spanish back to back. Specific written communications are translated by the bilingual translation team composed of the business manager and the Assistant Principal. Progress Reports, Quality Review Reports, Report Cards, and all letters sent home to parents are translated into Spanish. Copies are available in the Parent Coordinator's office. In the case that we have other language needs, the Office of Translation Services will be contacted.

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.

Oral interpretation is available at all times by the following school members who are bilingual Spanish/English: Assistant Principal, teachers, parent coordinator, school aides, guidance counselors, business manager, and secretary. During parent-teacher conferences, teachers are grouped together so that monolingual English speaking teachers have someone in the room who can help in communication between the school and the parent.

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>.

Translators are available at all times. Parents have full access to school activities and information regarding their children's' academic performance. A large number of people on staff speak Spanish and we also have staff members who speak French and Haitian Creole. Parents have full participation in school events as all activities are conducted in Spanish and English. Parents receive all letters and forms about school activities in the language that they speak.

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

*All Title I schools must complete this appendix.*

**Directions:**

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

**Part A: TITLE I ALLOCATIONS AND SET-ASIDES**

	Title I Basic	Title I ARRA	Total
1. Enter the anticipated Title I, Part A allocation for 2010-11:	\$ 384,415	\$49,280	\$43,3695
2. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside for Parent Involvement:	\$ 3,845	\$493.00	\$4338
3. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified:	\$ 19,221	*	
4. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Professional Development:	\$ 38,442	*	

5. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2009-2010 school year: 97%
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.

Despite help from the DOE, our graphics design teacher was assigned an incorrect code on the BEDS survey which affected the percentage of high quality teachers. This year, the teacher was assigned a different code and we should have 100% highly qualified.

\* 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.

### **2010-11 School-Parent Involvement Policy**

- I. MS 326 in compliance with the Title I/PCEN mandates, has implemented a parent involvement policy strengthening the link between the school and the community. Our policy is designed to keep parents informed by actively involving them in planning and decision-making. Parents are encouraged to participate on school leadership teams, parents associations, and parent advisory councils, as trained volunteers and as members of the school professional development advisory council. Educational research has shown a positive correlation between parental involvement and student achievement. The overall aim of the policy is to develop a parent involvement program that will build a home-school partnership that assists parents in acquiring effective parenting skills, provide parents with the information and training needed to effectively become involved in planning and decision making, increase their understanding of the role of the home in enriching education and improving student achievement, and the development of positive attitudes toward the school community as whole.
- II. The policy encompasses all parents including parents of English Language Learners and special needs students.

III. The policy is designed based upon a careful assessment of parents' needs and the evaluation of the effectiveness of the Title I/PCEN Parent Involvement Program. This policy is distributed in November to all Title I parents.

In developing the MS 326 Parent Involvement Policy, our PTA and parent members of the School Leadership Team were consulted on the proposed Parent Involvement Policy and asked to survey its members for additional input. To increase parent involvement, MS 326 will:

- Actively involve parents in planning, reviewing and improving the funded programs and parental involvement policy of the school.
- Support level committees that include parents such as the School Leadership Team and the Parents Teacher's Association. Provide technical support when needed.
- Maintain parent coordinators Title I funds to serve as liaisons between the school and parent communities. The parent coordinator will provide parent workshops based on the assessed needs of the parents in the school site in conjunction with Columbia Presbyterian Hospital.
- These workshops may include the parenting skills, immigration guidelines, health issues, GED, ESL and curriculum based workshops to build parents' capacity to help their children at home.
- Provide a school informational meeting on all funding programs in the school.
- Provide written translations.
- Provide an Annual Fairs for parents in order to improve home school communication

MS 326 will encourage more school-level parental involvement by:

- Holding annual Parent Curriculum Conference
- Maintaining parent participation in school leadership teams
- Encouraging parents to become trained volunteers
- Having written and verbal progress reports that are periodically given to keep parents abreast of their children's progress
- Providing monthly newsletter to increase communication between school/teacher and the home.

### **SCHOOL-PARENT COMPACT**

The Literary Arts Academy (MS 326) and the parents of the students participating in activities, services, and programs funded by Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) (participating children), agree that this Compact outlines how the parents, the entire school staff, and the students will share the responsibility for improved student academic achievement and the means by which the school and parents will build and develop a partnership that will help children achieve the State's high standards.

This School-Parent Compact is in effect during school year 2010-2011.

## **PART I - REQUIRED SCHOOL-PARENT COMPACT PROVISIONS**

### **School Responsibilities**

The Literacy Arts Academy MS 326 will:

- **provide high-quality curriculum and instruction in a supportive and effective learning environment that enables the participating children to meet the State's student academic achievement standards as follows:**
  - **Academic Intervention programs to address literacy and math needs i.e. Wilson Reading program; Read 180, At Risk SETSS, ,**
  - **Unified curriculum in all content areas across the grade**
  - **Consultants to work with teachers to improve the delivery of instruction**
  - **Common prep for planning**
  
- **hold parent-teacher conferences during which this compact will be discussed as it relates to the individual child's achievement. Specifically, those conferences will be held:**
  - **November 2010 and February 2011**
  
- **provide parents with frequent reports on their children's progress. Specifically, the school will provide reports as follows:**
  - **Six Week Progress Reports will be sent home in October 2010; December 2010; March 2011 and May 2011.**
  - **Report Cards will be distributed at the parent teacher conferences in November 2010 and February 2011; and sent home in April 2011 and in June 2011.**
  
- **provide parents reasonable access to staff. Specifically, staff will be available for consultation with parents as follows:**
  - **Staff members are available at all times except when they are in the classroom engaged in instruction.**
  
- **provide parents opportunities to volunteer and participate in their child's class, and to observe classroom activities, as follows:**
  - **All parents have the opportunity to volunteer and participate in their child's class or do a walk through the building.**

