



P.S. 161 ARTHUR ASHE SCHOOL

2010-11

SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)

SCHOOL: P.S. 161 ARTHUR ASHE SCHOOL
ADDRESS: 101-33 124 STREET
TELEPHONE: 718-441-5493
FAX: 718-441-6202

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE	3
SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE	4
SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE.....	5
Part A. Narrative Description	5
Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot.....	6
SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT	10
SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS.....	11
SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN	12
REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2009-2010	13
APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM	14
APPENDIX 2: PROGRAM DELIVERY FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELLs)	17
APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION	24
APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL TITLE I SCHOOLS	26
APPENDIX 5: NCLB/SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS IDENTIFIED FOR IMPROVEMENT, CORRECTIVE ACTION, AND RESTRUCTURING	30
APPENDIX 6: SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS UNDER REGISTRATION REVIEW (SURR).....	32
APPENDIX 7: TITLE I, PART A – SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS IN TEMPORARY HOUSING (STH)	33

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: 342800010161 **SCHOOL NAME:** P.S. 161 Arthur Ashe School

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 101-33 124 STREET, QUEENS, NY, 11419

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 718-441-5493 **FAX:** 718-441-6202

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: JILL HODER **EMAIL ADDRESS** JHoder@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION / TITLE **PRINT/TYPE NAME**

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON: Janice Egan

PRINCIPAL: JILL HODER

UFT CHAPTER LEADER: Kathy Beaulieu

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT: Daniel Diaz

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE:
(Required for high schools) _____

DISTRICT AND NETWORK INFORMATION

DISTRICT: 28 **CHILDREN FIRST NETWORK (CFN):** CFN Cluster 207

NETWORK LEADER: PEGGY MILLER/Gary D. Goldenback

SUPERINTENDENT: JEANNETTE REED

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

Directions: Each school is required to form a School Leadership Team (SLT) as per State Education Law Section 2590. **SLT membership must include an equal number of parents and staff** (students and CBO members are not counted when assessing this balance requirement), and ensure representation of all school constituencies. Chancellor's Regulation A-655 requires a minimum of ten members on each team. Each SLT member should be listed separately in the left hand column on the chart below. Please specify any position held by a member on the team (e.g., SLT Chairperson, SLT Secretary) and the constituent group represented (e.g., parent, staff, student, or CBO). The signatures of SLT members on this page indicates their participation in the development of the Comprehensive Educational Plan and confirmation that required consultation has occurred in the aligning of funds to support educational programs (Refer to revised Chancellor's Regulations A-655; available on the NYCDOE website at <http://schools.nyc.gov/NR/rdonlyres/381F4607-7841-4D28-B7D5-0F30DDB77DFA/82007/A655FINAL1.pdf>). *Note: If for any reason an SLT member does not wish to sign this plan, he/she may attach a written explanation in lieu of his/her signature.*

Name	Position and Constituent Group Represented	Signature
Jill Hoder	Principal	Electronic Signature Approved.
janice egan	Admin/CSA	Electronic Signature Approved.
Jennifer VanBenschoten	UFT Member	Electronic Signature Approved. Comments: SLT authorized Ms. Egan to approve
Theresa Bennett	UFT Member	Electronic Signature Approved. Comments: SLT authorized Ms. Egan to approve
Kathy Beaulieu	UFT Chapter Leader	Electronic Signature Approved. Comments: SLT authorized Ms. Egan to approve
Daniel Diaz, Jr.	PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	Electronic Signature Approved. Comments: SLT authorized Ms. Egan to approve
Lalbachan Harricharran	UFT Member	Electronic Signature Approved. Comments: SLT authorized Ms. Egan to approve
Karen Dix	Parent	Electronic Signature Approved. Comments: SLT authorized Ms. Egan to approve
Gopaul Etwaroo	Parent	Electronic Signature Approved. Comments: SLT authorized Ms Egan to approve
Joanne Franco	Parent	Electronic Signature Approved. Comments: SLT authorized Ms. Egan to

		approve
Rafena Santram	Parent	Electronic Signature Approved. Comments: SLT authorized Ms. Egan to approve
Purnima Chander	Parent	Electronic Signature Approved. Comments: SLT authorized Ms. Egan to approve

* Core (mandatory) SLT members.

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

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

It is with great pride that we welcome our students, parents, and other members of the Richmond Hill and New York City communities to P.S. 161, the Arthur R. Ashe Jr. School. In our "barrier free school" children with mild to moderate disabilities receive the finest of care, while performing to the same rigorous academic standards applied to all of our students. We have received a rating of "A" for the last three years on our Progress Reports, and in 2009-2010 performed better than 92% of schools citywide. We received a rating of "Well Developed" on our last Quality Review.

Our school has a total of 799 students in grades Pre-K through Six. Our unique ethnic mix includes 72% students of Asian/Pacific Islander origin, 16% Hispanic, 9% African or Caribbean American, 2% Caucasian, and less than 1% American Indian or Alaskan native students. Further defining that 72% figure: the predominant ethnic/cultural populations of our school are children of Guyanese, Trinidadian, Indian, or Pakistani origin. 94 of our students, or 11.76%, are designated as English Language Learners. Two Certified ESL teachers ensure that these students are welcomed into our school and transitioned gently into the practical and academic language they will need to succeed. Tolerance for differences is woven throughout the curriculum and everyday discussions, and visitors to our school note the respectful behavior of our students. The overall atmosphere of our school is one that is highly conducive to learning.

One of our most important academic strengths lies in our close affiliation with the Columbia Teacher's College Reading/Writing Project. In our sixth year as a "Project School", we continue to deepen our work towards creating truly literate students who can compete in any academic arena. Another strength is our ongoing pursuit of up-to-the-minute, proven, best teaching practices, gained through truly comprehensive professional development.

We are especially proud of our growth in the area of instructional technology. We now emphasize the daily interaction of students with SmartBoard technology. A SmartBoard is available in every classroom, thanks to a generous Reso-A grant sponsored by the late Councilman Thomas White. This has truly transformed the way our students learn. This year we anticipate upgrading Computer Lab as well.

We continue to stress "academic rigor" in all subject areas. We have seen a steady increase in Literacy and Math scale scores, overall, over the past three years. As the state tests in Reading and Math have been renormed, our performance and progress numbers have gone down, (as have all of New York City's Schools'), but we expect that they will rise next year, as we surpass the new benchmarks we have established this year.

This year's initiatives are clear. While implementing the new Common Core State Standards, we will continue to boost our students' Reading and Math performance. We will expand our Inquiry studies to involve more teachers, while continuing to focus on the particular needs of English

Language Learners, Special Needs students, and "High Achievers". Our "Data Leaders" will help optimize staff use of technology and data analysis techniques.

Although we are a high performing "Triple A" school, we will not rest on our laurels. Diligently and devotedly, we will continue moving our school forward, realizing we still have a way to go towards meeting our own high standards as a school that meets the needs of all learners.

SECTION III - Cont'd

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot. Directions: A pre-populated version of the School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot provided in template format below (Pages 6-8 of this section) is available for download on each school's NYCDOE webpage under "Statistics." Pre-populated SDAS data is updated twice yearly. Schools are encouraged to download the pre-populated version for insertion here in place of the blank format provided.

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT										
School Name:		P.S. 161 Arthur Ashe School								
District:		28	DBN #:		28Q161	School BEDS Code:				
DEMOGRAPHICS										
Grades Served:		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pre-K	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> K	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 7
		<input type="checkbox"/> 8	<input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 11	<input type="checkbox"/> 12	<input type="checkbox"/> Ungraded			
Enrollment:				Attendance: - % of days students attended*:						
<i>(As of October 31)</i>		2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	<i>(As of June 30)</i>		2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	
Pre-K		20	28	30			94.6	95.5	TBD	
Kindergarten		74	100	111						
Grade 1		97	102	106	Student Stability - % of Enrollment:					
Grade 2		107	118	101	<i>(As of June 30)</i>		2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	
Grade 3		101	100	123			94.4	93.33	TBD	
Grade 4		132	112	113						
Grade 5		133	124	115	Poverty Rate - % of Enrollment:					
Grade 6		117	124	111	<i>(As of October 31)</i>		2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	
Grade 7		0	0	0			84.3	81.8	92.1	
Grade 8		0	0	0						
Grade 9		0	0	0	Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:					
Grade 10		0	0	0	<i>(As of June 30)</i>		2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	
Grade 11		0	0	0			3	5	TBD	
Grade 12		0	0	0						
Ungraded		3	0	0	Recent Immigrants - Total Number:					
Total		784	808	810	<i>(As of October 31)</i>		2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	
							3	3	3	
Special Education Enrollment:				Suspensions: (OSYD Reporting) - Total Number:						
<i>(As October 31)</i>		2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	<i>(As of June 30)</i>		2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	
# in Self-Contained Classes		0	0	0	Principal Suspensions		6	0	TBD	
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes		42	68	64	Superintendent Suspensions		0	2	TBD	
Number all others		53	46	34						
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>				Special High School Programs - Total Number:						
<i>(As of October 31)</i>		2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	<i>(As of October 31)</i>		2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment: (BESIS Survey)					CTE Program Participants		0	0	0	
<i>(As of October 31)</i>		2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Early College HS Participants		0	0	0	
# in Transitional Bilingual Classes		0	0	0						

# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	0	Number of Staff - Includes all full-time staff.			
# receiving ESL services only	90	96	82	(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
# ELLs with IEPs	1	3	9	Number of Teachers	63	63	TBD
<i>These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.</i>				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	9	9	TBD
				Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	6	6	TBD
Overage Students (# entering students overage for grade)				Teacher Qualifications:			
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	0	0	TBD	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	96.8	100	TBD
				% more than 2 years teaching in this school	73	81	TBD
Ethnicity and Gender - % of Enrollment:				% more than 5 years teaching anywhere	58.7	68.3	TBD
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	% Masters Degree or higher	95	94	TBD
American Indian or Alaska Native	2.3	1.7	0.2	% core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	100	98.8	TBD
Black or African American	10.7	10	9.6				
Hispanic or Latino	20.2	19.8	18				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	64.2	65.3	68.3				
White	2.7	3	3.3				
Multi-racial							
Male	51.2	52.5	53.8				
Female	48.8	47.5	46.2				
2009-10 TITLE I STATUS							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP)		<input type="checkbox"/> Title I Targeted Assistance			<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Title I		
Years the School Received Title I Part A Funding:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2006-07	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2007-08		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2008-09	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2009-10		
NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY							
SURR School: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:					
Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2009-10 Based on 2008-09 Performance):							
In Good Standing (IGS)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
Improvement Year 1		<input type="checkbox"/>					
Improvement Year 2		<input type="checkbox"/>					
Corrective Action (CA) - Year 1		<input type="checkbox"/>					
Corrective Action (CA) - Year 2		<input type="checkbox"/>					
Restructuring Year 1		<input type="checkbox"/>					
Restructuring Year 2		<input type="checkbox"/>					
Restructuring Advanced		<input type="checkbox"/>					
Individual Subject/Area AYP Outcomes:							
Elementary/Middle Level				Secondary Level			
ELA:	Y			ELA:			
Math:	Y			Math:			
Science:	Y			Graduation Rate:			
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	√	√	√				
Ethnicity							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Black or African American	√	√	-				
Hispanic or Latino	√	√	-				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	√	√					
White	-	-	-				
Multiracial							
Students with Disabilities	√	√	-				
Limited English Proficient	√	√	-				
Economically Disadvantaged	√	√					
Student groups making AYP in each subject	7	7	1				

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results - 2008-09		Quality Review Results - 2008-09	
Overall Letter Grade	A	Overall Evaluation:	
Overall Score	92.5	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	
School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)	11.5	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	
School Performance (Comprises 25% of the Overall Score)	22	Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	
Student Progress (Comprises 60% of the Overall Score)	56	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	
Additional Credit	3	Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise	

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
X* = Did Not Make AYP Due to Participation Rate Only	◇ = Outstanding

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

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Directions: Conduct a comprehensive review of your school's educational program informed by the most current quantitative and qualitative data available regarding student performance trends and other indicators of progress. Include in your needs assessment an analysis of information available from New York State Education Department and New York City Department of Education accountability and assessment resources, i.e., School Report Cards, Progress Reports, Quality Review and Quality Review Self-Assessment documents, periodic assessments, ARIS, as well as results of Inquiry/Teacher Team action research, surveys, and school-based assessments. (Refer to your school's Demographics and Accountability Snapshot in Part B of Section III, and feel free to use any additional measures used by your school to determine the effectiveness of educational programs) It may also be useful to review your schools use of resources: last year's school budget, schedule, facility use, class size, etc.

After conducting your review, **summarize** in this section the major findings and implications of your school's strengths, accomplishments, and challenges. Consider the following questions:

- What student performance trends can you identify?
- What have been the greatest accomplishments over the last couple of years?
- What are the most significant aids or barriers to the school's continuous improvement?

Needs Assessment 2010-2011 CEP

A preliminary Needs Assessment was conducted by our School Leadership Team and CEP Development team in the Spring of 2010. As New York State Assessments in ELA and Math, as well as Progress Report results, NYSESLAT data, etc. are not available until after the school year has ended, it was necessary to conduct further data review upon gathering and analyzing the new data in the Fall of 2010. In total, the following sources of data were used to create this updated Needs Assessment:

1. 2009-2010 Progress Report
2. Spring 2010 New York State ELA Assessment
3. Teacher's College Readers/Writers Workshop Assessment Pro Website
4. Spring 2010 New York State Math Assessment
5. ARIS
6. ACUITY
7. NYSTART –DAA
8. Spring 2010 School Leadership Team Walkthrough and Discussion
9. School environment Survey
10. Parent Technology Survey
11. NYSESLAT
12. Administrative Observations and Walkthrough Logs
13. Staff Development Agendas and Logs

Results of School Leadership Team Classroom Walkthrough and Discussion

On May 12, 2010, our School Leadership Team conducted its walkthrough of all the classrooms in the building, during the morning Literacy block. Afterwards, the team met to discuss what they had seen, and to brainstorm preliminary ideas for the CEP goals. Based on the team's observations, the following areas of concern were noted:

1. Classes did not have rubrics for student work displayed consistently.
2. Students' writing samples on the bulletin boards and in folders indicated an impressive volume of writing and depth of development conceptually. Students in all grades were able to reflect on their work and whether they had met their Writing goals. Students in Kindergarten, however, had not reflected on their work, as evidenced by hallway and classroom bulletin boards.
3. SmartBoards, though they had been given to all classrooms, were being underutilized.
4. Classroom and Computer lab computers were outdated.
5. Not enough differentiation was been shown in classroom lessons. Whole group instruction was predominant during Literacy. There was no differentiation evident in content area classrooms, and instruction was done on a whole class basis.

This meeting was followed up by a Cabinet meeting, where the school administration echoed these concerns. As a formative part of the CEP goals-making process, the following needs were identified.

1. More staff development would be done regarding student goals and student-made rubrics.
2. Early childhood PD in particular would stress Kindergarten students' ability to identify and articulate their goals and whether they had met them. Kindergarten student can write by this time of year, and it will be expected that Kindergarten children include reflections in their writing pieces and in other curricular areas.
3. Further professional development will be provided by an outside agency, so that teachers may more effectively integrate SmartBoard technology into all curriculum.
4. Any future Reso-A grant funds would be utilized to upgrade our Computer Lab, and to provide more desktop computers in the classrooms.
5. It was agreed, that while the staff had spent a good portion of this school year, in collaboration with Teachers College Staff Developers, deepening the teachers' ability to provide differentiated instruction to their students, and teachers had staff developed each other during "Turnkey" sessions in Math differentiation, no specific differentiation training had been provided for the content areas, i.e. Social Studies and Science. It was decided preliminarily, that the focus for next year would be specifically in differentiated Social Studies lessons. PD was planned for the June Chancellor's PD Day, as well as the beginning of the school year PD in September, 2010.

The data from Interim Assessments such as TC Assessment Pro for Literacy, and Acuity for Math, give a further indication of what should be the academic area of focus next year. The Preliminary Literacy and Math Data will be analyzed below, however, it is important to first discuss the results of our 2009-2010 School Report Card:

In analyzing our **2009-2010 Progress Report and Progress Report Overview**, we can state the following:

- Our school has earned an "A" rating for the third year in a row on the Overall Progress Report with an impressive 78.1 points out of a possible 100.

- For the school year 2009/2010, our school performed better than 92% of all elementary schools citywide. This qualifies us as a “Triple A” school.
- To further appreciate our school’s standing it is important to note that, whereas our former “A” scores were also achieved by 80% of city schools, this year only 25% of city schools received an “A” designation. Therefore, an A rating is even more meaningful as we compare ourselves to our peers under the new criteria.

The Progress Report is best interpreted by looking at both the school’s performance in individual categories, as well as when it is compared to both our City Horizon and Peer Horizon Groups. In each of the categories (School Environment, Student Performance, and Student Progress), the data indicates that PS 161 out performed schools in both the City and Peer Horizon Groups. It is also important to note that we received special recognition for the growth among our special groups: ELL’s, Special Education, as well as the lowest 1/3 of the entire student population.

We are very gratified to see that the school community of Richmond Hill regards the school favorably, as measured by the School Environment surveys. We appreciate that providing the students with an academically rigorous education is best achieved when the families and the school faculty work together in the best interest of the children. Parents are invited to Curriculum Meetings with the teachers, providing them information about grade appropriate expectations. The PTA meets monthly, disseminating information about new programs while celebrating students’ accomplishments. Teachers keep in touch with many of the families on a regular basis, securing their trust and their cooperation. Our Parent Coordinator initiates workshops for the families. Each month, the Principal meets for Round Table discussions with the parents. At this time, the families have the opportunity to offer feedback and gain further insight into new programs and initiatives. In this way, the students are aware of the home/school connection; everyone is working to secure a better and more literate future for them.

The category of Student Performance is another area of pride for our school even though this was our only “B” on this year’s School Report Card. Since NYS has reconsidered the correlation of scaled scores to grade level expectations in grades 3-6 (Levels 3 and Level 4), it would appear at first glance that there was a downward trend in the number of students achieving grade level expectations. However upon more careful review of the scaled scores, the students at PS 161 continued to demonstrate gains. In addition when comparing the data of Student Performance with that of the Peer Horizon and the City Horizon, the school out performed those groups by single and double digits. However since this is the criteria by which we will be evaluated in the future, the CEP Goals in Math for 2010/2011 will reflect our new understanding of the data and be reviewed in keeping with student performance. We will focus on moving our students from 80.9% on Level 3 and Level 4 to 82.9% in the school year 2010/2011. In the area of ELA, we will concentrate on the data gleaned by Teachers’ College since we are invested in the “Project School” initiative. Our ongoing assessments in ELA will be evaluated by Fountas and Pinnell “TC” levels since this is the measure by which the teachers assess their students, differentiate instruction, and plan for interventions..

