



PROFFESIONAL PERFORMING ARTS SCHOOL

2010-2011

SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)

SCHOOL: 02M408
ADDRESS: 328 WEST 48TH STREET, NY, NY 10036
TELEPHONE: (212) 247-8652
FAX: (212) 247-7514

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE	3
SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE	4
SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE	5
Part A. Narrative Description	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot	7
SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT	11
SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS	17
SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN	17
SECTION VII: PARENT INVOLVEMENT PLAN	21
REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010	20
APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM ..	Error! Bookmark not defined.13
APPENDIX 2: PROGRAM DELIVERY FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELLs)	Error! Bookmark not defined.
APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION	17
APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS	18
APPENDIX 5: NCLB/SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS IDENTIFIED FOR IMPROVEMENT	23
APPENDIX 6: SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS UNDER REGISTRATION REVIEW (SURRE) .	Error!
Bookmark not defined.	24
APPENDIX 7: SCHOOL-LEVEL REFLECTION AND RESPONSE TO SYSTEM-WIDE IMPLICATIONS OF FINDINGS FROM AUDITS OF THE WRITTEN, TESTED, AND TAUGHT CURRICULUM IN ELA AND MATHEMATICS	25Error!
Bookmark not defined.	
APPENDIX 8: CONTRACTS FOR EXCELLENCE (C4E) SCHOOL-BASED EXPENDITURES FOR 2009-10	Error!
Bookmark not defined.	35
APPENDIX 9: TITLE I, PART A – SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS IN TEMPORARY HOUSING (STH)	Error!
Bookmark not defined.	36

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: 02M408 **SCHOOL NAME:** Professional Performing Arts School

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 328 W. 48th Street, NY, NY 10036

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: (212) 247-8652 **FAX:** (212) 247-7514

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Keith Ryan **EMAIL ADDRESS:** Kryan5@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON: Keith Ryan

PRINCIPAL: Keith Ryan

UFT CHAPTER LEADER: Kim Mussman

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT: Frank Mandela, Christina Latrowski (co-pres)

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE:
(Required for high schools) Rafael Santiago

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL SUPPORT ORGANIZATION (SSO) INFORMATION

DISTRICT: 2 **SSO NAME:** Cluster 1

CFN LEADER: Sumita Kaufhold

SUPERINTENDENT: Elaine Gorman

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

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

Name	Position and Constituent Group Represented	Signature
Keith Ryan	*Principal or Designee	
Sara Pourghasemi	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Christina Latrowski	*PA/PTA Co-President	
Frank Mandala	*PA/PTA Co-President	
	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
Rafael Santiago	Student Representatives (<i>optional for elementary and middle schools; a minimum of two members required for high schools</i>)	
Hassan Blandford	CBO Representative, if applicable	
Ed Lucas	Member/ Parent	
Tamara Jaffe	Member/ Teacher (UFT)	
Cheryl Lieberman	Member/Parent	
Zina Mingo	Member/Parent	
Chuck Vassallo	Member/Assistant Principal (CSA)	
	Member/	

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

* Core (mandatory) SLT members.

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

HISTORY

Located in the heart of the theater district in Manhattan, Professional Performing Arts School (PPAS) was created in 1990 to meet the needs of two groups of students – those demonstrating a strong talent and passion for the performing arts and those who were pursuing professional work in the arts.

MISSION

It is the special mission of this small, personalized public school to develop, refine, and showcase students in dance, drama, musical theater, vocal and instrumental music while providing them with a comprehensive, sequential, academic curriculum.

FACULTY INFORMATION

Number of Faculty: 26

Education Level and Background: 95% teaching under certification, 55% teaching with masters plus 30 hours of doctorate, 18% teaching with fewer than 3 years experience.

STUDENT INFORMATION

PPAS admits students from all five boroughs of New York City. The student body is culturally diverse with a population that is *49% Caucasian, 28% African American, 18% Hispanic/Latino, 5% Asian/Pacific Islander*. Admission requires a performance-based audition designed and judged by the individual performing arts departments.

PARTNERSHIPS

PPAS offers students a unique opportunity to pursue an advanced regents curriculum as they study the arts in a professional environment. A wide range of performing arts courses are taught by professional artists who offer training to meet the needs of the beginning student and the professional actor, singer, musician or dancer.

Cultural/Art Organizations

The Ailey School, The National Chorale, School of American Ballet, The Actors Institute, Rosie's Broadway Kids, Waterwell Theater and Juilliard

Higher Education Institutions

PPAS offers AP Literature and Biology. We also partner with three New York City colleges (NYU, John Jay, City and Hunter College) which offer our students the opportunity to take college-level coursework during their junior and senior year.

ADMISSION TO PPAS

2008 Applications and Acceptances:

9th Grade:

Musical Theatre: 220	Accepted: 24
Drama: 608	Accepted: 24
Vocal Music: 549	Accepted: 24
Dance: 574	Accepted: 26

Dance: 41

Accepted: 2

10th Grade:

Musical Theatre: 21	Accepted: 5
Drama: 53	Accepted: 5
Vocal Music: 29	Accepted: 1

CURRICULUM AND COURSES

Acknowledging the needs for students to prepare for wider opportunities than any single profession may offer, PPAS offers an academically challenging, college preparatory course of study centered upon an interdisciplinary, multicultural, inquiry-based approach to learning. Predicting the statewide trend towards a Regents curriculum, all students at PPAS have always been required to take a full load of challenging Regents level courses. An extended day provides students with academic classes in the morning and performing arts classes in the afternoon. Collaboration with On Location Educators, a PPAS teacher coordinator and an on-site tutor, allows students who are in performance to maintain a consistent academic program.

GRADING STANDARDS AND DISTRIBUTION

Although the PPAS transcript is presented in a traditional NYC public school format, it represents performance and portfolio assessment as well as test results. As PPAS is a small school that stresses community and cooperation, students are not ranked.

Grades are related on the transcript as follows:

100-90=A 89-80=B 79-70=C 69-65=D

2009-2010 STATISTICS

- Regents Exams:
 - 100% passed English Regents Exam
 - 98% passed Algebra Regents Exam
- Mean SAT Scores:
 - Critical reading: 512
 - Mathematics: 495
 - Writing: 516
- June 2009 graduation rate: 96%
- Students furthering education after PPAS:
 - Four-Year Schools: 96%
 - Two-Year Schools: 2%
 - Professional Work: 2%

2009 Graduates of PPAS went to a wide variety of conservatories, colleges and universities including: Adelphi, Adirondack, AMDA, Bard, Barnard, Basbon, Boston Conservatory, Boston University, Cal Arts, CITY College, Conservatory at Shenandoah, CUNY Honors (Hunter), DePauw, Dominican, Drew University, Emerson, FIT, Five Towns College, Fordham, Hofstra, Howard, Hunter, Iona, Ithaca, John Jay College, Liberty, Long Island University, Manhattan School of Music, Manhattanville, Middlebury, NC School of the Arts, Northwestern, NYU, Otterbein, Pace, Pratt, Rider, Rutgers, San Francisco Conservatory, SUNY New Paltz, SUNY Potsdam School of Music, SUNY Purchase, Syracuse, UCLA, University of Connecticut, University of the Arts, Utah State, Vassar.