- **Parents should contact the Parent Coordinator.**

## **Parent Responsibilities**

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

- Supporting my child's learning by making education a priority in our home by:
  - making sure my child is on time and prepared everyday for school;
  - monitoring attendance;
  - talking with my child about his/her school activities everyday;
  - scheduling daily homework time;
  - providing an environment conducive for study;
  - monitoring the amount of television my children watch;
  - making sure that homework is completed;
- anticipating, as appropriate, in decisions relating to my children's education;
- promoting positive use of my child's extracurricular time;
- participating in school activities on a regular basis;
- staying informed about my child's education and communicating with the school by promptly reading all notices from the school or the school district either received by my child or by mail and responding, as appropriate;
- providing my child with a library card;
- communicating positive values and character traits, such as respect, hard work and responsibility;
- respecting the cultural differences of others;
- helping my child accept consequences for negative behavior;
- being aware of and following the rules and regulations of the school and district;
- supporting the school's discipline policy;
- express high expectations and offer praise and encouragement for achievement;

## **PART II OPTIONAL ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS**

### **STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES**

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

- come to school ready to do our best and be the best;

- Advocate LASER: Learning; Accountability; Standards; Excellence and Results.
- attend school with all the necessary tools of learning- pens, pencils, books, etc.
- listen and follow directions;
- participate in class discussions and activities;
- be honest and respect the rights of others;
- follow the school's/class' rules of conduct;
- follow the school's dress code;
- ask for help when we don't understand;
- do our homework every day and ask for help when we need to;
- study for tests and assignments;
- read at least 30 minutes every day outside of school time;
- get adequate rest every night;
- use the library to get information and to find books that we enjoy reading;
- give to our parents or to the adult who is responsible for our welfare, all notices and information we receive at school every day.)

Additional Requirements:
--------------------------

MS 326 will:

- involve parents in the planning, review, and improvement of the school's parental involvement policy, in an organized, ongoing, and timely way;
- involve parents in the joint development of any school wide program plan, in an organized, ongoing, and timely way;
- hold an annual meeting to inform parents of the school's participation in Title I, Part A programs, and to explain the Title I, Part A requirements, and the right of parents to be involved in Title I, Part A programs. The school will convene the meeting at a convenient time to parents, and will offer a flexible number of additional parental involvement meetings, such as in the morning or evening, so that as many parents as possible are able to attend. The school will invite to this meeting all parents of children participating in Title I, Part A programs (participating students), and will encourage them to attend;

- provide information to parents of participating students in an understandable and uniform format, including alternative formats upon the request of parents with disabilities, and, to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand;
- provide to parents of participating children information in a timely manner about Title I, Part A programs that includes a description and explanation of the school's curriculum, the forms of academic assessment used to measure children's progress, and the proficiency levels students are expected to meet.
- on the request of parents, provide opportunities for regular meetings for parents to formulate suggestions, and to participate, as appropriate, in decisions about the education of their children. The school will respond to any such suggestions as soon as practicably possible;
- provide to each parent an individual student report about the performance of their child on the State assessment in at least English language arts and mathematics; and
- provide each parent timely notice when their child has been assigned or has been taught for four (4) or more consecutive weeks by a teacher who is not highly qualified within the meaning of the term in section 200.56 of the Title I Final Regulations (67 Fed. Reg. 71710, December 2, 2002).

## **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.

This was addressed earlier in the CEP on pages 13-24. Based on standardized exam results and student records, intervention classes are weaved into the school program and provided before and after school. Students are grouped heterogeneously for whole class instruction and homogeneously for intervention activities. ELL and special education students receive the same curriculum as their general education counterpart with modifications in the presentation of grade level curriculum in all subjects. Literacy teachers will teach 60 students and will provide additional support to the Levels 1&2 and then the Level 3's. Math teachers will work with 90 students and provide intensive support to all students. Saturday Academy program for grades six, seven and eight will be provided to all students. Courses, based on student need and interest, include tutorials in math and literacy, Art Portfolio Preparation, and other programs depending on student needs. An after school recreational program developed with the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Program will address student emotional and physical

needs. Our school wide reforms are associated with increased higher cognitive development resulting in increased use of convergent and divergent thinking skills in all content areas. Additionally, we are expecting increased student engagement in academic rigor and differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all learners.

2. School wide reform strategies that:

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

MS 326 has undergone a transformation since becoming Principal in 2006. School wide reforms include increasing the technology in the building, creating professional learning teams in all core subjects, creating a bilingual team in which the same teachers teach all three bilingual classes, establishing a regents class, provided extended day programs in math and science, continue increasing the number of special education students in LRE, and ensuring coherence of curriculum across the school. Our school wide reforms are associated with increased higher cognitive development resulting in increased use of convergent and divergent thinking skills in all content areas. Additionally, we are expecting increased student engagement in academic rigor and differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all learners.

3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.

With the exception of one teacher who was coded incorrectly on the BEDS survey, all of the teachers are highly qualified and continue to receive professional development from AUSSIE trainers, outside consultants, Children First Network team as well as attending national conferences in math and science.

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.

The school program includes common preps for professional development as well as looking at student work as part of our initiative to have at least 90% of the teachers involved in inquiry. These common preps are used for planning units of study based on needs of the students and for professional development through study groups reviewing best practices in the professional literature, and reviewing student work. There are subject meetings and grade meetings each month. The hiring of an outside literacy consultant for two days a week will help teachers improve their delivery of instruction and maintain uniform

curriculum across the grades. In addition, Assistant Principals will provide direct supervision of the subject areas (math, literacy, social studies, and science). AUSSIE consultants have been hired to work with the science teachers . In addition, the Children First Network functions as a learning support organization and provides professional development program for its member schools. The parent coordinator has planned an ongoing program for parents and parent involvement through the support of the Children Aid Society.

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

When there is a vacancy, the principal will ascertain if there are hiring restrictions for the position. If there are hiring restrictions, the principal will declare a vacancy in galaxy which will automatically be posted on the open market website. Interviews will be conducted throughout the year for those candidates that passed the initial screening of previous ratings and previous assignments. The success of the school will spread the word that MS 326 is a school filled with staff that provides a quality education for students. If the hiring restrictions are lifted for certain subject areas, the administration will contact teacher recruitment to recruit highly qualified teachers. The Principal also collaborates with Teaching Fellows to provide a summer site for their teachers to begin teaching in the classrooms. Successful schools attract highly qualified teachers. The principal will interview possible candidates and to plan for their internship with MS 326 students during summer school where pedagogical skills can be improved prior to the start of the academic year. Additionally, MS 326 has a working relationship with Teachers' College to place math graduate students in classrooms. We also have a working relationship with the Wurtzweiler Institute of Social Workers for providing placement for graduate students of social work completing their externship requirements.