The category of Student Progress is favorable when compared to our Peer and Horizon schools, as indicated by an “A” evaluation. We appreciate the importance of Student Progress and measuring each child’s success according to their scaled score. However, for the purposes of the CEP we will measure future success by Performance Levels on the NYS Math Assessment and “TC” levels for NYS ELA Assessment. Although our CEP will be discussing student performance rather than student growth, it is interesting to note, according to our Progress Report, that we received “Additional Credit” of 11.8 out of 15 point maximum in closing the Achievement gap for students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and the lowest 1/3 of the student population.

Results of School Leadership Team Classroom Walkthrough and Discussion

On May, 00 2010, our School Leadership Team conducted its walkthrough of all the classrooms in the building, during the morning Literacy block. Afterwards, the team met to discuss what they had seen,

and to brainstorm preliminary ideas for the CEP goals. Based on the team's observations, the following areas of concern were noted:

1. Classes either did not have rubrics for student work or the rubrics were displayed consistently.
2. Students' writing samples on the bulletin boards and in folders indicated an impressive volume of writing and depth of development conceptually. Students in all grades were able to reflect on their work and whether they had met their Writing goals. Students in Kindergarten, however, had not reflected on their work, as evidenced by hallway and classroom bulletin boards.
3. SmartBoards, though they had been given to all classrooms, were being underutilized.
4. Classroom and Computer lab computers were outdated.
5. Not enough differentiation was been shown in classroom lessons. Whole group instruction was predominant during Literacy. There was no differentiation evident in content area classrooms, and instruction was done on a whole class basis.

This meeting was followed up by a Cabinet meeting, where the school administration echoed these concerns. As a formative part of the CEP goals-making process, the following needs were identified.

1. More staff development would be done regarding student goals and student-made rubrics.
2. Early childhood PD in particular would stress Kindergarten students' ability to identify and articulate their goals and whether they had met them. Kindergarten student can write by this time of year, and it will be expected that Kindergarten children include reflections in their writing pieces and in other curricular areas.
3. Further professional development will be provided by an outside agency, so that teachers may more effectively integrate SmartBoard technology into all curriculum.
4. Any future Reso-A grant funds would be utilized to upgrade our Computer Lab, and to provide more desktop computers in the classrooms.
5. It was agreed, that while the staff had spent a good portion of this school year, in collaboration with Teachers College Staff Developers, deepening the teachers' ability to provide differentiated instruction to their students, and teachers had staff developed each other during "Turnkey" sessions in Math differentiation, no specific differentiation training had been provided for the content areas, i.e. Social Studies and Science. It was decided preliminarily, that the focus for next year would be specifically in differentiated Social Studies lessons. PD was planned for the June Chancellor's PD Day, as well as the beginning of the school year PD in September, 2010 and Nov. 2, 2010 Election Day PD.

English Language Arts

The 2010 Progress Report Summary encapsulates the data on the NYS ELA Assessments for the past two years, 2008-2009 and compares it to 2009-2010. Although the "Median Student Proficiency" from one year to the next did not vary drastically, the notable change occurred in those that performed on Level 3 and Level 4. This would appear to be a contradiction, however when analyzed in light of the re-norming of the test, it is more easily understood and explained..

In the school year 2008-2009, 22 out of every 25 students earned a Level 3 or Level 4 on the NYS ELA Assessment. However, only one year later that statistic showed a notable decrease; our student performance in ELA was now calculated to be 10.6 out of every 25 students. In addition, according to our ELA Progress Report Summary, 88.6% of students in grades 3 -6 were reading on or above grade level in 2008-2009. But suddenly that statistic dropped by 27.8 percentage points to 60.8% the following year. This might appear to be an indication of a sharp decline in performance according to the data. However, we are able to explain the sudden change in our performance when we review the newly equated correlation of scaled scores and performance levels. Although the statistics might be counter-intuitive, we still embrace the implications of the ELA Progress Report: we must strive to

implement interventions that will better support and enhance our students' performance goals in ELA through on going assessments, differentiated instruction, and precise data driven instruction.

PS 161 is a Teachers' College Project School and our teachers continue to receive ongoing professional development opportunities from both our 2 "on site" literacy staff developers, as well as outside "TC" consultants. Since we implement research driven instruction, it is unrealistic to believe that our students would suddenly stop demonstrating achievement in reading and writing. Therefore, it leads us to believe that the sudden drop in students attaining Level 3 and Level 4 is attributable to the re-norming of the data rather than our students' inability to read and write effectively. It is for this reason that for the purposes of this CEP and future ones, we will measure student's growth in accordance with "TC" levels.

Analysis of NYS ELA RESULTS, Student Performance, WHOLE SCHOOL

According to the data, the school demonstrated commendable gains in literacy for the years from 2008 – 2009. Those students on level one decreased from 1.3 to 0 in one year. On level two, the percentage of children who were approaching standards in this area decreased by 8.4% from 19.1% to only 10.7% of the student population. However, on levels three and level four there was a significant gain of 9.6% in those performing at or above grade level; the data indicates that 89.3% of the student population were now on level 3 or level 4 from the previous year of 79.7%.

In the year 2010, there was an increase in both levels 1 and 2 while levels 3 and 4 decreased. Clearly we are not satisfied with this negative trend. However as with the math assessment correlation, the scaled scores for literacy on the ELA were re-evaluated for the year 2010. If the previous criteria for scaled scores to levels had remained constant, then we would have demonstrated a statistical gain of over 1% for those students who mastered grade level expectations in ELA. We will continue to provide our students with academically rigorous instruction and differentiated lessons in literacy.

The data found on the **ELA Results by Grade** provides us with additional information that when analyzed will help us plan for differentiated instruction, focused classroom lessons and additional professional development opportunities. On third grade, clearly the levels of one and two have suddenly increased since 2008. It is disturbing to note that whereas the trend has been positive for the years 2008-2009, in 2010 those children merely approaching standards went up to 22.8% from 13.1% respectively. However, those children who now were performing at level 1 or level 2 rose from 13.1% combined in 2009 to a combined score of 48.7% in 2010. It is difficult to explain this result without referring back to the re-norming of the benchmark for each level. For those reaching grade level expectations, level 3 and 4, the data indicates that this too resulted in a percentage drop: 75.2% in 2008, 86.9% in 2009, with a sudden decrease in 2010 to 51.3%. The school will continue to focus on grade level professional development opportunities to offer insights into literacy instruction that will produce to a more favorable learning curve for third grade students.

The data for the fourth grade is more favorable than that of the third grade. It should be noted that the students taking the ELA in fourth grade were the third graders in 2009. According to the chart, those students approaching standard based work in ELA in 2010 was 38.1%, either on level 1 or level 2. This is difficult to explain since the students on level 1 or level 2 in the year 2009 were a mere 13.1%. This is discouraging and hard to understand outside of the new benchmark evaluations. Those students achieving level 3 or level 4 on this grade did considerably better than the third grade, 10.5% more of the students were attaining grade level expectations.

The information gleaned from the data for fifth grade is significantly more encouraging than both the third grade and the fourth grade. Only 32.1% of the students who took the test in spring 2010 were struggling to demonstrate mastery of grade level ELA concepts. A total of 67.9% of the students on this grade earned a level 3 or level 4, according to the 2010 ELA assessments. Again, these students

had performed significantly better the year before with 86.1% deemed on or above grade level in 2009.

The sixth grade data is similar to that found on the fifth grade. 33.4% of the students were identified as reading and writing on level 1 or level 2. 66.7% of the children were assessed to be performing on level 3 or level 4. However, in the previous year those same students performed at 87.4%. This is a significant decrease, one which again can be explained by the re-evaluation of the scaled scores to the level expectations.

We recognize that the scaled scores for each grade have adversely affected the data for each grade. However, we are not satisfied with that explanation. We are re-evaluating our professional development opportunities and providing the teaching staff with data that will better prepare them to deliver instruction that is more precise. The key to our continued academic success has always been our professional development and the implementation of "cutting edge" strategies in ELA and all other curriculum areas. We are confident that a positive trend will once again be reflected in the spring 2011 data. We see the new correlation of scaled scores to performance levels to be an opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to delivering the highest quality education to the children of Richmond Hill.

Teacher's College Assessment Pro Data Analysis

The 2009-2010 school year is the second year that we have been using Teacher's College Reading and Writing Project's Assessment Pro website. The most valuable data that our teachers enter onto this website is their Running Record results. We now have two years worth of data to analyze and compare. We focused our analysis on the different ethnic groups in the building, males versus females, and March 2009 versus March 2010 Running Record results.