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT

School Name:	Professional Performing Arts High School						
District:	2	DBN:	02M408	School BEDS Code:	310200011408		

DEMOGRAPHICS

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

Enrollment

(As of October 31)	2006-07			2007-08			2008-09		
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	Attendance - % of days students attended :					
Pre-K	0	0	0	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08*	2008-09		
Kindergarten	0	0	0		95.6 / 92.3	95.6/93.7	TBD		
Grade 1	0	0	0	Student Stability - % of Enrollment :					
Grade 2	0	0	0	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Grade 3	0	0	0		97.9	98.4	TBD		
Grade 4	0	0	0	Poverty Rate - % of Enrollment :					
Grade 5	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Grade 6	23	25	26		17.9	13.2	14.0		
Grade 7	29	29	28	Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number :					
Grade 8	26	29	27	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Grade 9	69	87	90		1	7	TBD		
Grade 10	88	80	98	Recent Immigrants - Total Number :					
Grade 11	89	98	84	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
Grade 12	79	80	96		0	0	1		
Ungraded	1	0	0						
Total	404	428	449						

Special Education Enrollment:

(As of October 31)	2006-07			2007-08			2008-09		
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	Suspensions (OSYD Reporting) - Total Number:					
# in Self-Contained Classes	0	0	0	(As of June 30)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	0	0	0		0	0	TBD		
Number all others	19	24	18		0	0	TBD		

These students are included in the enrollment information above.

(As of October 31)	2006-07			2007-08			2008-09		
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	Special High School Programs - Total Number:					
CTE Program Participants	TBD	TBD	0						
Early College HS Program Participants	0	0	0						

English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment: (BESIS Survey)

(As of October 31)	2006-07			2007-08			2008-09		
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	Number of Staff - Includes all full-time staff:					
# in Transitional Bilingual Classes	0	0	0	(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0		24	25	25		
# receiving ESL services only	0	0	1						

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT

# ELLs with IEPs	0	0	0	Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	3	4	4
Number of Educational Paraprofessionals These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.					N/A	0	0

Overage Students (# entering students overage for grade) Teacher Qualifications:

(As of October 31)	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08(As of October 31)	2008-09
	0	0	0	100.0	100.0 % fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100.0
			54.2	68.0	% more than 2 years teaching in this school	88.0

37.5 48.0 **Ethnicity and Gender - % of Enrollment:** % more than 5 years teaching anywhere 68.0

(As of October 31) 2006-07 2007-08 2008-09 88.0 88.0 % Masters Degree or higher 92.0

American Indian or Alaska Native 0.5 0.2 0.2 90.0 74.5 % core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition) 100.0

Black or African American 23.8 29.0 28.1

Hispanic or Latino 15.6 19.2 18.0

Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl. 3.7 3.0 3.8

White 56.4 48.6 47.7

Male 28.5 28.7 26.5

Female 71.5 71.3 73.5 **2009-10 TITLE I STATUS**

√	Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP)						
	Title I Targeted Assistance						
	Non-Title I						

Years the School Received Title I Part A Funding:	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
---------------------------------------------------	---------	---------	---------	---------

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

SURR School (Yes/No) If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:

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

√	In Good Standing (IGS)			
	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1			
	School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 2			
	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) – Year 1			
	NCLB Corrective Action (CA) – Year 2/Planning for Restructuring (PFR)			
	NCLB Restructuring – Year			
	School Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP) – Year			

CEP Section III: School Profile Part B: School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot (Version

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT

Individual Subject/Area Ratings:							
Elementary/Middle Level				Secondary Level			
ELA:		IGS		ELA:		IGS	
Math:		IGS		Math:		IGS	
Science:		IGS		Graduation Rate:		IGS	
This school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for each accountability measure:							
Student Groups	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level			Grad Rate
	ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad Rate	
All Students	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Ethnicity							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Black or African American	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Hispanic or Latino	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	-	-		-	-		
White	√	√	√	√	√	√	
Other Groups							
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Limited English Proficient				-	-		
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Student groups making AYP in each subject	2	2	2	2	2	2	1

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results – 2008-09		Quality Review Results – 2008-09	
Overall Letter Grade:	TBD	Overall Evaluation:	TBD
Overall Score:	TBD	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	TBD
School Environment:	TBD	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	TBD
<i>(Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)</i>		Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	TBD
School Performance:	TBD	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	TBD
<i>(Comprises 25% of the Overall Score)</i>		Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	TBD
Student Progress:	TBD		
<i>(Comprises 60% of the Overall Score)</i>			
Additional Credit:	TBD		

KEY: AYP STATUS	KEY: QUALITY REVIEW SCORE
√ = Made AYP	Δ = Underdeveloped
√ ^{SH} = Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target	► = Underdeveloped with Proficient Features
X = Did Not Make AYP	√ = Proficient
- = Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status	W = Well Developed
	◇ = Outstanding

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

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

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

I. Development of the Needs Assessment

Phase One: Subject area teams responded to a series of questions that explored coherence in instructional planning and practice among the teachers on the team. Full staff involvement.

Phase Two: The Data Specialist and the Principal reviewed the subject team responses and wrote the first draft of the needs assessment.

Phase Three: A team consisting of teachers, a guidance counselor, the data specialist, and administrators met to identify cross-subject coherence so that we had the best possible sense of school-wide coherence in instructional planning and practice.

Phase Four: The Middle School team worked on Section IV to provide detailed analysis of the Middle School Organization.

Final Phase: The staff was given a draft of the needs assessment for review and asked for feedback. This feedback was assessed by a group consisting of teachers, the Data Specialist, and the Principal who made further modifications to this document to give the clearest possible picture of the school's needs.

II. Instructional Goals

The 2010-11 PPAS Goal: To improve our instructional planning and practice by using a teacher-centered professional development structure. PD will focus specifically on the following:

- Differentiated Instruction
 - Student Engagement
 - Classroom Management
 - Classroom Strategies to Improve Lateness and Absence
 - Middle School Cross Subject Planning
-
- All teachers will participate in at least one of the above strands.
 - The groups will be inquiry-based; 100% of teachers will be involved in Inquiry through the above strands. (Quality Statement #4)
 - Each strand is currently working on needs assessments that will lead to measurable objectives.
 - The Middle School strand will support the specific goal of earning an "A" on the 09-10 Progress Report.

III. Areas of Celebration and Promising Practices

#1. PPAS Academic Intervention Services (AIS) Program:

- A Child Study Team (CST) was implemented as the core component of our AIS/RTI program.

- The AIS/RTI program has been supported with various staffing and organizational changes.
- The CST has been assessed and modified/improved to its current processes and procedures.
- A systematic assessment tool has been built into the CST referral process.
- The CST referral process is grade level-based and well known and open to all staff.
- The CST referral process is open to all student and parents. (We continue to work on making the process well known to students and parents.)
- The Director of Performing Arts sits on the core CST in order to promote school-wide coherence including our performing arts partners and subsequent curricula.
- We have added to our AIS/RTI program a formal tutoring program supported by a time compensation position.
- We are currently adding a mentoring program that will provide mentoring for a select number of students.
- We are currently building a space to house the daily operations of the AIS/RTI program.
- Our current AIS/RTI goal is to move support into the classroom by improving instructional practice and aligning it with our PD strands, class goals, and class observations.
- A shift toward the use of hard data is on-going and reflected in the most recent modification to the program, namely the CST referral.

Evaluative Statement: The AIS/RTI program has led to clear gains in our lower third populations evidenced by higher credit accumulation among this group, higher passing rate on regents exams and instructional improvements in the classroom.

#2. PPAS Structure and Organization:

- Middle school teaching assignments, historically fielded to high school teachers, now supported with a committed core middle school staff.
- Built in common planning time for all grades
- A dedicated cross-subject PD Strand.
- A dedicated Child Study Team meeting.
- A self-contained entry year 6th grade class.
- A doubling of all CST/RTI time and effort for 9th grade students.
- A commitment to understanding the testing data and other formative assessments to inform instructional modification/improvements.
- Conferences and follow-up meetings with high school teachers.
- Group counseling.
- Professional development training specifically for middle school teachers (most recently a Nancy Atwell seminar).
- Middle school only activities and events (pot luck, parties, etc.)
- Middle school and High School student council.
- Consistency across grading policies and curriculum.