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

The parent coordinator holds parent workshops each month for parent education in many areas with the focus on student achievement. The school has an open door policy to encourage parent visitation and parent volunteerism. School messenger is used to call parents once a week with school announcements. The school's website will be developed and will provide additional information for parents on school workshops and workshops through the DOE. In addition, the Parent Coordinator will be provided Professional Development to assist parents. The parents on the School Leadership Team have expressed a wish to be exposed to content which will help them assist their children i.e. reading instruction.

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.

Not applicable

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.

Assessment is ongoing through the interim assessment tests and standardized tests as well as informal classroom assessment data using running records, unit tests, and other pre-post assessments. Teachers will be discussing student progress during common planning time throughout the year. It is an integral part of the new culture of our school. Every four and a half weeks students will be assessed using teacher made tests and progress reports will be sent home to parents. Assessment data/progress reports will be reviewed by Assistant Principals and information will be brought back to the PD/Intervention teams. Every

Friday will be devoted to a clinic atmosphere in which teachers will be addressing individual needs as identified on tests and constantly conferencing students to push students to achieve the next level on standardized tests. Inquiry teams will focus on the needs of the students and will use interim assessments to monitor progress.

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.

Interim assessments in all four core subjects (literacy, social studies, science and math), will help us provide targeted intervention to students. ACUITY has an item bank in which to develop specific tests to address specific student needs. Our focus is to assess students in order to identify strengths and weaknesses and to identify programs and materials that can address identified weakness. From the beginning of the year we work to improve student understanding of the content through ITA's, running records, teacher pre- and post tests and Impact math unit-tests. The results of these assessments, along with teacher observation and student work samples, provide us with a much deeper understanding of the individual needs of students. Using the results we place students into intervention groups with other students who have similar weaknesses based on teacher input. Ongoing assessments (ITA's, predictives, interim assessments) and teacher observations are then used to determine whether the selected interventions were successful. After analyzing the results of the assessments that are given we identify areas that give students difficulty. Great Leaps to use with students' who have difficulty with reading fluency, and Rewards to use with students who need to strengthen their ability to read multi-syllabic words. Staff members will be trained to work with these programs and groups of students have been identified who could benefit from the programs and there will be ongoing assessment to ascertain student progress or the lack of progress. At the end of four weeks, progress reports will be sent home to parents..

While we work to identify new programs and assessments we also use guided reading, readers and writers workshops, and math tutorials to address our students' needs. We will also devote one day per week for a clinic in which students/teachers to address needs during the regular school day. By expanding the options available for interventions we will improve our ability to address students' weaknesses and to build on their strengths. As we go forward we will continue to look for new intervention programs and methods of assessment while continuing to use those that are already identified as successful.

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.

In collaboration with the Twenty-First Program students will participate in recreation programs and instructional programs during and after school. Parent workshops are sponsored by the CBO and the DOE. Students are receiving instruction in math and science after school four days a week followed by a wrap around recreation program.

## 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” <sup>1</sup> Consolidated in the Schoolwide Program (✓)			Amount Contributed to Schoolwide Pool <i>(Refer to Galaxy for FY’11 school allocation amounts)</i>	Check (✓) in the left column below to verify that the school has met the intent and purposes <sup>2</sup> of each program whose funds are consolidated. Indicate page number references where a related program activity has been described in this plan.	
		Yes	No	N/A		Check (✓)	Page #(s)
Title I, Part A (Basic)	Federal	✓			\$ 384,415	✓	52-56
Title I, Part A (ARRA)	Federal	✓			\$ 49,280	✓	52-56
Title II, Part A	Federal			✓	-0-	N/A	
Title III, Part A	Federal	✓			\$ 24,660	✓	42-43
Title IV	Federal			✓	-0-	N/A	
IDEA	Federal	✓			\$ 138898	✓	42-43
Tax Levy	Local	✓			\$3175023	✓	42-43

## Part D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS

**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.
- **Title II, Part A:** Supplementary funding to improve student academic achievement by reducing class size in grades K, 1, 2, and 3, with an emphasis on grades with average register greater than 20. If space is not available to form additional classes, funds may support push-in teacher(s) to supplement the instructional program.
- **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.

**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**

*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:** \_\_\_\_\_ **SURR<sup>3</sup> 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.

### **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.

---

School Under Registration Review (SURR)

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

*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.

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

## **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>

---

### **Part A: FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS**

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

We have four students in Temporary Housing.

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

Students in temporary housing are seen by the MS 326's social worker individually and in groups to help the students deal with the anxieties of living in temporary housing. Support is given to the child's parents in helping them through the maze of city rules and regulations. These children are at-risk of dropping out of school and their attendance is monitored to identify problems.

### **Part B: FOR NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS**

1. Please identify the number of Students in Temporary Housing who are currently attending your school (please note that your STH population may change over the course of the year).
2. Please describe the services you are planning to provide to the STH population with the Title I set-aside funds.
3. Some Non-Title I schools receive a specific allocation based on the reported number of students living in temporary housing. If your school received an allocation (please refer to the current Title I Funds Summary of School Allocation Memorandum), include the

amount your school received in this question. If your school did not receive an allocation and needs assistance in identifying resources to assist STH students, please contact an STH liaison in your Children First Network.