Analysis Grades K-6

The data from the March 2009 and March 2010 Running Records indicates that most of the grades have shown an increase in the number students who are reading on or above grade levels from 2009 to 2010. Kindergarten has shown a slight increase of 0.55%, First grade has shown an increase of 12.99%, Third grade has shown an increase of 7.7%, Fourth grade has shown an increase of 14.19%, Fifth grade has shown an increase of 8.6%, and Sixth grade has shown an increase of 8.57%. Second grade was the only grade which had a decrease, which was of 4.32%. We took a closer look at spreadsheets, conferencing notes, and plans and it indicates that many of the teachers have improved their targeted small group instruction. We have spent a lot of professional development time developing strategies that will support teachers meeting with small groups, thereby lifting the reading levels of the students. This data indicates that the professional development has been successful in giving the teachers the tools needed to address the individual needs of their students. This data also shows that we need to continue our work with the Second grade teachers. We need to work closely with these teachers in order to identify the needs of their students and then develop a plan for addressing these needs. Our K-2 in house staff developer will spend time working one-to-one model strategies in the second grade classrooms. Additionally, the Second grade teachers can pair up with the first grade teachers who have had demonstrated a very large increase, to learn some of the strategies that they found successful.

Ethnicity

The results of the March 2010 Running Records, which assesses the students' reading levels, indicates that students whose ethnicity is Hispanic or Black are less likely to be reading on or above grade level. 83.99% of the students who are of Asian Pacific Islander descent are reading at or above grade level, while only 74.28% of Hispanic students and 72.85% of Black students are reading at or above grade level. This indicates that we need to address the literacy needs of the Hispanic and Black students more effectively. One way to address this deficit is by finding ways to encourage the students to read more for longer periods of time and with greater frequency. This can be done by

acquiring books that are of higher interest to these students. When children can identify with the main character of a book, they are more apt to read it; therefore it would be beneficial for us to purchase more books with Black and Hispanic main characters.

Males vs. Females

Further analysis of the results of the March 2010 Running Records indicates that in every grade, except for kindergarten, a larger percent of females are reading at or above grade level than the males. This indicates that we need to address the literacy needs of the males in the building. While it can not be expected that an exact equal percent of males and females are reading at a benchmark level of 3 or 4, a 10% difference is too large. In the second grade, 78.95% of females are reading on or above grade level while only 68.85% of males are at that level. At this age, most of the students begin reading chapter books, which tend to have more female characters and story lines which may not be of interest to males. One way to address this issue would be to fill the classroom libraries with more books that have male main characters and story plots that would be of interest to the boys as well. Additionally, the literacy staff developers will provide support to the classroom teachers in choosing their read alouds for the class. In order for the boys to learn the skills necessary to be a proficient reader, they need to be engaged in the lessons taught to the class. If the teacher takes the time to identify books which will be of greater interest to the boys, they may be more focused during the class lessons. Kindergarten is the only grade where more males read at or above grade level than the females. This may be because a large number of the independent reading books are nonfiction or fables. In these books, there is no main character the students have to identify with or the main character is an animal. When the main character is an animal, there is equal chance for the males and the females to identify with the main character.

ELL vs. Non-ELL DATA Analysis

Comparing March 2009 to March 2010

As a Teacher's College Project School, all classroom teachers evaluate their student's progress in literacy by reflecting upon assessed reading levels. Each student's reading level is determined by the teacher after a running record has been administered. This procedure is completed a minimum of four times a year. It is a highly effective method of data gathering, one which supports differentiated instruction, conferences and strategy lessons. The reading levels are recorded on TC Assessment Pro. Once the information is entered onto the site, it is automatically correlated to both the TC reading level and grade level benchmarks.

When we reflect upon the data of our growing ELL population, it becomes apparent that they are lagging behind the rest of the student population. Although this is easily explained and understandable, we still recognize that this is an area of concern and therefore one that needs to be addressed. When comparing the schoolwide performance of ELL's from 2009 to 2010, we find that the total amount of students in levels 3 and 4 went down from 39.03% to 38.09%. While this is less than a one percentage point drop, clearly, this also points to the need to continue rigorous efforts with our English Language Learner. We recognize that it is of particular importance when viewed in light of the growth of the **non-ELL population** from the 2009 to 2010 school year (79.16% to 85.05%).

The third assessment period in reading is completed in March of each year. As a team, we compared the reading levels of ELL's vs. Non ELL's in the year 2009. In addition, we compared the results of 2009 to that of 2010 for the entire school population. Since there are fewer benchmarks for a child entering school for the first time in kindergarten, the difference in the data for these two groups is negligible. In March 2009, the gap between kindergarten Non ELL's and ELL's was a mere 5.16% and in March 2010 the difference was 7.31%. This is not a dramatic difference when we recognize that the ELL's are grappling to learn the language at the same time they are engaged in rigorous instruction. It is noteworthy that the number of Non ELL students reaching the benchmark in kindergarten has grown to almost 99% (98.98% exactly) in March 2010! This is a rise of over 1.5%.

When the children move on to first grade, the data appears to be less impressive since this is the first time that the students are expected to read independently with both understanding and fluency. In March of 2009, 77.28% of our students were reading at or above grade level but only 45.83% of the ELL's attained benchmark success in the first grade. However in March 2010 the data is much more promising. According to the statistics, 86.21% of the Non-ELL population were now reaching benchmark level expectation. That is a rise of almost 9% (8.93%). In addition, now 58.82% of the ELL population was reading at or above level. This is a rise of 13% in just one Year! Clearly, the interventions are having a positive effect on the students' ability to read with greater understanding.

Once the children master the most preliminary literacy skills in first grade, the data is much more promising. The only dip in the students' increasingly impressive reading skills is apparent in the fourth grade. It is at this juncture that the expectations to be judged proficient readers become more pronounced. Children who are reading on or above fourth grade are now introduced to many more demanding concepts. The students are expected to not only read with understanding, but also apply prior knowledge, inference ideas without the supports of earlier texts, write responses to what they read that are well developed and are insightful. This is a quantum leap forward and many of the students remain on the same level for a while; they remain there until they are better prepared to navigate through the more challenging books. Now, the difference between the Non-ELL population and the ELL's population becomes more dramatic. Only 6.67% of the fourth grade ELL's reached benchmark expectation in March 2009 and none of the fourth grade ELL's were able to rise to benchmark levels in March 2010. The data indicates a continuous rise among the Non-ELL population in both 2009 and also in 2010. However the gap between the two groups remains pronounced. When looking carefully at ELL's and their struggle for proficiency in literacy, this is clearly an area of concern and one that will be addressed by the entire school community during the school year 2010/2011.

The two certified ESL teachers on staff recognize that our ELL population is entitled to interventions that are more carefully tailored to the needs of the recent immigrant. It is for this reason, that all teachers will be expected to incorporate more technological resources into their daily instruction. This helps to build prior knowledge and make more obscure concepts understandable. In addition, the ESL teachers will provide the entire staff with professional development opportunities, providing the staff with practical interventions that will have positive implications for the students.

Some Notes About NYSESLAT Results

In analyzing the Literacy performance of our English Language Learners as reflected in the NYSESLAT data, we noticed a few trends. 27% of our ELLs attained proficiency. 21% moved up one or more proficiency levels but only one percent moved down a proficiency level (one student). 17% of our ELLs scaled scores increased within the same proficiency level, but only 10% of these students' scaled scores decreased within the same proficiency levels. It would seem that according to the NYSESLAT, we are continuing to make gains with our English Language Learners, including our most recent immigrants.

High Achieving Students, Grades 3-6, March 2009 vs. March 2010

We recognize that our students are continuing to show gains in Literacy as reflected upon TC Assessment Pro. However, when looking at the trends both in Third and Fifth Grade, it is apparent that the students suddenly do not show as dramatic positive gains as they do in grade Four and Six. This might be because, in third and fifth grade, the children are beginning to reach levels where the concepts are decidedly more rigorous. In fourth and sixth grades, to reach level four, they have had the time to master these skills. For example, in Grade Three, going from level M to level N requires mastery of many higher order thinking skills. In addition, they no longer have dependence on illustrations to help support their understanding of test. In grade five, although the students' performance on level 4 dropped to 23.8%, this is only indicative of a -1.2%, which is statistically insignificant. So clearly, when looking at the trends, a very positive note is that Fourth and Sixth

Grade have a combined gain of 20.72%, while the losses in Grades Three and Five are a minimal 6.1%. The gains are three times greater than the losses. Although the data indicates overall gains of over 20%, we are not satisfied with the results until every grade has a positive outcome. An Inquiry Team has been formed to investigate strategies to support those students who demonstrate higher achievement.

Mathematics

An analysis of the Math Results from our Progress Report provides the school community with statistical outcomes for the school years 2008/2009 and 2009/2010. The statistical analysis has been summarized and is aligned with the new math performance levels. However, it does not provide us with the detailed elaboration we need to objectively analyze the data. Therefore for the purpose of gaining insights into our students' achievements and creation of the CEP we sought other sources, namely ARIS and NYSTART. Using these additional sources, we now had the information needed to gain insights into the data according to both subgroup and grade.

In summarizing our students' performance in math from 2008/2009-2009/2010 on the Progress Report, it is important to note that the percentage of students on Levels 3 and 4 declined from 97.2% in the year 2008/2009 to 80.9% the following year. However when we reviewed the scaled scores of each child in 2010, we found had the level 3 and 4 criteria not been re-normed, the percentage of students on Level 3 or 4 would have in fact risen to 99%. Since the Progress Report in the future will reflect the revised performance data, our CEP in mathematics will be written with that in mind. Therefore, our goal for 2010/2011 will state that for the school year 2010/2011, 82.9% of students in grades 3-6 will achieve Level 3 or Level 4 in mathematics.