Evaluative Statement: The re-organization of the school as detailed above has been a boon to our program and has led to far better cross-grade and cross-subject area coherence. It has also resulted in a better understanding of standardized assessments and instructional practice.

#3. Building Capacity and Coherence of the Performing Arts Curriculum and Programs:

- An Assistant Principal was hired as Director of Performing Arts to oversee all of the performing arts programs.
- We clarified the hierarchy and structure of the management of the Drama program.
- We have created new arts partnerships with New York City arts organizations as a response to the need for expanded coursework in certain performing arts majors.
- We obtained additional funding to support supplementary academic instruction necessary as a result of schedule conflicts with various arts partners.
- We have supported the development of additional performance projects and venues that allow us to expand our performance schedule and offer artistically challenging works on a variety of scales.
- We have worked with the parent body to develop additional sources of funding to support the performing arts programs.

Evaluative Statement: The Performing Arts curricula, specifically in the areas of drama, musical theater and dance have evolved with the support of the Assistant Principal in charge of Performing Arts. There is more cohesiveness across the teaching artists and the programs have been brought closer to the core mission and fabric of the school.

IV. Relating Practice to the Quality Review Rubric

PPAS School Structure and Organization

- What are the intended outcomes of this practice, initiative, or project?

- To support the unique learning/emotional/social/cognitive needs of middle schoolers.
- To ensure that every middle schooler feels successful and makes marked progress each year.
- To ensure that students see cross-curricular connections.
- To ensure that students see continuity in their learning from one year to the next.

- How do you know this initiative is on target to achieve the stated outcomes, within this school year and beyond?

- Classroom, city-wide, and state-wide assessments are used and shared regularly to inform instructional modifications and improvements.
- Tracking yearly progress and comparing against grade level standards and using item analysis has informed our practice in the Middle School grades, particularly in English and Math.
- We solicit student and parent feedback. We have a very tight-knit community where student/parent feedback is part of the fabric of the school. There are also formal approaches for assuring a systematic way such feedback is used (CST referrals, parent events, well-organized parent/teacher conferences).
- We solicit teacher feedback. Excellent communication tools used regularly are on-line grade postings and weekly progress reports. Teacher feedback is essential to classroom practice in the Middle School. Feedback is also shared among the core teachers in order to arrive at coherence across the subjects and grades.

- Links and references in this initiative to specific Quality Statement indicators include but are not limited to:

- 1.2 - Reading curriculum is Readers' Workshop which lets students pick their own books at

their own level and then produce meaningful work products.

- 1.3 - Forming team middle school, dedicated professional development strand, middle school child study team, middle school daily meetings.
- 2.1 - ARIS and assessment information used to inform instruction.
- 2.4 - Citizenship grades, weekly progress reports, online grade reports, open-door email policy.
- 3.2 - Daily meetings between general and special education teachers, child study team meetings, middle school team meetings, subject area meetings, frequent student reports, differentiated groupings in reading and word study.
- 4.3 - Various professional development seminars including: Nancie Atwell, Schools-Attuned, History of Elections, History of United States Government, Aligning the Needs of All Social Studies Learners, etc.
- 3.4, 1.1 Accelerated studies in foreign language (French 1) and science (Living Environment) for all 8th graders.
- 3.4, 1.1 Accelerated studies in math for students who appropriately test for Algebra.
- 3.3, 3.1 One of our Inquiry teams will monitor student progress in specifically in Middle School math. Teacher made assessments, Acuity Periodic and ITA assessments will be used as interim benchmarks.

- The reviewer will know this initiative is having an impact on our school's performance during the review by doing the following:

- Looking at grade book data.
- Conducting teacher and student interviews.
- Engage in classroom observations.
- Analyzing grading policies.
- Looking at sample task sheets, lesson plans, and rubrics.
- Examining student portfolios.
- Observing a team meeting.
- Observing a child study team meeting.

V. Classroom Visits

Teachers across classrooms at PPAS will use formative assessments at appropriate intervals for modifying their instruction to meet their students' needs. Classroom visits will undoubtedly provide illustrations of formative assessment. Teachers use the following to inform instruction:

- Homework
- Quizzes
- Class work and discussions
- Projects and Presentations
- Self Evaluation
- Writing, Quizzes
- Peer Assessment

The principal's observations of classes often lead to the question, "How do you use this strategy or activity to plan or modify your next class, unit and/or objective?" There is a school wide

understanding that the ability to answer this question is essential to instructional practice.

The PPAS community believes that needs assessment is essential for knowing the best instructional strategies for our students. Such assessments will inevitably show us that each classroom has various learning needs and each teacher will use this information to provide a degree of differentiation that is manageable and aligned with standards that students must meet. We continue to develop our skills in Differentiated Instruction. We have one PD Strand that is specifically designed to push this practice further.

This PD strand, like all PD at PPAS, is teacher-driven. The objectives of the PD strands are to respond specifically to needs assessments and formative assessments that have been part of the teachers' instructional practices. Currently the PD Strands are developing more focused needs assessments so we have better data for supporting the following instructional topics:

- Differentiated Instruction
- Classroom Management
- Student Motivation
- Instructional Strategies to Improve Lateness or Absence
- Middle School Cross-Subject Planning

VI. Data-informed Decision Making and Capacity Building

Data-informed Decision Making has been most prevalent and urgent in our Middle School because we slipped from an "A" to a "B" on the Progress Report.

The Middle School team understands how focused on results they need to be in order to continue performing and to keep their students performing, at very high levels.

Prior to the release of the matrixes for the MS Progress Report last year, the Middle School Team was cognizant of and became fluent in the scoring metrics for the ELA and Math state tests. We had seen some slips that were alarming, and the team began to drill down, using item analysis from Acuity, Predictive and ITA, assessments and researching ARIS for any specific patterns.

We had an Inquiry Team specifically focused on measuring slope in 8th-Grade math last year, an area where we recognized some weakness. This focus was chosen based on in-class as well as standardized diagnostics and previous state tests.

We plan to continue an Inquiry Team in the area of Middle School math this year, cross-grade.

We also have established the Middle School PD Strand which will focus on cross-subject planning, assessing and modifying instructional practice to increase student understanding and performance.

VII. Importance of Performing Arts Component

Our performing arts programs are at the core of our mission.

We are working on building coherence across all our performing arts programs as well as academic programs. Though we are a small school, approximately 460 students, PPAS often feels

like a large institution because at any given time our students can be in studios from 44th Street to 65th Street. We truly have a city campus.

We have partnerships with Alvin Ailey Dance, Rosie's Broadway Kids, School of American Ballet, Juilliard Pre-College, The Actors' Institute, Waterwell Theater and The National Choral. Much of our time is dedicated to the daily logistics of these programs and to building a unified school-and-partner-wide program.

We have established a refrain here at the school over the last few years and continue to build upon it. It is the expectation that all stakeholders will provide and work appropriately in a professional setting. The word "professional" in the title of the school is not that our students work professionally (though a small percentage do), it is that our expectations of what we are culturally is a place of professionalism: We provide professional teaching artists, our approach to teaching and learning is for a professional setting, expectations for our students is to respond to a professional environment. We feel strongly that this will lead to successes in the profession of performing arts or any other profession that our students pursue.