**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**

<b>School Name:</b>	M.S. 326 - Writers Today & Leaders Tomorrow					
<b>District:</b>	6	<b>DBN:</b>	06M326	<b>School</b>		310600010326

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

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

<b>Enrollment</b>				<b>Attendance - % of days students attended:</b>			
<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		89.7	89.5	90.3
Kindergarten	0	0	0				
Grade 1	0	0	0				
Grade 2	0	0	0				
Grade 3	0	0	0				
Grade 4	0	0	0				
Grade 5	0	0	0				
Grade 6	80	110	107				
Grade 7	123	121	116				
Grade 8	174	134	128				
Grade 9	0	0	0				
Grade 10	0	0	0				
Grade 11	0	0	0				
Grade 12	0	0	0				
Ungraded	2	7	9				
<b>Total</b>	<b>379</b>	<b>372</b>	<b>360</b>				

  

<b>Student Stability - % of Enrollment:</b>			
<i>(As of June 30)</i>	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	89.3	89.7	83.2

  

<b>Poverty Rate - % of Enrollment:</b>			
<i>(As of October 31)</i>	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
	95.7	95.3	96.2

  

<b>Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:</b>			
<i>(As of June 30)</i>	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	7	36	47

  

<b>Recent Immigrants - Total Number:</b>			
<i>(As of October 31)</i>	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	30	12	39

<b>Special Education</b>				<b>Suspensions (OSYD Reporting) - Total Number:</b>			
<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	20	12	12	Principal Suspensions	35	12	15
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	35	31	30	Superintendent Suspensions	11	20	16
Number all others	22	31	27				

*These students are included in the enrollment information above.*

<b>Special High School Programs - Total Number:</b>			
<i>(As of October 31)</i>	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
CTE Program Participants	0	0	0
Early College HS Program Participants	0	0	0

<b>English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment: (BESIS Survey)</b>				<b>Number of Staff - Includes all full-time staff:</b>			
<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	39	76	TBD				
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	TBD				
# receiving ESL services only	102	80	TBD	Number of Teachers	40	39	34
# ELLs with IEPs	13	44	TBD	Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	9	9	8

*These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.*

				Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	0	0	4
--	--	--	--	---	---	---	---

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
	17	12	51	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100.0	94.9	96.7
				% more than 2 years teaching in this school	22.5	59.0	73.5
				% more than 5 years teaching anywhere	50.0	46.2	58.8
Ethnicity and Gender - % of Enrollment:							
(As of October 31)	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	% Masters Degree or higher	80.0	69.0	73.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.0	0.0	0.0	% core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers	100.0	97.0	94.8
Black or African American	19.3	18.5	13.9				
Hispanic or Latino	80.7	79.8	84.7				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific	0.0	0.3	0.0				
White	0.0	1.1	1.1				
<b>Male</b>	60.4	61.0	61.1				
<b>Female</b>	39.6	39.0	38.9				

#### 2009-10 TITLE I STATUS

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

#### NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

<b>SURR School (Yes/No)</b>		If yes,					
-----------------------------	--	---------	--	--	--	--	--

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

	Phase		Category			
	In Good		v	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:	v	ELA:
Math:	v	Math:
Science:	v	Graduation Rate:

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

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

American Indian or Alaska Native						
Black or African American	v	v	-			
Hispanic or Latino	vsh	v				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander						
White	-	-				
Multiracial						
Students with Disabilities	vsh	v	-			
Limited English Proficient	vsh	v				
Economically Disadvantaged	v	v				
<b>Student groups making</b>	6	6	1			

**CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY**

<b>Progress Report Results – 2009-10</b>		<b>Quality Review Results – 2009-10</b>				
<b>Overall Letter Grade:</b>	A	<b>Overall Evaluation:</b>				NR
<b>Overall Score:</b>	63.8	<b>Quality Statement Scores:</b>				
<b>Category Scores:</b>		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data				
School Environment:	10.5	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals				
<i>(Comprises 15% of the</i>		Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals				
School Performance:	7.3	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals				
<i>(Comprises 25% of the</i>		Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise				
Student Progress:	39.2					
<i>(Comprises 60% of the</i>						
Additional Credit:	6.8					

<b>KEY: AYP STATUS</b>		<b>KEY: QUALITY REVIEW SCORE</b>				
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](http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/nyc/APA/Memos/Graduation_rate_memo.pdf)

# The Literary Arts Academy

MIDDLE SCHOOL 326  
401 W. 164<sup>TH</sup> Street ♦ New York, New York 10032  
Telephone: (917) 521-1875

Principal  
Sharon Weissbrot

Assistant Principal  
Angel Ortega  
Marcos Bausch  
Donna McGuire

---

## Language Allocation Policy 2010-2011

The purpose of the 2010-2011 school wide Language Allocation Policy at MS 326 is to provide guidance for language use as ELL's progress through their academic and language development program in grades sixth through eighth grade. Our Language Allocation Policy is a coherent plan for language development that provides a continuum through which instruction in English will increase as ELL's develop proficiency in their second language. This Language Allocation Policy will include a description of the various programs at Middle School 326 and how it is applied to meet the needs of all ELL's in the building. It is expected that the Language Allocation Policy will enable us to meet and exceed the minimum requirements for English language development instruction as mandated by CR Part 154. Sharon Weissbrot MA CCC/SLP, the Principal of MS 326, is accountable for the implementation of this policy which will strengthen ELL instruction and enable our students to meet and exceed the language requirements for ESL instruction as mandated by New York State Part 154 regulations. The LAP team members consist of Sharon Weissbrot (Principal), Julie Kreichman (ESL teacher), Jessica Allred (ESL teacher), Angel Ortega (Assistant Principal), Jose Brito (bilingual teacher), Zaida Ortiz (guidance counselor) and Iris Nunez (parent coordinator).

MS 326 is located in District 6 in upper Manhattan and services students grades six, seven and eight. This year, the school had a student population of about 400 students and the ELL population comprises slightly more than 46% (N=186) of the total population. MS 326 is a school on the rise as we continue to be a school that achieved a grade of an "A" on the 2007-8 Progress Report and an A on the 2008-9 Progress Report. We received extra credit for moving our ELL's in both math and literacy in 2009.

MS 326 offers transitional bilingual programs as well as pull out/push in ESL programs in all grades. We have two certified ESL teachers, a bilingual math teacher, bilingual science teacher, and a Spanish language literacy teacher. Given the increase in the number of Ell's, we are planning to hire an additional ESL teacher. Copies of all teachers' licenses are on file in the main office (room 221) of MS 326.