Since we rely heavily on the documentation found on the internet sources, it is disturbing to note that the data found on our Progress Report contradicts that which is found on both ARIS and NYSTART. According to our Progress Report the student performance in math was 80.9%, but on ARIS and NYSTART student performance in math is 82%. There is a discrepancy of 1.1% which cannot be explained on the school level. Since the school will continue to gauge our measure of success on the Progress Report, that is the data that we will use in the future.

Analysis of Last 5 Years Student Performance in Math, Schoolwide

Our school-wide student performance trends over the three previous years showed a rise in student performance, for a 2008-2009 score of 96.3% performing in levels 3 and 4. This year's 2010 performance score has declined to 80.9%. This percentage, we will show, has gone down due only to the re-norming of the levels and scaled scores, not our students true performance. In fact when compared to previous scaled scales, our students demonstrated a 2% increase in the area of mathematics. Therefore, rather than discuss our students' according to progress, we will reflect upon level performance. When we receive results for spring 2011, we will compare them to the new baseline that has been established with the new re-normed criteria. Therefore, our goal will be to have the students grow 2% in performance, from 80.9% to 82.9%.

Looking at the scale score conversion chart above, we note the following results:

- The number of students on Level One has gone from 15 in 2006 to 5 in 2010. Although there was a slight increase from 2009 to 2010, from 1 child to 5 children, this number is statistically insignificant when testing over 400 students in grades 3-6.
- While the number of students on Level One continues to decline, the number of students on Level Two continues to increase. In 2007, 8.9% of the student population had achieved a Level Two. However in 2010, 16.9% of all students tested rose to Level Two. This is an 8% gain in three years. Clearly, the number of students on Level one is decreasing while the number of students on Level two is increasing.

- At first glance it would appear that the number of students on either level 3 or 4 is declining, as we have gone from 89.8% in 2007 to 80.9% in 2010. This statistic can be explained since the correlation tables have changed this year, making it more difficult to attain either a level 3 or level 4 in mathematics. However, upon closer investigation, the number of students who are now on Level 4 has risen from 29.2% in 2007 to 42% in 2010.

By Grade Analysis:

Grade 3:

- The mean scaled score has risen from 680.1 in 2006 to 701.7 in 2010. This indicates a rise of 21.6 points on the average of all students' in the third grade. This means that more students are gaining a deeper understanding of mathematical concepts as demonstrated by progress in this math.
- The percentage of children attaining a level 1 has declined since 2006 while those on level 2 have increased. This is particularly impressive since the number of ELL and Special Needs students continue to grow.
- As mentioned earlier in the CEP, the apparent drop of Level 3 and Level 4 from 89.2% to 77.9% can be explained by the re-norming of the scaled scores and their equivalent levels.

Grade 4:

- The mean scaled score has risen from 680.2 in 2006 to 697.9 in 2010. This indicates a rise of 17.7 points on the average of all students in the fourth grade. This is evidence that more students are grasping and applying advanced mathematical concepts.
- Although the percentage of students on Level 1 has been never been greater than 2.4%, an impressive 0% of students were on Level 1 in 2010.
- Even though the re-norming of the NYS Mathematics Assessment has negatively affected the percentage of students on Level 3 and 4 on most grades, the data indicates that there has been a rise of 1.3% since 2006. Normally, this would not be worth mentioning except that it is now more difficult to achieve these proficiency levels.

Fifth Grade:

- The median scaled score has risen from 659.9 in 2006 to 697.3 in 2010. This is a rise of 37.4 in the median scaled score. Statistically, there is a positive trend in mathematics as the students move to up to higher grade levels.
- In 2006, 3.6% of the fifth grade students received a Level 1 evaluation. In 2010, that percentage dropped to .9%, less than 1% of the fifth grade population. It is apparent that the high level of interventions and differentiation has positively affected the children's understanding of mathematical concepts.
- On most grades, the re-norming of the NYS Mathematics Assessment has adversely affected the number of students who achieve Level 3 or Level 4 proficiency status. There has been a steady rise in these levels since 2006, including the school year 2009/2010. Since 2006, those students identified as performing on Level 3 and Level 4 has risen from 58.9% to 78.2%. That is a notable rise of 19.3%. This is the largest gain of any grade in the school.

Sixth Grade:

- The median scaled score has increased from 665.6 in 2006 to 694.4 in 2010. This indicates a rise of 28.8 points in four years.
- The number of students on Level 1 has dropped from 5.3% to 1.9%, after several years at 0%. This indicates that 3.4% more of the students are now performing higher than Level 1.

- The number of students on Level 2 is declining, 20.2% in 2006 to 11.1% in 2010. That means that there were 12.5% fewer students failing to reach grade level expectations in mathematics in 2006 than in 2010.
- The number of students achieving Level 3 and Level 4 has risen from 74.5% in 2006 to 87% in 2010. That means that there are now 12.5% more sixth grade students meeting or exceeding the standards in the area of mathematics. This is particularly notable in a year when the test has been re-normed.

Math Results, ELL Students, Schoolwide

The ELL population at PS 161Q continues to grow. Many of the students are coming to our community from countries around the world where English is not spoken and the educational systems are decidedly different than those in found in New York City public schools. They are struggling with language acquisition, both social and academic mastery of English.. Since the NYS Mathematics Assessment relies heavily on reading and writing in this content area, they are at a distinct disadvantage; they are ill prepared to perform well on the standardized test in mathematics. Although most of our ELL's have prior knowledge of mathematical concepts, they are unable to apply this information on an assessment in mathematics that relies heavily on reading and writing. However research shows that once the ELL population transition into English dominance, they often out perform their native born counter parts.

The data indicates that the number of students performing on Levels 1 and 2 has risen since 2008, while the percentage of students achieving Levels 3 and 4 has declined. Therefore, the CEP Goal in Mathematics will make special mention of the need for additional support in this subject area for our ELL students

Math Results, ELL Students, By Grade

The grade specific math data analysis of the ELL population since 2008-2010 provides us with information that supports our plans for future instructional goals and strategies. Upon careful inspection, it is noted that the scaled scores have continued to rise in all four grades over this three year period.

- On third grade, the average scaled score has risen from 677.9 to 684.9. This is an average rise of 7 points. Yet according to the statistical analysis, the number of students who are now performing on level 3 or level 4 is 43.8%. This indicates an apparent decline of 41.9% in three years. However the percentage rose from 85.7% in 2008 to 92.3% in 2009. Therefore, it would be safe to assume that the dramatic negative change is a consequence of the re-normed performance equation.
- On grade four the evidence appears to be similar to that of grade three. Although the scaled scores rose by 7.2 points from 2008 to 2010, those students who are performing below grade expectation on Levels 1 and 2 rose to 50%. This would seem to be contradictory data, however once again the analysis of our performance in math is being tainted by the new criteria by which we evaluate levels.
- On grade five the trends indicate improved scaled scores, indicating a gain of 19.5 points from 2008 to 2010. This is the greatest positive indicator of all four grades. However, like the other grades those on Levels 1 and 2 rose. The percentage of students in 2010 performing on Level 1 and 2 is 25%. In addition, the number of students on Level 1 rose from 0% in both 2008 and 2009 to 8.3%. Clearly, the scaled scores and the performance levels differ.
- We are unable to glean information about our sixth grade performance in 2010. Since these students have graduated, they are no longer included on our school's data. We have every reason to believe that given the statistical analysis, they will probably yield similar results.

Math Results, Special Education, Schoolwide

The school received extra points on our School Report Card for our special groups, including those with IEP's. It is distressing to see that the % of Special Education children on Levels 1 and Level 2 rose from 2008 to 2010, while those on Levels 3 and 4 declined during that time from 88.7% to 62.7%. Since statistically this was more favorable outcome than our Peer School and Horizon School comparison, it is perhaps safe to assume that the negative change in our data is once again indicative of the new correlation of scaled scores to competency levels. However, we are not satisfied with our students' performance and will continue to provide our Special Education students with additional opportunities for academic support.

Math Results, Special Education, by Grade

The data indicates that the scaled scores for the Special Education population continue to rise since 2008. On grade three, Special Education students gained 20 scaled score points from 2008-2010. On grade four, the scores rose by 15.8 points over the three year period. On grade five, the scores rose by 25.1 points in 2010 compared to 2008. And on grade six, the scores had slight decline of 4.2 points. However, the increase in the % of students on Level 1 and Level 2 and the decline on Levels 3 and 4 was expected. This information may seem counter-intuitive when analyzed along with the progress on scaled scores. However, like the rest of the population, it has been negatively affected by the new correlated performance standards in mathematics.

Math Results, by Ethnicity Schoolwide,

The four ethnicities represented in the school are Asian, Black, Hispanic, and White and their data was analyzed from 2008-2010..

In the years 2008 to 2009 the Asian and Black subgroups showed gains on Levels 3 and 4, +1.3% and +2.8% respectively. The Hispanic population showed a slight decline of -1.5% during that time and 100% of the White population performed on Levels 3 and Levels 4 in both of those years. The performance levels for each of these four groups declined on the 2010 NYS Mathematics Assessment. This was an expected outcome and we will address its implications with the entire school population.