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

AND

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

Goal Number 1	
Goal: To raise the performance in the Algebra regents by raising the mean score in our bottom half of performers by 2 points. Our 2010 score of 69.1 will change to 71.9 for this targeted group.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• PERCENTAGE IMPROVEMENT IN REGENTS MATH SCORES via instructional improvements in math, specifically using new technologies as a vehicle for learning math. Mean will rise by 2 points in lower half of performers. In raw numbers the June 2010 mean for the lower half of performers in the Algebra regents was 69.1. Our goal is to change this number from 69.1 to 71.9 for this targeted group.
Measurable Objective	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The mean for our lower half of performers on the June 2010 Algebra regents was 69.1• Our goal is for there to be a change from 69.1 to 71.9 by June 2011 for the bottom half of the participants. This will be based on approximately 51 participants students, compared to last year's 48 participants in the lower half group. All 10th graders take the test in June.• Interim assessments will provide benchmarks and help us assess our implementation of using teaching strategies with technology in math classes.
Action Plan	An inquiry team has been developed to achieve this goal. The team will analyze various assessments: in class formative data, class quizzes and tests, interim standardized tests, and ultimately the regents, to identify areas that need growth and how to best implement new technologies to support these areas. Classroom strategies will be implemented based on on-going assessments and the work of the inquiry team, especially technological supports. The math classrooms will be supported in these implementation by funding and PD supports in place at the school.

Evidence	An inquiry team will meet once per week for the school year starting in October. Team minutes, team findings, team conclusions, recommendations and an assessment of the implementation and success rate of the instructional modification. The effectiveness of the instructional modifications will be measured by school level, city level and state level tests.
----------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Goal Number 2	
<p>Goal: To have 10% more students scoring on the Global and US History Regents tests above 75%. AND The June 2010 mean score of 63.7% will change to 65% by June 2011.</p>	<p>We have identified some improvement in our history tests over the last several years. Nonetheless, strategies in social studies instruction, in particular its relationship with writing and research, require improvement. The goal of raising higher level scores by 10% will provide the impetus for our social studies team to look closely at the Common Core Standards for English Language Arts and communication effectively with our ELA staff to establish recommendation and implement instructional improvements in the social studies curriculum. In raw numbers this means that approximately 10 more students (depending on our number of participants this year) will score a 75 or better relative to June 2010. We are adding a secondary goal of raising the mean score from 63.7% to 65% on the Global Regents. This will keep the instructional focus on the complete lower half of the performance range rather than focusing souly on the mid-range category.</p>
Measurable Objective	10% more students will achieve a 75% or higher on the Global Regents and the US History Regents.
Action Plan	Social Studies and English Language Arts pedagogues will meet together in departmental meetings at least once a month to establish an improved support system for reading, writing and research in the social studies curriculum.

Evidence	This combination of English and Social Studies staff will mimic the inquiry process and record information that will include team minutes, team findings, team conclusions, recommendations and an assessment of the implementation and success rate of the instructional modification. The effectiveness of the instructional modifications will be measured by school and city level tests with the ultimate goal measured by the Regents exams in US History and Global Studies.
-----------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**SECTION VII
PARENT INVOLVEMENT PLAN**

TARGET AREA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Identifying specific strategies to create a welcoming environment. ❖ Practicing techniques for engaging and working together with parents
DESIRED OUTCOME/S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ To provide information, resources and support for families as they develop learning opportunities in the home. ❖ To provide parents avenues to explore learning with their children in the school environment. ❖ To Provide meaningful ways for non-English speaking parents to participate ❖ To initiate frequent informal and positive contact between staff and parents.
PARTICIPANTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Parent Coordinator ❖ Parent Association ❖ Guidance Counselor ❖ Attendance Teachers ❖ Attendance Coordinator
RELEVANT CURRENT DATA	Parents/Teachers Environment Survey

Actions

Steps / actions required	By when	Who, with help from, and resources req.	Data Source / Indicators of Progress	Review date
Identify community resources	Ongoing	Community Board 4. Broadway orgs: Alvin Ailey, RTK, National Chorale	Increased CBO presentation and building relationships with school-neighborhood organizations	
Create resource list/directory	Ongoing	Parent Coordinator	Providing parents with essential information on community resources and support groups ,resource guide	
Developing parent outreach strategies	ongoing	Parent Coordinator	Newsletters, phone calls, translators, phone tree bulletin board, resource guide	
Creating a “family-friendly school”	Ongoing	Parent Coordinator School Admin/Teachers	Meeting with key school staff	
Identify target group (Parents/guardians/ foster parents)	Ongoing	Parent Coordinator, Parent Association & Social Worker	Surveys, phones, letters	
Provide training for parents to access DOE and school’s website. for info on tests, regents, and curriculum.	Ongoing	Administration Technology administration	Surveys & interviews	
Provide ongoing information on students’ progress report, curriculum, and attendance	ongoing	Administration, Attendance Coordinator Attendance Teachers, Family Assistant & Teachers	Survey, Interviews and conferences	
Parent Coordinator will attend PD on Implementing effective techniques & strategies to help engage families	Ongoing	Office of Parent Support and Family Engagement	Attendance at workshop/”turn key” information to staff & parents	
Parents serving on the SLT / PA or other committee	Ongoing	PA President/SLT chair person	Attendance at PA & SLT meetings	
Translation services	Ongoing	Legal Interpreting Services	Surveys, Interviews, Conferences	
Open house /orientation/ school tours	Ongoing	Administration/Teachers, & Parent Coordinator	Attendance at open house/orientation/tours	
Parent/Teacher Conferences	Oct and April	Administrators/ teachers & Parent Coordinator	Conference Attendance	

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENT FOR ALL TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

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

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

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

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

Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).
ELA: Study Group	Study Groups are a 40 minute period of time students at risk in this subject area spend with a small group of AIS student (no more than 8) and one instructional support teacher. Every Study Group is also supported by at least one college tutor.
Mathematics: Study Group	Study Groups are a 40 minute period of time students at risk in this subject area spend with a small group of AIS student (no more than 8) and one instructional support teacher. Every Study Group is also supported by at least one college tutor.
Science: Study Group	Study Groups are a 40 minute period of time students at risk in this subject area spend with a small group of AIS student (no more than 8) and one instructional support teacher. Every Study Group is also supported by at least one college tutor.
Social Studies: Study Group	Study Groups are a 40 minute period of time students at risk in this subject area spend with a small group of AIS student (no more than 8) and one instructional support teacher. Every Study Group is also supported by at least one college tutor.
At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:	
At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	
At-risk Health-related Services:	

RE: APPENDIXES 2 AND 3: DUE TO A NEW POPULATION OF ELL STUDENTS AT 02M408 WHO ARE CURRENTLY IN THE PROCESS OF BEING ASSESSED BY THE CITY TESTING REQUIREMENT (THEY WERE REGISTERED IN OCTOBER), THESE FUNDS HAVE YET TO BE ALLOCATED DUE TO LACK OF AN APPROPRIATE NEEDS ASSESSMENT. ON THE NEXT SUBMISSION OF THE CEP, THIS SECTION WILL BE COMPLETED BASED ON THE NEEDS ASSESSMENT CURRENTLY FINALIZING.

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

NCLB/SED requirement for all schools

Part A: Language Allocation Policy (LAP) – Attach a copy of your school’s current year (2009-2010) LAP narrative to this CEP.

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

Form TIII – A (1)(a)

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

Number of Teachers _____ Other Staff (Specify) _____

School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview

Title III, Part A LEP Program

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

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.

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

School: _____ BEDS Code: _____

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

Allocation Amount:		
Budget Category	Budgeted Amount	Explanation of expenditures in this category as it relates to the program narrative for this title.
Professional salaries (schools must account for fringe benefits) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Per session - Per diem 	(e.g., \$9,978)	(Example: 200 hours of per session for ESL and General Ed teacher to support ELL Students: 200 hours x \$49.89 (current teacher per session rate with fringe) = \$9,978.00)
Purchased services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High quality staff and curriculum development contracts. 	(e.g., \$5,000)	(Example: Consultant, Dr. John Doe, working with teachers and administrators 2 days a week on development of curriculum enhancements)
Supplies and materials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Must be supplemental. - Additional curricula, instructional materials. - Must be clearly listed. 	(e.g., \$500)	(Example: 1 Books on Tape, Cassette Recorders, Headphones, Book Bins, Leveled Books)
Educational Software (Object Code 199)	(e.g., \$2,000)	(Example: 2 Rosetta Stone language development software packages for after school program)

Travel		
Other		
TOTAL		

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.
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.