The Department of Education has implemented promotional policies in grades six through eight for June 2010 which will have major impact on ELL students who previously may have moved to the next grade without meeting standards in both English

and math or passing all of their core academic subjects. English Language Learners will be held to promotion standards based on their number of years in NYC public schools. Students with less than two years in an English speaking school and students with interrupted formal education (SIFE's) must pass core subjects. Second and third year ELL's must score at Level 2 in math and make expected gains in ELA as well as pass core subjects. Fourth year ELL's will be held to the same standards as English proficient students which means they must score a level 2 or above on math and ELA assessments and pass all core academic subjects (ELA, math, science and social studies). We have nine special education students mandated for ESL services. Additionally, MS 326 has \_\_\_\_\_ newcomers in the sixth grade, \_\_\_\_\_ newcomers in the seventh grade and \_\_\_\_\_ in the eighth grade.

Language Allocation Policy is included in the Comprehensive Education Plan. MS 326 has a clear and comprehensive vision of its services for all students. The school does coordinate all personnel and resources in alignment with ELL needs, as addressed in the CEP. The school leadership is knowledgeable of all federal, state and city mandates that support the ELL population as evidenced by classroom settings and procedures. In addition, the instructional support specialists from the Leadership Support Organization support the teachers and drive best practices in classrooms with ELL's.

The School Leadership Team as well as cross grade, cross content and cross program teams use data to inform decision making and drive instruction. Ms. Nunez, the parent coordinator, invites parents of ELL's to participate in the school leadership team, the CEP process and attend the Parents' Association meetings. Posters advertising meetings are placed prominently throughout the building as well as in entrance ways. The phone master, which can be programmed to contact all parents or just the parents of the ELL's, is used to notify parents of meetings and/or important messages. Translated letters are also be sent home via backpack. Through the creation of monthly meetings of the Language Allocation Committee, the staff works collaboratively with the school community in monitoring, assessing and revising school procedures, policies and practices as they apply to the ELL population

#### IV Parent Program Choice:

MS 326 is committed to providing parents with programmatic options for parents of English Language Learners. There are sustained activities for informing and orienting parents about the LAP policy. When a parent comes into MS 326 with a newly arrived student, he/she is greeted by the ESL Coordinator, Julie Kreichman, who gives her a Home Language Survey. The parent completes the form and as well as other registration papers. The parent is given a choice of available programs. There is a video presentation that is provided to the parents within ten days of their child's enrollment in our school. The parent coordinator is available to assist the parent in the registration process and help arrange visits to the medical clinic to update immunization status of their child. The parent will see the Parent Orientation Video/DVD and a "Guide for Parents" brochure which is printed in the parent's home language. The State requires students to be placed in the appropriate program within ten days of enrollment. Parents, who do not come to view the video, are contacted by the parent coordinator to ensure that all parents are given an opportunity to view the video and make an informed choice of ELL programs. This entire process is supervised by the Assistant Principals and the Principal.

MS 326 has undergone major changes since it opened its doors in 2004. It has gone from a SURR school to a school in good standing with the State Education Department for the 2009-2010 year. An analysis of the trends in program choices over the past few years indicates that most of our parents chose a transitional bilingual program as their choice of programming. With the implementation of a dual language program in September 2010, parents will have another type of instructional model to select for their child. By adding a third option to the instructional models, we will be able to provide appropriate programming in accordance with parent requests as many of our feeder schools have dual language programming and if we are to attract these students to our school, we must be able to offer a dual language program.

Upon registration, if the ELL student is in need of mandated special education services, the Individualized Education Plan is reviewed to ascertain the classification, the recommended program, staffing ratio, the language of instruction, whether the student is category X, and the language of the related services as well as the short term objectives. If the parent does not come into school with the IEP, the Principal will check the Special Education Information Services website to ascertain the recommended services. The parent will be introduced to the special education teacher as well as the related service providers and a copy of the A-1 letter will be placed in the child's cumulative records. If it is deemed that the special education program is not appropriate after thirty days of the student sitting in the program and depending on the change requested, either a Type II change will be implemented or a Type 3 request for a substantial change in the IEP will be submitted to CSE. Language instruction in the special education classes is aligned with the ESL, ELA and NLA New York standards as well as the IEP mandates. Most special education students either meet standard criteria or modified criteria. However, there is a small group of students who meet New York State Alternate Assessment based on their cognitive performance levels as determined by their IEP. These students will meet Alternate Placement Indicators as determined by their functional levels. There are presently nine special education students mandated for ESL services. The ESL teacher maintains an attendance booklet on each child and submits attendance data in December and June of each year.

Within ten days of his/her registration at the school, the student will be administered a LAB-R if the child is new to the system as well as a Spanish test to ascertain functional abilities in both languages. The tests are hand scored to provide immediate data. However, the grids are submitted to the Regional Assessment Coordinator at specified times of the year as the DAA memorandum regarding the LAB-R testing. Based on the results of these tests as well as teacher input, the student may remain in his assigned class or move to a more appropriate setting which will meet his instructional needs. A parent survey and program selection form which is attached to the notification of entitlement to ELL services provides information on how the ELL program information is delivered. MS 326 uses the information from the survey form to make sure that the parents understand the information provided by the school and that the information that they are getting is useful thorough and timely. Documentation to support the fact that the school has appropriately placed all eligible students can be found in the Principal's office. This documentation includes parent option letters, continuation letters, program and class ATS lists as well as the list of new admits (code 51 and 58 only). The

parent survey and program selection forms are reviewed by the ESL coordinator, Ms. Kreichman, periodically to see the trends of parental choice and to make any changes to programs as necessary. As a school, we are committed to providing parents in the community a full selection of programs that will meet the linguistic needs of their students. The parents are very pleased with the instructional program at MS 326 as evidenced by the results of the environmental surveys as 100% of the parents responded favorably to the conditions at MS 326.