Math Results, By Gender, All Grades

The Math Results, By Gender, for All Grades data is predictably similar to the information found for the previous groups. In the years 2008 and 2009, there is a decline in the number of students performing on Levels 1 and Level 2 while those on Level 3 and Level 4 increased. The statistics for females and males on Levels 1 and 2 varied by less that 1% points during this two year period. In 2009 female performance increased by 1.3%, from 95.2% in 2008 to 96.5% in 2009. In 2009 male performance increased by .5% from 95.5% in 2008 to 96% in 2009. Since the number of students performing on Levels 3 and Level 4 was well over 90%, it has become more challenging to demonstrate greater statistical gains.

In the year 2010, the increased number of those performing on Levels 1 and Level 2 was expected. Conversely, there was a decline in the percentage of students performing on Levels 3 and 4. The number of females performing at or above grade level in mathematics was now 80.4%, a decline of over 16% over the previous year. The number of males performing "at or above grade level in mathematics" declined in 2010 by 12.4%. The performance slide was almost 3.6% greater for females than males. Since 2010 was the year when NYS realigned the ratio of scaled scores to performance levels, this apparent decline was not unexpected outcome.

PS 161 is very proud that the over whelming majority of our students continue to perform at or above the benchmark in mathematics for their grade. The measure of our success in this curricula area has

been gauged by our students' performance on the Spring NYS Mathematics Assessment. We are encouraged by the performance data that indicates that the number of children performing at Level 3 and Level 4 had continued to grow from 2006 - 2009. .

In 2006, 77.7% of our students performed at Level 3 and Level 4 in the area of mathematics. In 2007, this percentage rose to 89.8%. That was positive gain of 12.1% in one year. In 2008 and 2009, our students demonstrated even greater proficiency with 95.3% and 96.3% achieving scores on Level 3 and Level 4, respectively. Although we will never be satisfied until all of our students have attained grade level expectations in mathematics, we believe that our strategies were sound and therefore we would not need a Mathematics Goal in our 2010/2011 CEP. However since the scaled scores have been re-evaluated and their correlation to levels changed, we felt that we had to revisit this area of the curriculum.

When looking at the data over the past 5 years, we found that in 2010 80.9% of our students were at or above grade level in mathematics, which was still 4.3% better than our performance in 2007 of 77.7%. In addition upon more careful review of the student assessments for 2010, we found that if year's scaled scores were correlated against the previous criteria for level 3 and level 4, 99% of our students would have attained a Level 3 or Level 4 evaluation. However now that the standards have been raised, we felt that we needed to take a closer look at our instructional practices in this area and include a mathematics goal in our 2010/2011 CEP.

It is important to note at this time that there is a contradictory data found on ARIS and NYSTART in the area of mathematics. ARIS indicates that 80.9% of our students attained a Level 3 or Level 4 on the 2010 NYS Mathematics Assessment. However, NYSTART reports that 82% of our children attained grade level proficiency. This data is confusing since there is a 1.1% difference in the statistics. Since we will rely more heavily on the information found on ARIS, we are choosing to focus on 80.9%.

The students at PS 161 receive daily instruction that is academically rigorous and Standards based. Teachers access their children regularly and use this data as the foundation for future conferences and to create differentiated groups. Everyday Math and Impact Math programs are implemented in every classroom and the students are expected to utilize higher order thinking skills, in accordance with Bloom's Taxonomy. In addition, the emphasis is on process rather than product. Questioning, thinking, talking, and collaborating on problems helps to build the student's understanding of mathematical concepts.

We have begun to implement The New NYS Common Core Standards in Mathematics. With that in mind, we are encouraging staff members to implement instruction that is more inter-disciplinary in

nature while expecting them to become more conscience of their thinking. The emphasis is now on process rather than just product. Reading and writing about math helps the learner better understand the information.

Teachers are reading aloud during their lessons to help the students appreciate the implications of new concepts in mathematics. Students are expected to work collaboratively to solve problems, explicitly writing about their thinking and the process used to complete the task. Peer-evaluation, argumentative writing and evidentiary support take the process to a higher level of thinking. In this way, the children are taking the time to think through the *process* rather than simply developing a product.

Social Studies

Based on Administrative walkthroughs, and our SLT's needs assessment, it has been noted that Social Studies instruction is in need of further development. We have agreed in past years that textbook should be used as a resource for teachers. Therefore, teachers are expected to plan their lessons, based on the NYS Standards-based Social Studies Calendar, created in June in collaboration with each grade and with our Global Studies teacher. Non-fiction trade books, based on important Social Studies themes, have been distributed to the classrooms. Teachers commonly begin lessons with a read-aloud and provide supporting materials through use of Internet websites, magazines, visuals, and cooperative groups. However, we found that there was infrequent use of differentiated instruction in this content area. Thoughtfully planned instruction for either content, process, or product was not happening frequently enough, particularly on the early grades. Since we recognize that this has is an area of need, we are implementing a new differentiated social studies initiative for the current school year. Lessons are being planned in social studies that reflect an appreciation of learning styles.

New York State Social Studies Assessment, Grade 5, Comparison of Last Four Years

Comparing the 2009-2010 data to that of previous years, the trend shows an increase in students attaining levels 3 and 4, however, in this past year, the number of students attaining level 4 slipped down to 31%, a difference of 8% from the year prior. In addition, the percentage of students in level 1 increased slightly, from less than 1% to 3%. This would seem to indicate a need for more differentiated instruction in Social Studies, to meet the needs of the highest learners as well as the neediest learners. Professional development in differentiating instruction in social studies is indicated, and will be provided, during school wide Professional Development sessions in September (School Year Opening PD), November (Election Day PD), and June (Chancellor's Professional Development Day), as well as through Turnkey lessons during weekly grade PD. We will also work collaboratively with our Teachers College Staff Developers on Pre-K through grade 2, and Grades 3-6, to make plans for Social Studies content delivery, including the study of more non-fiction in the Literacy period and integrating appropriate literature into Social Studies lessons.

In cabinet meetings, the fact that there is no grade-wide assessment, or any formative assessment, in any grade prior to grade 5 was discussed. We determined that there was a need to prepare early childhood teachers to teach more differentiated, in-depth Social Studies, creating rubrics that uniform results and establish clear expectations. Since essay writing does not truly begin until grade Four, Document Based Question Essays are not expected until this grade. Further training in answering document-based questions has begun in grade four. Students in earlier grades, however, can be expected to reflect on important Social Studies concepts and understandings prior to Grade Four. An end-of-the year grade-wide assessment will be implemented beginning in the 2010-2010 school year. This will help us determine whether students are able to analyze primary source documents suitable

to their grade levels, engage in accountable talk activities such as debates, create interviews, write reflectively about Social Studies concepts, and organize their thoughts on the paragraph level by the end of Grade Three, preparing them to think critically very early on.

Technology

PS 161 was the proud recipient of a “Reso A” grant from the office of Councilman Thomas White. The generous allocation of funds was ear marked for the purchase of technology, specifically Smart Board technology in every classroom. Since the distribution of that money, every student in the school now has the opportunity to interact with this technology. Every one of our classrooms from kindergarten – grade 6 now routinely incorporates Smart Board capability into instruction. We expect that it will positively affect the level of instruction and achievement in the school.

The Smart Boards were delivered in the spring of 2010. We are now making plans to provide the staff with appropriate staff development opportunities to support them as they learn to integrate this technology routinely into their daily instruction. Since the teachers are at different levels of computer sophistication, the training will be differentiated according to their technology proficiency. Training is being provided by both the “In House” technology staff developer, members of the staff, as well as professionals from the company representing the Smart Board technology. If we are to use the Smart Boards to their greatest capacity, then we must expose the staff to its many possibilities and implications on instruction.

The ELL population at the school continues to grow. Each year we welcome children from around the globe, providing our students with an opportunity to interact with many other ethnic groups. Although we view this as a positive ramification of embracing large groups of immigrants, it poses a different challenge. Many of the students entering the school come from countries where the educational systems are decidedly different from those found in NYC. In addition, the prior background knowledge that they bring with them does not necessarily prepare them to draw conclusions or develop more sophisticated inferencing skills in reading. The use of Smart Board technology will help support our most recent immigrant population by expanding their intellectual horizons and providing them with concrete evidence of unfamiliar concepts..

Differentiating instruction is challenging when teaching in a heterogeneous classroom setting. When the Smart Board is used effectively, it can provide alternative assignments for various groups of students. It enables the teacher to conference with individuals or small groups while others are engaged in computer generated assignments displayed on the Smart Board.

We recognize that if our students are to be competitive with their counter-parts from other communities around the country, they must become more technologically adept. Up until this time, the computer resources available to our children were either inadequate or obsolete. It is for this reason that we have set a technology goal that expects 95% of our teachers and 70% of our students to interact with the Smart Board, contributing to lessons and producing projects.

Final Remarks and Reflections

The students at PS 161 continue to receive academically rigorous instruction from all members of the school community. The scaled scores on both the NYS ELA and Math indicate that they are demonstrating progress in both of these curriculum areas. Although the performance trends might indicate a decline in achievement, the raw data contradicts that conclusion. In addition, the high marks received on the NYS Science and NYS Social Studies Assessments indicate that they are receiving targeted instruction that is aligned with the expectations of both the NYS Standards and the reflective of Scope and Sequence. The students are expected to develop understandings that use of higher order thinking skills and are reflective of the Standards. The data found on TC Assessment Pro, Interim Assessments, and Predictive Exams all give further proof that our students continue to

demonstrate academic excellence in all areas of the curriculum and the trend continues to be positive in all content area subjects.