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.
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.
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>.

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

NOT APPLICABLE

All Title I schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:

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

Part A: TITLE I ALLOCATIONS AND SET-ASIDES

	Title I	Title I ARRA	Total
1. Enter the anticipated Title I Allocation for 2009-10:			
2. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside for Parent Involvement:			
3. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside to Improve Parent Involvement (ARRA Language):			
4. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified:			
5. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect – HQ PD (ARRA Language):			
6. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Professional Development:			
7. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Improved Teacher Quality & Effect (Professional Development) (ARRA Language):			

8. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2008-2009 school year: _____
9. If the percentage of high quality teachers during 2008-2009 is less than 100% describe activities and strategies the school is implementing in order to insure that the school will have 100% high quality teachers by the end of the coming school year.

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

1. School Parental Involvement Policy – Attach a copy of the school’s Parent Involvement Policy.

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

2. School-Parent Compact - Attach a copy of the school’s School-Parent Compact.

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

Part C: TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM SCHOOLS

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

1. A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school that is based on information on the performance of children in relation to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards.
2. Schoolwide reform strategies that:
 - a) Provide opportunities for all children to meet the State's proficient and advanced levels of student academic achievement.
 - b) Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically-based research that:
 - Increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as extended school year, before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities.
 - Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.
 - Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.
 - Address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of low academic achieving children and those at risk of not meeting the State academic content standards and are members of the target population of any program that is included in the Schoolwide Program. These programs may include counseling, pupil services, mentoring services, college and career awareness/preparation, and the integration of vocational and technical education programs.
 - Are consistent with and are designed to implement State and local improvement, if any.
3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.
4. High-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals (and, where appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff) to enable all children in the Schoolwide Program to meet the State's student academic standards.
5. Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.
6. Strategies to increase parental involvement through means such as family literacy services.
7. Plans for assisting preschool children in the transition from early childhood programs, such as Head Start, Even Start, Early Reading First, or a State-run preschool program, to local elementary school programs.
8. Measures to include teachers in the decisions regarding the use of academic assessments in order to provide information on, and to improve, the achievement of individual students and the overall instructional program.

9. Activities to ensure that students who experience difficulty mastering the proficient or advanced levels of the academic achievement standards are provided with effective, timely additional assistance. The additional assistance must include measures to ensure that students' difficulties are identified on a timely basis and to provide sufficient information on which to base effective assistance.

10. Coordination and integration of Federal, State, and local services and programs, including programs supported under NCLB, i.e., violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, vocational and technical education, and job training.

Part D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS

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

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

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

3. Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically based research that strengthens the core academic program of the school and that:
 - a. Give primary consideration to providing extended learning time, such as, extended school year, before/after school, and summer programs and opportunities;
 - b. Help provide an accelerated, high –quality curriculum, including applied learning; and
 - c. Minimize removing children from the regular classroom during regular school hours;

4. Coordinate with and support the regular educational program;

5. Provide instruction by highly qualified teachers;

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

7. Provide strategies to increase parental involvement; and
8. Coordinate and integrate Federal, State and local services and programs.

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

NOT APPLICABLE

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

NCLB/SED Status: _____ **SURR¹ Phase/Group (If applicable):** _____

Part A: For All Schools Identified for Improvement

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

Part B: For Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

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

School Under Registration Review (SURR)

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

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

NOT APPLICABLE

All SURR schools must complete this appendix.

SURR Area(s) of Identification: _____

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

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

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

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Background

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

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

CURRICULUM AUDIT FINDINGS

KEY FINDING 1: CURRICULUM

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

1A. English Language Arts

Background

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

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

ELA Alignment Issues:

- **Gaps in the Written Curriculum.** Data show that the written curriculum in use by many schools is not aligned with the state standards in terms of the range of topics covered and the depth of understanding required. All reviewed curricula had gaps relative to the New York State ELA standards. The fewest gaps were found at Grade 2, but the gaps increased as the grade levels increased. Interviewed staff in a number of the schools that were audited reported less consistent and effective curriculum and instruction at the secondary level. These data further indicated that curricula were not adequately articulated—less articulated in secondary than elementary schools.
- **Curriculum Maps.** The curriculum alignment analyses noted that although a number of curriculum maps had been developed, the mapping has been done at a topical level only and does not drill down to an expected level of cognitive demand that will indicate to teachers what students should know and be able to do at each grade level. These curriculum maps addressed only content topics—not skills to be mastered, strategies to be utilized, or student outcomes to be attained.
- **Taught Curriculum.** The *Surveys of Enacted Curriculum* (SEC)² data also show that the taught curriculum is not aligned to the state standards. For example, in the reviewed high school-level ELA classes, auditors observed a great disparity between what is taught and the depth to which it should be taught. A similar lack of depth can be seen in elementary and middle grades as well (specifically Grades 2, 4, 5, and 6) and Grade 8. As one might look at it, the taught ELA curriculum is quite broad but lacks depth in any one area. Although standards indicate that instruction should be focused on having students create written products and spoken presentations, SEC data show quite the opposite. There is very little emphasis on speaking and listening and only a moderately higher level of emphasis on writing. Critical reading also is supposed to have a much greater depth than is currently occurring in high school English classes.
- **ELA Materials.** In a number of the audited schools, teachers interviewed indicate that they have sufficient amounts of curriculum materials available to them; however, the materials they have are not adequate to meet the needs of all learners, particularly English language learners, students with disabilities, and struggling readers. Further, the materials in use are reportedly often not relevant to the students' background knowledge, suggesting a need for more age appropriate and culturally relevant books and articles for student use.

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

– **English Language Learners**

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

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

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

Professional Performing Arts School has implemented a three-year ELA curriculum aligned with state standards. 100% of students have made annual progress.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

100% of students have made one year annual progress in ELA.

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

1B. Mathematics

Background

New York State assessments measure conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and problem solving. In the New York State Learning Standard for Mathematics, these are represented as *process strands* and *content strands*. These strands help to define what students should know and be able to do as a result of their engagement in the study of mathematics. The critical nature of the process

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

Specific Math Alignment Issues:

- A review of key district documents for mathematics shows substantial evidence that the primary mathematics instructional materials for Grades K–8 (*Everyday Mathematics* [K–5] and *Impact Mathematics* [6–8]) are aligned with the New York state *content strands* except for some gaps that appear at the middle school level in the areas of measurement and geometry and number sense and operations. The instructional materials that were available at the high school level during the time of the audits (New York City Math A and B [8–12]) were aligned with the 1999 standards but not with the newer 2005 standards. Furthermore, these documents show that there is a very weak alignment to the New York state *process strands* for mathematics at all grade levels.
- The SEC data for mathematics curriculum alignment (similar to Key Finding 1A for ELA), shows that there is a lack of depth in what is being taught in the mathematics classroom as compared to what is required by the state standards.

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

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

Professional Performing Arts School has implemented a math curriculum aligned with state standards. 100% of students have made annual progress.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

100% of students have made annual progress.

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

KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION

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

2A – ELA Instruction

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

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

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

Differentiated instruction, a key component to our Professional Development Plan has been implemented into the majority of our classrooms. It is at a developmental stage. PD continues to focus on the issue with the goal of modifying best practice to improve student outcomes.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

Student achievement and progress measurements; graduation rates, progress to graduation measurements; observable use of differentiation in the classrooms.