The parents' surveys and program selections forms are also reviewed by the ESL coordinator in conversation with teachers and the Assistant Principals to ascertain if the child's program is appropriate during the monthly Allocation Policy Committee meetings. A review of returned forms indicates that most parents of children who have been in the English speaking class prefer a monolingual ELL setting. This is also similar to parents of special education students who also request that their children be Type 3'd for monolingual settings. In addition, if the student is encountering academic difficulties, the appropriateness of a student's program is also a discussion topic at the Intervention Team meetings. If the Intervention Team recommends a change in programming, the change is implemented and then reviewed by the Intervention Committee to ascertain if the student is benefiting from the TIER I and/or TIER II intervention strategies.

If the student was enrolled in the school the previous June, then the Language Allocation Policy committee has already met and ascertained his/her performance levels on the NYSESLAT as well as the ELA test. MS 326 notifies parents of the NYSESLAT scores and program eligibility before the beginning of the school year. ELL's that continue to score below a certain level of English proficiency continue to be entitled to ELL services. Ell's scoring at or above that level are no longer entitled to ELL services through state funding and enter an all monolingual classes. Parents of ELLs in bilingual classes can decide whether or not their child should continue, despite entitlement status. Ms. Krecihman, the ESL coordinator, assists parents in their decision making process. All teachers receive class lists of their students' NYSESLAT scores in September and professional development is provided so that the teachers can make informed decisions about their students based on data analysis. The teachers' schedules and the flow of the day are posted in the main office on the counter which is accessible to everyone. Bilingual teachers have opportunities to articulate with quota teachers, ESL and ELA teachers during a common planning periods. In accordance with individual teacher programs, there is additional time during the day when teachers can meet to discuss student progress. All stakeholders including administrators, teachers, and students are able to clearly articulate when and why the students' native language and English are used in teaching and learning in the various programs. The parent coordinator and the bilingual coordinator are available to help the parents understand the intricacies of the different programs and how they relate to instruction for their children.

In addition to the new arrivals, who have been in an English Speaking school for three years or less, there are students who are termed long term ELL's. These students have not been able to move their NYSESLAT scores into the proficient stage. The teachers of these students are held accountable for raising scores and performance levels in the classrooms. When there is a need for TIER II intervention strategies, a general education teacher pulls the students out of the classroom and provides support. There is also the possibility of the SETTTS teacher providing at-risk intervention services to the

bilingual students. As part of our medical clinic, students can be referred for a hearing and vision test to ascertain acuity. A referral to the Pupil Personnel Committee may help shed some light on why the child is having difficulty meeting performance expectations. At times, it may be determined through an evaluation that the child needs special education services to help him/her achieve his education potential.

#### V: Assessment Results Part B

1. Ongoing assessment i.e. interim tests, unit tests in content areas, teacher made assessment tools, standardized tests, are designed to collect evidence of student learning or the need for mid-course change that are systematically implemented across grades and programs. Tests are provided in both languages to children in both formal and informal testing situations. As per DAA, all ELL's are entitled to a full range of testing accommodations: extended time for standardized tests, separate locations, bilingual glossaries and dictionaries, simultaneous use of English and bilingual version (Spanish, Chinese, Arabic) of the tests, a third reading of the reading selection on the ELA tests. The ESL, literacy and content area teachers work collaboratively to help evaluate student work and data to ascertain the language and cognitive demands of tasks aligned to the standards. In the special education classes, the teachers work collaboratively with the paraprofessionals in implementing the objectives as indicated on the student's Individualized Educational Plan.

Based on the evaluation of student performance on the 2009 standardized tests, it was determined that that the students needed support in the writing process as well as literacy above the core curriculum. In addition, a bilingual literacy outside consultant has been working with the students in 621, 721, and 821 as well as the seventh grade monolingual classes to help improve the students' reading and writing skills. The Leadership Support Organization has a bilingual instructional specialist working with the staff on a regular basis. Additionally, the lead ESL teacher has registered for workshops for literacy coaches to help close the achievement gap of the ELL's.

The patterns across the four modalities-listening, speaking reading and writing affected our instructional decisions as to selection of teachers to instruct the students, programming of students for ESL pullout as well as push-in services, the grouping of students for ESL instruction as well the amount of ESL time.

#### Part D:

An analysis of the NYSESLAT data revealed that listening skills and speaking skills performance levels surpass the performance levels in reading and writing in both the transitional and ESL only classes. Based on this analysis, we made an instructional decision to hire consultants who will be working with the ELL's in the bilingual classes and the monolingual classes on their writing skills and raise the academic rigor of their work. Additionally, all ELL's in bilingual and monolingual classes have been administered running records to help improve the reading levels by establishing basal levels, applying instruction and then they will be retested every eight weeks this year.

The students are also administered the ACUITY interim assessments as well as the predictive and instructional targeted assessments in transitional programs as well as the free standing ESL program. In all cases, the data is posted online within five days and teachers had access to the data to identify specific needs to be addressed in the classroom.

Based on these tests, we know that our children in the bilingual transitional classes have moderate delays in vocabulary and inferential reasoning. Students in free standing ESL classes exhibit similar needs but to a lesser degree than the transitional students. Most students in the bilingual and the free standing classes use simple declarative sentences when writing answers to extended responses. As a result of this analysis, this year, we will also administer an extended response to all students to begin analyzing their extended response data and use the data to drive instruction.

Native language instruction is aligned with ESL/ELA instruction. The same skills/strategies are worked on in both languages simultaneously to reinforce the learning experiences. A certified Spanish Language teacher provides instruction which is programmed into the daily schedule for the bilingual classes. Instruction in the English Language Arts is provided by certified English Language Arts teachers for both the bilingual and ESL classes.

#### Part VI:

This year, we are continuing to move from a school which was reactionary to a school which is meeting the needs of its students. There are about 135 ELL's in the building with varying linguistic abilities in English. In order to meet the needs of these students, there are three transitional bilingual classes, and a free standing ESL program to service those students who are in monolingual classes. Students are all departmentalized with seventh and eighth grade students moving from room to room. In sixth grade, all students remain in their classrooms but the teachers move from room to room to help bridge the gap between fifth and seventh grades. Students are grouped heterogeneously for all subjects except for ESL instruction which is based on functional levels. ESL teachers also push into classes to support the content area teachers who are working with monolingual ELL's and enrich language development for these students within the content area instruction. All ELL's who have been in an English speaking school for more than a year and a day must take the ELA exam in English. They are able to take other NY State exams in their native language.