We are very proud to be a member of a very select group; we are a "TC Project School". Although it has required that we commit both time and money to this initiative, we do not believe that the school would have risen to its current level without this support. Our classroom teachers receive on going professional development from our team of "In House" staff developers. In addition, they engage in staff development opportunities with professional developers from the TC project. It has raised the level by which we deliver instruction and at the same time has increased the teachers' awareness of research based innovations in the field of education.

In this time of fiscal crisis, it is becoming more difficult to provide our students with the programs and innovations that they deserve. We aggressively seek out activities that will enhance their lives and improve their academic prowess. It has been our goal to expose them to more than just the instruments of academics. We appreciate the positive impact that the arts, music, and performance have on molding a young person into a well rounded individual. However, budgetary constraints are sometimes derailing our efforts. We are writing grants and using creative means to bring these programs into the school, however it continues to be problematic.

□

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

Directions: Based on the findings and implications from the comprehensive needs assessment (Section IV), determine your school’s instructional goals for 2010-11 and list them in this section along with a few phrases of description. The resulting list should include a limited number of goals (5 is a good guideline), and the list as a whole should be a clear reflection of your priorities for the year. Good goals should be SMART - Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound. **Notes:** (1) In Section VI of this template, you will need to complete an "action plan" for each annual goal listed in this section. (2) Schools designated for improvement (Improvement, Corrective Action, Restructuring, SURR, Persistently Lowest-Achieving (PLA), or schools that received a C for two consecutive years, D, or F on the Progress Report) must identify a goal and complete an action plan related to improving student outcomes in the area(s) of improvement identification. (3) When developed, Principal’s Performance Review (PPR) goals should be aligned to the school’s annual goals described in this section.

Annual Goal	Short Description
<input type="checkbox"/> By March of 2011, 82.83% of our students in grades K-6 will achieve Reading Benchmarks of level 3 or 4, as compared to 80.83% in Spring of 2010, as measured by Teacher's College Assessment Pro data.	<input type="checkbox"/> As a Teacher's College Reading Writing Project school, we decided that our Reading goals should be based on Teacher's College Assessment data. Also, benchmarks have become more rigorous this year.
<input type="checkbox"/> By March of 2011, 41.09% of our ELL students in grades K-6 will achieve Reading Benchmarks of level 3 or 4, compared to 39.03% in the Spring of 2010, as measured by Teacher College Assessment Pro data.	<input type="checkbox"/> ELA and NYSESLAT data indicated that ELL's needed their own specific goal.
<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> By of June 2011, 90% of teachers will improve their ability to deliver differentiated instruction during Social Studies lessons as measured by focused walk throughs.	<input type="checkbox"/> Our needs assessment indicated a need for more professional development in Social Studies differentiation.
<input type="checkbox"/> By June, 2011, 95% of the staff will significantly improve their use of technology by using SmartBoard instruction throughout the school day. 70% of students will interact with the SmarBoard during instruction during the school year, as measured by focused walkthroughs, observations, teacher and student surveys, classroom checklists, and increased production of technology-based projects.	<input type="checkbox"/> We now have SmartBoards in every classroom. Classroom visits indicated a need for more PD in using them effectively and increasing student interaction with them.
<input type="checkbox"/> By March of 2011, 25.48%% of our students in grades 3-6 will achieve Reading Benchmark level 4, compared to 23.48% in Spring of 2010, as measured by Teachers College Assessment Pro data.	<input type="checkbox"/> This goal specifically targets upper grade students' reading performance, based on needs assessment data.
<input type="checkbox"/> By June of 2011, 95% of our teaching staff will be participating members of an Inquiry Team, analyzing data and implementing interventions within a research model, to promote student growth within each grade, and within indetified subgroups.	<input type="checkbox"/> 90% of teachers participated in Inquiry last year; this year it will be 95%.

By Spring 2011, 82.9% of students in grades 3 through 6 will achieve level 3 or 4 in performance, as compared with 80.9% in Spring of 2010, as measured by the New York State Mathematics Assessment.

New assessment benchmarks, and new Common Core State Standards in Math, indicated the need for this goal.

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

Directions: The action plan should be used as a tool to support effective implementation and to evaluate progress toward meeting goals. Use the action plan template provided below to indicate key strategies and activities to be implemented for the 2010-11 school year to support accomplishment of each annual goal identified in Section V. The action plan template should be duplicated as necessary. **Reminder:** Schools designated for (Improvement, Corrective Action, Restructuring, SURR, PLA, or schools that received a C for two consecutive years, D, or F on the Progress Report) must identify a goal and complete an action plan related to improving student outcomes in the area(s) of improvement identification.

Subject Area Literacy
(where relevant) :

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>By March of 2011, 82.83% of our students in grades K-6 will achieve Reading Benchmarks of level 3 or 4, as compared to 80.83% in Spring of 2010, as measured by Teacher's College Assessment Pro data.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Activities:</p> <p>Daily practice of TC Reading/Writing Workshop in 90-minute Literacy Block and 45-minute Writing workshop.</p> <p>Increased time spent reading and talking about books on students' levels and of their interest.</p> <p>Special targeted interventions will be provided to our students with IEP's.</p> <p>Teachers College and In-house Staff Development that supports reading and writing that shows greater depth of thought, understanding, and volume.</p> <p>Teachers will differentiate instruction during Literacy to accommodate for students' learning styles, and provide for targeted interventions. Teacher plans will reflect differentiation.</p> <p>Purchase of additional reading materials that reflect the interests of special subgroups that have been identified by TC Assessment Pro data as needing additional support, i.e. boys, African American students, and ELLs.</p> <p>Teacher attendance at TC Calendar days to reinforce units of study in Reading and Writing</p> <p>Data driven instruction will include reflecting upon Teachers College Assessment Pro data in grades K-6, teachers' conference notes and running records, and computer-based Predictive tests.</p>

“Grade Level Data Leaders” will be assigned to each grade to assist colleagues with the interpretation and use of data to drive instruction. Coaches will work closely with these GLTF’s to ensure that they are trained to use and share the technology and data sources available.

Technology-supported curriculum and hardware, including Smart Boards, laptop computers, and Internet access, to augment the teaching of reading and writing, specifically purchased for the exclusive use of the targeted ELL population.

Teachers monitoring all students’ progress bimonthly using TC Assessments.

Weekly Grade PD reflection on students’ movement through reading levels

During-school grade-specific AIS services supporting all components of Literacy on grades 3-6

Extended Day small-group intervention services, 3X per week, (2:40-3:30 p.m.)

Conferences with students that are targeted to match their identified areas in need of intervention.

Guided Reading groups that help support students to move to higher ability levels.

Accountable talk in large and small groups to further the understanding of all reading texts, utilizing inference and other higher-order thinking skills.

Students’ work will be displayed on bulleting boards that will have reflective comments, written by the children, indicating future goals and “next steps”.

Student council members will meet with strugglin readers during lunch periods to support the students in meeting Literacy standards.

Ongoing Professional Development opportunities, including intervisitations, for teachers to help them implement cutting edge practices that will positively impact upon the students’ academic growth.

Daily writing in Reader’s Response Journals.

Daily writing in Writers Notebook.

Weekly Cabinet meetings will include reflections about student literacy growth, and PD to support this, based on data.

Parent workshops to provide information regarding TC Assessment Pro, ARIS, and other supports to literacy growth.

School Library will host a Native Language Library to support students as they transition into English dominance.

Development of critical and creative thinking skills during discussions of artist’s works during Art lessons.

Reflection upon conference notes to drive instruction

Focused walkthroughs by administrators, cabinet, and PD Team.

Formal and informal observations

	<p>Increased use of online games and other interactive activities, and technology-based programs Books on tape</p> <p>Target Population(s) All students on grades K-6, At-risk students, ELL's, especially those who are recent Immigrants; and African-American, Hispanic, and Special Education students.</p> <p>Responsible Staff 38 classroom teachers and 8 cluster teachers, 2 AIS Providers, 2 Literacy Coaches, 2 SETTS Providers, 2.5 Speech teachers, 2 Full-Time ESL teachers, 1 AIS Coordinator, 1 Principal, 1 Assistant Principal</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: Beginning September 9, 2009, classroom teachers and support auxiliary staff will work together to match the instruction to the individual, identified academic needs of each student, thereby promoting greater Literacy performance.</p>
<p>Aligning Resources:Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include specific reference to scheduled FY'11 PS and/or OTPS budget categories that will support the actions/strategies/activities described in this action plan.</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 40 Teachers: School Support Supplement, Title IIA Supplemental, TL Children First Network, Network Support, TL Children First Operation Funds, TL DRA Stabilization, TL Fair Student Funding, TL Fair Student Funding Incremental, TL One-Time Allocations, Universal PreK</p> <p>7 Cluster Teachers: Title I SWP, TL DRA Stabilization, TL Fair Student Funding, TL FSF Legacy Teacher Supplement</p> <p>1 AIS Provider: Contract for Excellence FY09, TL One-Time Allocations</p> <p>2 Literacy Coaches: TL DRA Stabilization, Title I SWP</p> <p>2 SETSS Providers: TL Fair Student Funding</p> <p>2.5 Speech Teachers: TL Mandated Speech Shared</p> <p>2 Full Time ESL Teachers: TL Fair Student Funding and TL Fair Student Funding Incremental</p>