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

2B – Mathematics Instruction

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

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

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

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

Differentiated instruction, a key component to our Professional Development Plan has been implemented into the majority of our classrooms. It is at a developmental stage. PD continues to focus on the issue with the goal of modifying best practice to improve student outcomes

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

Student achievement and progress measurements; graduation rates, progress to graduation measurements; observable use of differentiation in the classrooms.

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

KEY FINDING 3: TEACHER EXPERIENCE AND STABILITY

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 3:

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

Over the past five years, one teacher has chosen to leave the school before retirement. This teacher moved to Europe and has been approved for a leave of absence. We have virtually no turnover.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

3.3: Based on your response to Question 3.2, what evidence supports (or dispels) the relevance of this finding to your school's educational program?

Over the past five years, one teacher has chosen to leave the school before retirement. This teacher moved to Europe and has been approved for a leave of absence. We have virtually no turnover.

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

KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

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

In 2008-2009 we had one ELL student. The student received the mandated service and earned all required credits for promotion. However in 2009-2010 we have a population of approximately 10 ELL students. We have hired a new ESL teacher to assure that we cover the mandates. We are also using a CBO to support this ELL population by providing additional after school ESL classes. Though we have check "Not Applicable" below, the school does need to develop appropriate new PD regarding this new ELL population. Historically, however, the finding does not apply to our school.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

In 2008-2009 we had one ELL student. The student received the mandated service and earned all required credits for promotion. However in 2009-2010 we have a population of approximately 10 ELL students. We have hired a new ESL teacher to assure that we cover the mandates. We are also using a CBO to support this ELL population by providing additional after school ESL classes. Though we have check "Not Applicable" below, the school does need to develop appropriate new PD regarding this new ELL population. Historically, however, the finding does not apply to our school.

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

KEY FINDING 5: DATA USE AND MONITORING—ELL INSTRUCTION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

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

In 2008-2009 we had one ELL student. The student received the mandated service and earned all required credits for promotion. However in 2009-2010 we have a population of approximately 10 ELL students. We have hired a new ESL teacher to assure that we cover the mandates. We are also using a CBO to support this ELL population by providing additional after school ESL classes. Though we have check "Not Applicable" below, the school does need to develop appropriate new PD regarding this new ELL population. Historically, however, the finding does not apply to our school.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

In 2008-2009 we had one ELL student. The student received the mandated service and earned all required credits for promotion. However in 2009-2010 we have a population of approximately 10 ELL students. We have hired a new ESL teacher to assure that we cover the mandates. We are also using a CBO to support this ELL population by providing additional after school ESL classes. Though we have check "Not Applicable" below, the school does need to develop appropriate new PD regarding this new ELL population. Historically, however, the finding does not apply to our school.

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

KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

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

We provide folders to all general education teachers that have IEP students in their classes. The folders include the IEP and recommendations made from a Instructional Support person who works directly with the student. Teachers have full access to the Instructional Support teachers throughout the entire school year as well as a well-vetted AIS referral process. PD for IEP students is an essential component to our PD plan which focuses largely on Differentiated Instruction and using best practices in the general education classroom. 100% of our IEP students spend the majority of their academic day in general education classrooms. Their progress to graduation and graduation rates have been almost 100% over the last five years for 4 year graduation and will be 100% for 6 year graduation rate.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

We provide folders to all general education teachers that have IEP students in their classes. The folders include the IEP and recommendations made from a Instructional Support person who works directly with the student. Teachers have full access to the Instructional Support teachers throughout the entire school year as well as a well-vetted AIS referral process. PD for IEP students is an essential component to our PD plan which focuses largely on Differentiated Instruction and using best practices in the general education classroom. 100% of our IEP students spend the majority of their academic day in general education classrooms. Their progress to graduation and graduation rates have been almost 100% over the last five years for 4 year graduation and will be 100% for 6 year graduation rate.

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

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

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

We need support in answering this question. We are unclear about the statement regarding "grade level state-tests" and how the question is posed regarding modified promotion criteria. Please note that 100% of our IEP students graduate with a high school diploma at either the local, regents or advanced level.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

7.3: Based on your response to Question 7.2, what evidence supports (or dispels) the relevance of this finding to your school's educational program?

We need support in answering this question. We are unclear about the statement regarding "grade level state-tests" and how the question is posed regarding modified promotion criteria. Please note that 100% of our IEP students graduate with a high school diploma at either the local, regents or advanced level.

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

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

This appendix will not be required for 2009-10.

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

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

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:

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

Supporting Students in Temporary Housing (STH)

As included in your Office of School and Youth Development Consolidated Plan STH Section and in accordance with the federal McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act and Chancellor's Regulation A-780, schools must identify, serve, and report on students living in temporary housing (STH). For more information on using Title I set-aside funds to support your STH population, please refer to the Frequently Asked Questions document on DOE's website: <http://schools.nyc.gov/NR/rdonlyres/9831364D-E542-4763-BC2F-7D424EBD5C83/58877/TitleIPartASetAsideforStudentsinTemporaryHousing.pdf>

Part A: FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

Part B: FOR NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

Number of students in temporary housing: 0

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 the borough Integrated Service Center (ISC) or Children First Network.

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT

School Name:	Professional Performing Arts High School					
District:	2	DBN:	02M408	School		310200011408

DEMOGRAPHICS

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

Enrollment				Attendance - % of days students attended:			
(As of October 31)	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Pre-K	0	0	0		95.6/93.7	95.5/	95.7 /
Kindergarten	0	0	0				
Grade 1	0	0	0	Student Stability - % of Enrollment:			
Grade 2	0	0	0	(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Grade 3	0	0	0		98.4	98.6	98.7
Grade 4	0	0	0				
Grade 5	0	0	0	Poverty Rate - % of Enrollment:			
Grade 6	26	26	24	(As of October 31)	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Grade 7	28	29	30		13.2	21.4	27.8
Grade 8	27	30	31				
Grade 9	90	100	97	Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:			
Grade 10	98	104	109	(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Grade 11	84	96	105		7	10	12
Grade 12	96	82	99				
Ungraded	0	0	0	Recent Immigrants - Total Number:			
Total	449	467	495	(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
					0	1	6

Special Education				Suspensions (OSYD Reporting) - Total Number:			
(As of October 31)	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
# in Self-Contained Classes	0	0	0	Principal Suspensions	0	0	0
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	0	0	0	Superintendent Suspensions	0	0	0
Number all others	18	19	15				

These students are included in the enrollment information above.

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

English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment: (BESIS Survey)				Number of Staff - Includes all full-time staff:			
(As of October 31)	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
# in Transitional Bilingual Classes	0	0	TBD	Number of Teachers	25	25	26
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	TBD	Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	4	4	4
# receiving ESL services only	1	7	TBD				
# ELLs with IEPs	0	0	TBD				

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

Number of Educational Paraprofessionals			
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	0	0	0

Overage Students (# entering students overage for				Teacher Qualifications:			
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	0	0	4	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100.0	100.0	100.0
				% more than 2 years teaching in this school	68.0	88.0	88.5
				% more than 5 years teaching anywhere	48.0	68.0	69.2
Ethnicity and Gender - % of Enrollment:							
(As of October 31)	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	% Masters Degree or higher	88.0	92.0	92.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.2	0.2	0.4	% core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers	74.5	100.0	100.0
Black or African American	28.1	28.5	20.6				
Hispanic or Latino	18.0	18.6	29.7				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific	3.8	6.0	5.3				
White	47.7	42.4	37.0				
Male	26.5	26.8	26.5				
Female	73.5	73.2	73.5				

2009-10 TITLE I STATUS

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

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

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

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

	Phase		Category			
	In Good		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:

Elementary/Middle Level		Secondary Level	
ELA:	v	ELA:	v
Math:	v	Math:	v
Science:	v	Graduation Rate:	v

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

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

American Indian or Alaska Native				-	-		
Black or African American	-	-	-	v	v	-	
Hispanic or Latino	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	-	-		-	-	-	
White	v	v	-	v	v		
Multiracial				-	-	-	
Students with Disabilities	-	-		-	-	-	
Limited English Proficient	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Economically Disadvantaged	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Student groups making	2	2	1	3	3	1	

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results – 2009-10		Quality Review Results – 2009-10	
Overall Letter Grade:	A / A	Overall Evaluation:	P
Overall Score:	62.4 /	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	P
School Environment: <i>(Comprises 15% of the</i>	7.1 / 9.3	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	P
School Performance: <i>(Comprises 25% of the</i>	17.1 /	Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	UPF
Student Progress: <i>(Comprises 60% of the</i>	38.2 /	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	P
Additional Credit:	0 / 0	Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	UPF

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

* = For Progress Report Attendance Rate(s) - If more than one attendance rate given, it is displayed as K-8/9-12.
 Note: Progress Report grades are not yet available for District 75 schools; NCLB/SED accountability reports are not available for District 75 schools.

**http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/nyc/APA/Memos/Graduation_rate_memo.pdf

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

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

Part I: School ELL Profile

A. Language Allocation Policy Team Composition

Network Cluster 108	District 2	School Number 408	School Name PPAS
Principal Keith Ryan		Assistant Principal Jodi Kostbar	
Coach type here		Coach type here	
Teacher/Subject Area Heather Fife		Guidance Counselor Caitlin Kelly	
Teacher/Subject Area Sara Pourghasemi		Parent Christina Latrowski	
Teacher/Subject Area Tamara Jaffe		Parent Coordinator Teri Gindi	
Related Service Provider type here		Other type here	
Network Leader Sumita Kaufhold		Other type here	

B. Teacher Qualifications

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

Number of Certified ESL Teachers	1	Number of Certified Bilingual Teachers		Number of Certified NLA/Foreign Language Teachers	
Number of Content Area Teachers with Bilingual Extensions		Number of Special Ed. Teachers with Bilingual Extensions		Number of Teachers of ELLs without ESL/Bilingual Certification	

C. School Demographics

Total Number of Students in School	491	Total Number of ELLs	16	ELLs as Share of Total Student Population (%)	3.26%
------------------------------------	------------	----------------------	-----------	-----------------------------------------------	--------------

Part II: ELL Identification Process

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

1. Describe the steps followed for the initial identification of those students who may possibly be ELLs. These steps must include administering the Home Language Identification Survey (HLIS) which includes the informal oral interview in English and in the native language, and the formal initial assessment. Identify the person(s) responsible, including their qualifications, for conducting the initial screening, administering the HLIS, the LAB-R (if necessary), and the formal initial assessment. Also describe the steps taken to annually evaluate ELLs using the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT).
2. What structures are in place at your school to ensure that parents understand all three program choices (Transitional Bilingual, Dual Language, Freestanding ESL)? Please describe the process, outreach plan, and timelines.
3. Describe how your school ensures that entitlement letters are distributed and Parent Survey and Program Selection forms are returned? (If a form is not returned, the default program for ELLs is Transitional Bilingual Education as per CR Part 154 [\[see tool kit\]](#).)
4. Describe the criteria used and the procedures followed to place identified ELL students in bilingual or ESL instructional programs;

- description must also include any consultation/communication activities with parents in their native language.
- After reviewing the Parent Survey and Program Selection forms for the past few years, what is the trend in program choices that parents have requested? (Please provide numbers.)
 - Are the program models offered at your school aligned with parent requests? If no, why not? How will you build alignment between parent choice and program offerings? Describe specific steps underway.
- Students who are indentified as LAB-R eligible come on an ATS report which we run periodically. Those students are interviewed to make sure they are actually LAB R eligible. If so, we LAB-R test them and based on the score, program them for ESL class. They are assessed periodically throught the year in the ESL class and given the NYSESLAT in Spring.
 - We only have an ESL program. Due to the small number of ELL students we have on our register, we have the unique opportunity to have individual discussions about choices with every family with and ELL students. Our parent conferences have dictated the current structure of one ESL class for currently enrolled students. Every parent is oriented to the ESL program by individual conferences.
 - We meet with the parents indovidually.
 - N/A We only have an ESL program.
 - N/A
 - N/A

Part III: ELL Demographics

A. ELL Programs

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

K 1 2 3 4 5
 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

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

ELL Program Breakdown														
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Tot #
Transitional Bilingual Education <small>(60%:40% → 50%:50% → 75%:25%)</small>														0
Dual Language <small>(50%:50%)</small>														0
Freestanding ESL														
Self-Contained											4	10	2	16
Push-In														0
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	2	16

B. ELL Years of Service and Programs

Number of ELLs by Subgroups					
All ELLs	16	Newcomers (ELLs receiving service 0-3 years)	15	Special Education	0
SIFE		ELLs receiving service 4-6 years	1	Long-Term (completed 6 years)	

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

ELLs by Subgroups										
	ELLs (0-3 years)			ELLs (4-6 years)			Long-Term ELLs (completed 6 years)			Total
	All	SIFE	Special Education	All	SIFE	Special Education	All	SIFE	Special Education	
TBE										0
Dual Language										0
ESL	15			1						16
Total	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	16

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

C. Home Language Breakdown and ELL Programs

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

Dual Language (ELLs/EPs) K-8																				
Number of ELLs by Grade in Each Language Group																				
	K		1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		TOTAL	
	ELL	EP																		
Spanish																			0	0
Chinese																			0	0
Russian																			0	0
Korean																			0	0
Haitian																			0	0
French																			0	0
Other																			0	0
TOTAL	0																			

Dual Language (ELLs/EPs) 9-12										
Number of ELLs by Grade in Each Language Group										
	9		10		11		12		TOTAL	
	ELL	EP	ELL	EP	ELL	EP	ELL	EP	ELL	EP
Spanish									0	0
Chinese									0	0
Russian									0	0
Korean									0	0
Haitian									0	0
French									0	0
Other									0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Freestanding English as a Second Language														
Number of ELLs by Grade in Each Language Group														
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOTAL
Spanish														0
Chinese											4	9	2	15
Russian														0
Bengali														0
Urdu														0
Arabic														0
Haitian														0
French														0
Korean												1		1
Punjabi														0
Polish														0
Albanian														0
Other														0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	2	16

Part IV: ELL Programming

A. Programming and Scheduling Information

1. How is instruction delivered?
 - a. What are the organizational models (e.g., Departmentalized, Push-In [Co-Teaching], Pull-Out, Collaborative, Self-Contained)?
 - b. What are the program models (e.g., Block [Class travels together as a group]; Ungraded [all students regardless of grade are in one class]; Heterogeneous [mixed proficiency levels]; Homogeneous [proficiency level is the same in one class])?
 2. How does the organization of your staff ensure that the mandated number of instructional minutes is provided according to proficiency levels in each program model (TBE, Dual Language, ESL)?
 - a. How are explicit ESL, ELA, and NLA instructional minutes delivered in each program model as per CR Part 154 (see table below)?
 3. Describe how the content areas are delivered in each program model. Please specify language, and the instructional approaches and methods used to make content comprehensible to enrich language development.
 4. How do you differentiate instruction for ELL subgroups?
 - a. Describe your instructional plan for SIFE.
 - b. Describe your plan for ELLs in US schools less than three years (newcomers). Additionally, because NCLB now requires ELA testing for ELLs after one year, specify your instructional plan for these ELLs.
 - c. Describe your plan for ELLs receiving service 4 to 6 years.
 - d. Describe your plan for Long-Term ELLs (completed 6 years).
 - e. Describe your plan for ELLs identified as having special needs.
-
1.
 - a. collaborative, self-contained, sheltered
 - b. ungraded, heterogenous
 2. We have a very small population of ESL students so we have only one teacher who provides all the mandated minutes of services (although some students receive additional minutes through an out-of-school provider).
 - a. one period a day of ESL, regular ELA classes, and the additional out-of-school provider
 3. Daily ESL lessons combined with individualized support, tutoring (both in English and native language) and differentiated instruction.
 - 4
 - a. n/a
 - b. Our objective is for all ELL's to test out before they graduate. In exceptional cases, we would provide TOEFL training and support to help students transition to college.
 - c. n/a
 - d. n/a
 - e. n/a