All staff members in the general education and special education classes are appropriately licensed. Three teachers hold appropriate teaching certificates that reflect not only their content areas but also their bilingual expertise. In addition, the bilingual special education teacher has demonstrated her proficiency in both languages by passing the required English proficiency exams. The English Language Arts program is taught by licensed ELA teachers. Through these various programs, MS 326 has implemented for 2009-2010 a rigorous instructional program that ensures continuity of instruction and language development. The ELL students receive 90 minutes of literacy and 90 minute blocks of math instruction to help them achieve their education potential in these subjects. Content area instruction is rigorous as evidenced by the reports and projects the students are required to complete.

Language instruction for the ELL's is aligned with the ESL, ELA and NLA and content learning standards and the core curriculum from New York standards. Regardless of the content area, all instruction promotes four language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Native language is used to support high demand, high challenging areas of instruction. It is expected that the teachers will know how to scaffold instruction to promote linguistic development. There is consistency of language usage as per the

program design i.e. transitional, dual or free standing ESL. Content area instruction is aligned with the NYC and NYS standards in mathematics, science and social studies. It is provided in both English and the native language based on the student's placement as per the Language Allocation Policy. English language instruction is provided through the content areas using scaffolding strategies to ensure that both language and content acquisition objectives are achieved. Content area instruction is supported by instructional materials in both languages in sufficient numbers of appropriate quality and aligned to the standards. Content area instruction is conducted in the languages identified on the language allocation policy in the transitional and dual language programs. Content area teachers develop linguistic functions and cognitive skills through the content topics and themes. On going assessment strategies i.e. unit tests, teacher made tests, practice standardized tests, student created projects are used to determine movement towards the content area.

Observations of classroom instruction in the transitional classrooms as well as monolingual classes have revealed that the teachers engage the students in an environment that is conducive to learning. Teachers have high expectations for all students and are accountable for instruction. Lessons consistently promote the use of oral and written language as evidence by work in the student portfolios and classroom visits. Scaffolding strategies are employed which promote ESL and academic development as well as the development of higher cognitive skills i.e. modeling, bridging, contextualization, schema building, text representation, and metacognition. By having the teachers act as facilitators this year, there has been an increase in oral discourse between pairs of students which has promoted the further development of language.

Students participate in an instructional program that regular ensures continuity of rigorous instruction. The instructional program is aligned with the mandated ESL/NLA/ELA and content learning standards and the core curriculum. There is evidence in the classroom of implementation of the core curriculum in all content areas: literacy, science, social studies and math. Teaching materials include a wide range of print, visual and digital resources designed for increasing English language proficiency. Language functions and structures are taught within the context of the lesson. Classroom teachers can explain the basis for their decisions for language use in instruction. The knowledge level of the entire staff is sustained through ongoing training in ESL methodologies, as well as changes and status of the Language Allocation policy. There is a professional development program that targets the needs of teachers of second language learners i.e. second language acquisition, developing academic language through content areas. The literacy and ESL teachers work collaboratively to evaluate student work and data to ascertain the language and cognitive demands of tasks aligned to standards. In addition, the math and science teachers interact with the literacy/ESL teachers as part of a team approach to help the students achieve his/her educational potential. All teachers maintain portfolios for each student where reading and writing products are collected to be assessed periodically by the student, teachers and parents in both languages

In the transitional bilingual program, instruction is provided in the student's native language with intensive support in ESL. The goals of a transitional bilingual program are to attain English language proficiency within three years; providing grade level academic work in the student's native language so that the student maintains academic progress while developing English proficiency and providing instruction in two

languages (Spanish and English). Students are grouped for ESL instruction based on their performance levels on the NYSESLAT test and instruction is differentiated based on their functional levels. By grouping students according to functional levels, explicit ESL instruction is delivered to comply with the mandates. In the beginning stages of English language development, 60% of instructional time will take place in the student's native language and 40% in English. As the students develop fluency in English, instructional time in English also increases. It is expected that students will develop their English language skills through ESL and ELA with the ratio shifting to second language proficiency until the student is ready to enter into an all English program. It is expected that the beginner's ESL class will move to 50% English and 50% Spanish by the end of the year. It is the policy of MS 326 to provide increased English instruction by providing instruction in English for literacy/ESL, social studies, science and finally math. All bilingual students receive instruction in the native language arts. Based on an analysis of the data, most of our students are in the intermediate level with weaknesses in reading and writing. Analysis of the 2009 ELA data revealed that there has been a reduction in the number of level 1 students and an increase in the number of level 3's as we close the achievement gap of the students. However, the number of level 3 ELL students continue to lag their monolingual peers in all core subjects.

In the bilingual transitional class, math is taught in Spanish, Science is taught in Spanish while English language arts and social studies are taught in English with the support of a push-in ESL teacher. In the ESL stand alone classes, all classes are taught in English with the support of the ESL teachers.

In addition to the transitional programs, MS 326 also has an ESL program for those students who receive all instruction in English using ESL methodologies as determined by the NYSESLAT scores. The goals of our ESL program are to support the monolingual students in their academic subject area instruction in English. Using the push-in/pull out model, the ESL certified teacher provides ESL instruction to students

Instruction is aligned to the NYCDOE core curriculum in balanced literacy as supported by the Susan Radley literacy units and math using native and second language as determined by the program design and the Language Allocation Policy. Students are grouped homogeneously for ESL instruction based on performance on the LAB-R, NYSESLAT as well as teacher input and a consideration on the amount of time in an English speaking school. The ESL teacher pushes into the classrooms and works collaboratively with the teachers. In other cases, she pulls students out of their literacy class to provide instruction to the students based on their functional levels. It is important to note that all teachers group the children in pairs to promote oral discourse as well as socialization.

While a new arrival is considered to be in an English speaking school for three years or less, there are significant difference in receptive and expressive linguistic functioning in terms of content form and use between students who have been at MS 326 for two months as opposed to two years. Students are grouped heterogeneous for content area subjects to provide opportunities for students who are less proficient in language the necessary time to interact with those who are more proficient. Teachers facilitate learning and take responsibility for student success by using different approaches. However, students are grouped functionally for ESL instruction in small groups in order to promote social as well as academic language development

We have a small number of students who have been identified as students with interrupted formal education. These students are in the bilingual classes and receive small group instruction from the ESL teachers when they are in the classroom. Programmatically, the bilingual classes are small with registers of 16-18 in sixth and seventh grade and 22 in eighth grade. This setup allows teachers to provide individualized attention to SIFE students.

We also have a very small group of ELL students who have been in English speaking school for more than six years and are still considered English Language Learners. These students receive small group instruction and have been targeted for after school programs as well as the Saturday Academy. These students are also part of the Level 1 ELA group. The literacy teachers provide additional instructional time for these students.

We have a small group of students with special needs (N=9) who are mandated for exception for bilingual services as per their IEP. These students are pulled out for ESL instruction by a certified ESL teacher in addition to having a second teacher in the collaborative teaching setting. The Principal checks SEC on a weekly basis to ensure that all students have been picked up for services and that the teacher has called in the first attends to the IVR system.

As part of our intervention programs in ELA, we are in the process of implementing Read 180 for both the beginning as well as intermediate level students. The literacy teachers all have time built into their programs to address student needs in small groups during the day. Additionally, students have been identified to come to school for the 37.5 minute program. The ESL teachers work with the beginners while the other teachers work with the intermediate students. Furthermore, we have after school and Saturday programs to address the needs of ELL's. In math, we have classes before school and on Saturdays to address the needs of the students. Monolingual ELL's in general education and special education classes have their needs addressed by the presence of a second teacher in a reduce class. In social studies, an ESL teacher pushes into the class to help the students demonstrate understanding the content. In science, students are provided assistance in after school program for both monolingual as well as transitional classes.

Our plan for continuing transitional support for two years for ELL's reaching proficiency on the NYSESLAT includes monitoring of student progress in all core areas. In math, students are monitored on their performance on unit tests and these results are transparent in the classroom. In literacy, all students have been issued running records and these results are all transparent. Fridays are devoted for addressing the needs of students that surface via these tests and other interim assessments. Social studies and science are all developing uniform across the grade unit tests which will be transparent.

#### Part VII:

All students have access to standards based instructional materials. Instructional strategies and activities reflect scientifically based research. The balanced literacy model is used in Native Language Arts instruction and English as a Second Language. The students receive the mandated minutes of instruction of NLA, ESL and ELA. Technology continues to be improved as each year computers are bought from funds cut out from the general operating funds.

The students use textbooks, libraries and instructional materials that are aligned with the school's core curriculum and reflect the language of instruction. Impact math books are available to students in both English and Spanish. This is to ensure that they can refer back and forth between languages when necessary. The classroom library areas are clearly defined by language and include books that are leveled in English and in the native language. There are leveled books for guided reading and independent reading. We continue to buy additional low level high interest materials. Overhead projectors are available in all classrooms. The teachers use red ink to indicate Spanish materials and blue ink to represent English. There are adequate instructional materials in each language. For social studies, the students use the textbook entitled "Una Nacion Mucho Pueblos". Science textbooks are available in English and Spanish from Glencoe.

The ELL students demonstrate learning through measurable product development, demonstrations and exhibits i.e foldables, DNA models, exit projects, portfolios in both math and literacy. In order to complete their exit projects, the students demonstrate technical proficiency including but not limited to research on the internet and the use of computers in the classroom. Students' work is displayed in each language to celebrate their accomplishments in both their native language and their second language acquisition. The walls in the classroom are print rich in each language as evidenced by word walls, reports, posters, foldables. It is expected that the content area teachers will plan lessons that complement instead of merely translate the content instruction in the other language. The use of authentic literature in the native language is used to support the core curriculum.

Language functions, language structures and vocabulary lessons are planned as part of every lesson. Teachers are expected to incorporate the study of conventions (bound and unbound morphemes) along with the study of content and the use of pragmatics in discourse.

Teachers plan for the development of both social and academic language through various activities and trips. Activities are planned considering the family and language background of students and to celebrate their heritage through the Dominican Heritage performances, the Arts Festival, the January Talent/holiday/culture performances as well as the Spring Festival. Instruction is designed to mediate the learning of various proficiency classifications: newcomers, SIFE, long term ELL's, beginners, intermediate and advanced proficiency levels. Lessons are designed to meet standards while there is differentiation for student needs. Literacy development are provided for every student and the literacy instruction is consistent with the instructional goals and objectives of the program which is based on the student's linguistic performance levels as determined by the LAB-R and NYSESLAT.

Teachers scaffold academic language to support students' participation in content areas. The bilingual teachers use overhead projectors and other visuals to support students' participation in the content areas. The ESL teacher and the bilingual teachers model the use of language in ways in which students are expected to participate. They will model correct use of the language to the students during conversations and in feedback on students' work.

Professional development comes from many different sources...internal as well as external. We have a literacy and math coach that hold weekly grade level content level meetings. Additionally, the bilingual teachers meet with a lead ESL teacher to address the

needs of the students. Two outside consultants work with the teachers and students as they model instruction in the classrooms. They maintain connections with the teachers via emails. Consultants from the Leadership Support Organization provide additional support in the area of the ELL's in the building. Teachers are able to participate in LSO's workshops outside the building and interact with teachers from other parts of the city. We have math, science and technology consultants from AUSSIE who works with the math teachers on differentiating instruction. The minimum 7.5 hours for all staff takes place during the PD days as well as during faculty conferences. The staff is provided with opportunities to work with one of six counselors to assist them in providing supports in helping students articulate to high school. As discussed earlier in this plan, NLA is provided to the transitional classes only programmatically by a licensed teacher.

We also need to provide support to the students in the advanced group who might be sitting in monolingual classes. These student needs are addressed through after-school support via the Century 21 program, programmatic streaming, student grouping in class as well as opportunities for socialization.

All administrators and teachers are expected to be able to clearly state when and why the students' native language and English are being used in teaching and learning. Individualized Education plans for English Language Learners in special education

programs are reviewed by the Principal to ascertain proper placement programmatically as well as linguistically.