NYS CR Part 154 Mandated Number of Units of Support for ELLs, Grades K-8			
	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced
ESL instruction for <i>all</i> ELLs as required under CR Part 154	360 minutes per week	360 minutes per week	180 minutes per week
ELA instruction for <i>all</i> ELLs as required under CR Part 154			180 minutes per week
FOR TBE /DL PROGRAMS: Native Language Arts	60-90 minutes per day	45-60 minutes per day	45 minutes per day

NYS CR Part 154 Mandated Number of Units of Support for ELLs, Grades 9-12			
	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced
ESL instruction for <i>all</i> ELLs as required under CR Part 154	540 minutes per week	360 minutes per week	180 minutes per week
ELA instruction for <i>all</i> ELLs as required under CR Part 154			180 minutes per week
FOR TBE /DL PROGRAMS: Native Language Arts	45 minutes per day	45 minutes per day	45 minutes per day

Native Language Arts and Native Language Support

The chart below is a visual representation designed to show the variation of NLA usage/support across the program models.

Please note that NLA support is never zero.			
NLA Usage/Support	TBE		
100%			
75%			
50%			
25%			
	Dual Language		
100%			
75%			
50%			
25%			
	Freestanding ESL		
100%			
75%			
50%			
25%			
TIME	BEGINNERS	INTERMEDIATE	ADVANCED

B. Programming and Scheduling Information--Continued

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

5. Learning Center provides academic support or intervention to students who need or request support of this kind. The Learning Center has a well-equipped, quiet work location with staff assistance available as needed in a variety of formats, which are discussed below. The Learning Center also, for many students, serves the purpose of a home base as they transition from grade to grade. The Learning Center provides information about, and access to, a variety of resources for students, parents and teachers. The Learning Center provides an array of services that are fluid and flexible depending upon students' needs. The Learning Center works in partnerships with parents, students, and

teachers in a consultative role and as a service provider. Services available at The Learning Center include:

- Study groups: Small group classes (less than 8 students) that support struggling students, and give them time to complete their assignments.
- A menu of tutoring options – Regents testing, current coursework, study skills, organizational issues
- Lunchtime tutoring
- Academic Counseling:
- Support with ongoing coursework

The Learning Center has a bank of computers and a printer station for students' use. In addition, textbooks from all academic classes are available here, as well as reference books for the Regents tests, college admissions, an assortment of reference books and literature, as well as teacher resources. Students and staff also have access to tools, school supplies and some art supplies. □

Who comprises The Learning Center staff?

The Learning Center full-time staff is made up of Learning Specialists who each focus on another level of the school and who also coordinate tutoring at lunchtime and during 7th period.

In addition, PPAS recruits tutors from a variety of sources to help support TLC teachers

- America Reads Tutors: College students from NYU and Fordham University participating in Federal work-study program.
- Community Tutors: Adults from local community organizations (such as the JCC) who volunteer their time here at PPAS.
- Peer tutors: High-achieving 10-12 grade students earn transcript credit for helping other students during Lunchtime tutoring.

6. ESL support when necessary, tutoring

7. Professional Development around instructional strategies for ESL teaching

8. None

9. All students have the same access to all program and services. Translation services are available

10. ESL textbooks, ESL workbooks, NYSESLAT preparation books, online resources and videos, books on tape.

11. Through tutors only.

12. Yes.

13. The principal, the parent coordinator and the guidance counselor are available for individual meetings.

14. Spanish and French

C. Schools with Dual Language Programs

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

N/A We have no Dual Language program.

D. Professional Development and Support for School Staff

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

1. The ESL teacher gets periodic trainings and is doing independent research and reading.

2. n/a

3. Our staff is using a book called "Teaching English Language Learners" (published by ASCD) as a book study.

E. Parental Involvement

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

1. We have a very active parent community who are part of our school leadership team (SLT) and who attend PTA meetings. They participate in fundraising activities, attend many school events (such as shows), and volunteer to help at events like auditions.
2. Juilliard pre-college program, and ELS.
3. We use the NYC BOE school survey, we do outreach through our various programs (e.g. college office reaches out to survey parents about college needs), we have a SLT, and through our parent coordinator.
4. Primarily through workshops at PTA meetings. We usually have breakout groups to address specific needs (such as college admissions) or at additional evening events like orientations.

Part V: Assessment Analysis

A. Assessment Breakdown

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

OVERALL NYSESLAT* PROFICIENCY RESULTS (*LAB-R FOR NEW ADMITS)														
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOTAL
Beginner(B)														0
Intermediate(I)												3	2	5
Advanced (A)											4	7		11
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	2	16

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

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

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

NYS Science									
	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Total
	English	NL	English	NL	English	NL	English	NL	
4									0
8									0
NYSAA Bilingual Spe Ed									0

NYS Social Studies									
	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Total
	English	NL	English	NL	English	NL	English	NL	
5									0
8									0
NYSAA Bilingual Spe Ed									0

New York State Regents Exam				
	Number of ELLs Taking Test		Number of ELLs Passing Test	
	English	Native Language	English	Native Language
Comprehensive English	1			
Math <u>algebra</u>	3		3	
Math <u>geometry</u>	4		4	
Biology				
Chemistry				
Earth Science				
Living Environment	3		3	
Physics	1		0	
Global History and Geography	1		1	
US History and	1		1	

New York State Regents Exam

	Number of ELLs Taking Test		Number of ELLs Passing Test	
	English	Native Language	English	Native Language
Government				
Foreign Language				
Other				
Other				
NYSAA ELA				
NYSAA Mathematics				
NYSAA Social Studies				
NYSAA Science				

Native Language Tests

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

B. After reviewing and analyzing the assessment data, answer the following

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

1. NYSESLAT, Acuity, classroom grades and assignments, ESL assessments.

2. We have no beginners and our 11th grade is the largest group. Our ELL's do better on the listening and speaking sections of NYSESLAT than the reading/writing.

3. Based on the NYSESLAT data, we are focusing instruction in the ESL class on reading and writing. We are purchasing some book/audio tape sets and are having ELL's practice this part of the test.

4. A. Students fare very differently on exams based on competencies and language skills. Some very limited English speakers still do fairly well on regent exams if they are skilled in the subject area (like Math). The ELA regent is still an obstacle for our ELL's. We have set up the 12th graders who failed the FLA regent with Native language speaking tutors in addition to the services they already receive.

grades, Acuity results, regents, length of time in the country/program, etc.) Based on this information, we determine the success of the program.

Additional Information

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

Paste additional information here

Part VI: LAP Assurances

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

Name (PRINT)	Title	Signature	Date (mm/dd/yy)
	Principal		
	Assistant Principal		
	Parent Coordinator		
	ESL Teacher		
	Parent		
	Teacher/Subject Area		
	Teacher/Subject Area		
	Coach		

	Coach		
	Guidance Counselor		
	Network Leader		
	Other		