	<p>1 AIS Coordinator: TL DRA Stabilization, Title I SWP</p> <p>1 Principal: TL Fair Student Funding</p> <p>1 Assistant Principal: Title I SWP, TL Fair Student Funding, and TL DRA Stabilization</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> An additional 2% of students in each testing grade will demonstrate at least one year's progress as per scale scores on the New York State English Language Arts Assessments on Grades 4-6, April, 2010</p> <p>Teacher College Reading Assessments Pro data gathered four times per year (Gr. K-6)</p> <p>6) Weekly analysis of conferencing notes and students' Post-It notes Increase in NYSESLAT scores for our English Language Learners, for Spring, 2010 ELA Predictive scores, two times per year Annual and Tri-Annual Reviews for I.E.P. students Monthly writing portfolio reviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused walkthroughs by Administrators and Professional Development Team

Subject Area
(where relevant) :

English Language Learners

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> By March of 2011, 41.09% of our ELL students in grades K-6 will achieve Reading Benchmarks of level 3 or 4, compared to 39.03% in the Spring of 2010, as measured by Teacher College Assessment Pro data.</p>
--	---

Action Plan

Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.

**Activities:**

Daily practice of TC Reading/Writing Workshop in 90-minute Literacy Block and 45-minute Writing workshop.

Increased time spent reading and talking about books on students' levels and of their interest, in the classroom Literacy block. Provision of reading choice in the students' native languages, as materials become available.

Continuation of specific interventions targeting our increasing English Language Learner population, including Achieve 3000. Continued support of an ELL Inquiry Team to monitor and support the progress of English Language Learners.

For ELL teachers, data-driven instruction will include reflecting upon Teachers College Assessment Pro data in grades K-6, teachers' conference notes and running records, and computer-based Predictive tests.

ELL teachers will continue to staff develop classroom teachers in methods specifically designed to meet the needs of ELL's in the regular classroom. Ongoing Professional Development opportunities, including intervisitations, for teachers to help them implement cutting edge practices that will positively impact upon the students' academic growth.

Specific staff development focusing on academic language, to incorporate vocabulary that spans the content areas, will be offered to all classroom teachers

Technology-supported curriculum and hardware, including Smart Boards, laptop computers, and Internet access, to augment the teaching of reading and writing, specifically purchased for the exclusive use of the targeted ELL population.

Teachers monitoring all students' progress bimonthly using TC Assessments, including ELL students.

Weekly Grade PD reflection on students' movement through reading levels. The progress of ELL's will be reported out to teams in collaborations with ELL teachers.

Extended Day small-group ELL intervention services, 3X per week, (2:40-3:30 p.m.)

Accountable talk in large and small groups to further the understanding of all reading text, utilizing inference and other higher-order thinking skills.

Daily writing in Reader's Response Journals.

Daily writing in Writers Notebook.

Classroom teachers will differentiate instruction to better meet the academic needs of ELLs, as measured by focused walkthroughs by administrators and PD Team, and teacher's plans.

SmartBoards will be used to provide prior knowledge and expand abstract concepts for students who come from other cultures.

Increased use of online games and other interactive activities, and technology-based

	<p>programs.</p> <p>Books on tape.</p> <p>Native language libraries will continue to be available to the students in both the school library and in the ESL classrooms.</p> <p>Free ESL instruction will be available to parents during Saturday classes.</p> <p>Title III funds will be utilized to provide additional instruction for ELLs during after-school and Saturday classes.</p> <p>Target Population(s) All ELL's on Grades K-6, with special focus on those who are recent Immigrants.</p> <p>Responsible Staff 38 classroom teachers and 8 cluster teachers, 2 Literacy Coaches, 2.5 Speech teachers, 2 Full-Time ESL teachers, 1 AIS Coordinator, 1 Principal, 1 Assistant Principal</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: Beginning September 8, 2010, classroom teachers and support auxiliary staff will work together to upgrade their knowledge of the needs, materials, and methods of English Language learners. Beginning September 8, 2010, one ESL teacher will join weekly PD Cabinet meetings, to share data and discuss the ongoing issues related to ELLs. The ELL Inquiry Team will meet 2x monthly, beginning the second week in September, and ending the last week of June.</p>
<p>Aligning Resources:Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include specific reference to scheduled FY'11 PS and/or OTPS budget categories that will support the actions/strategies/activities described in this action plan.</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>40 Teachers: School Support Supplement, Title IIA Supplemental, TL Children First Network, Network Support, TL Children First Operation Funds, TL DRA Stabilization, TL Fair Student Funding, TL Fair Student Funding Incremental, TL One-Time Allocations, Universal PreK</p> <p>7 Cluster Teachers: Title I SWP, TL DRA Stabilization, TL Fair Student Funding, TL FSF Legacy Teacher Supplement</p> <p>1 AIS Provider: Contract for Excellence FY09, TL One-Time Allocations</p> <p>2 Literacy Coaches: TL DRA Stabilization, Title I SWP</p>

	<p>2 SETSS Providers: TL Fair Student Funding</p> <p>2.5 Speech Teachers: TL Mandated Speech Shared</p> <p>2 Full Time ESL Teachers: TL Fair Student Funding and TL Fair Student Funding Incremental</p> <p>1 AIS Coordinator: TL DRA Stabilization, Title I SWP</p> <p>1 Principal: TL Fair Student Funding</p> <p>1 Assistant Principal: Title I SWP, TL Fair Student Funding, and TL DRA Stabilization</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Increase of 2% in test scores on The New York State English Language Arts Assessments on Grades 3-6, June 2011, for all ELLs. Teacher College Reading Assessments Pro data gathered four times per year (Gr. K-6)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Weekly analysis of conferencing notes and students' Post-It notes Increase in NYSESLAT scores for our English Language Learners, for Spring, 2011 ELA Predictive scores, two times per year Annual and Tri-Annual Reviews for I.E.P. students Monthly writing portfolio reviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused walkthroughs by Administrators and Professional Development Team

Subject Area
(where relevant) :

Social Studies

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> By of June 2011, 90% of teachers will improve their ability to deliver differentiated</p>
--	---

<p><i>Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>instruction during Social Studies lessons as measured by focused walk throughs.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Activities:</p> <p>Professional development related to differentiation of instruction in the content area, including interactive workshops and turnkey lessons, will be provided for the staff.</p> <p>Classroom teachers and clusters will be expected to plan for differentiated lessons in Social Studies, taking into account readiness, student interests, learning styles, according to the protocols of Carol Ann Tomlinson.</p> <p>Integration of Social Studies and other curriculum areas, including Science and Literacy (Use of graphs, charts, statistics, and data collection)</p> <p>Inclusion of more non-fiction books that connect to Social Studies grade-level curriculum, in collaboration with Teachers College.</p> <p>Teachers will depend more heavily on original documents to support Social Studies curriculum on grades K-6.</p> <p>Integrating Social Studies concepts into Art lessons, including historical engravings, monuments depicting historical events and other visual aids to Social Studies learning.</p> <p>Technology-assisted Social Studies instruction, including websites, webquests, and other technology-based resources.</p> <p>Teachers will plan Type 1 experiences, where students will visit museums and other places of historical or cultural interest, to make the topics more relevant to the children.</p> <p>Teacher will provide students with graphic organizers and other materials to help them analyze Primary Source Documents, to enhance their ability to better understand Social Studies concepts.</p> <p>Teachers will assign research projects to promote collaborative independent inquiry.</p> <p>Teachers will use Social Studies textbooks as a resource, but only as one of many modalities by which to teach the curriculum.</p> <p>Non-fiction literature will be promoted as an additional resource for acquiring Social Studies content.</p> <p>Teachers will arrange for guest speakers to come to the school, when appropriate and available, to further dimensionalize the curriculum.</p> <p>Project Arts residencies will provide students with activities in music, dance, and theater that coordinate with the Social Studies curriculum.</p>

	<p>Target Population All students on grades K-6, At-risk students, ELL's (including recent immigrants); and African-Americans, Hispanic, and Special Education students.</p> <p>Responsible Staff 38 classroom teachers and 8 cluster teachers, 2 AIS Providers, 2 SETSS Providers, 2 Full-time ESL teachers, 1 AIS Coordinator, 1 Principal, 1 Assistant Principal</p> <p>Implementation Timeline: Beginning September 9, 2009, classroom teachers and support auxiliary staff will work together to match the instruction to the individual, identified academic needs of each student, thereby promoting greater Math performance.</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include specific reference to scheduled FY'11 PS and/or OTPS budget categories that will support the actions/strategies/activities described in this action plan.</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 40 Teachers: School Support Supplement, Title IIA Supplemental, TL Children First Network, Network Support, TL Children First Operation Funds, TL DRA Stabilization, TL Fair Student Funding, TL Fair Student Funding Incremental, TL One-Time Allocations, Universal PreK</p> <p>7 Cluster Teachers: Title I SWP, TL DRA Stabilization, TL Fair Student Funding, TL FSF Legacy Teacher Supplement</p> <p>1 AIS Provider: Contract for Excellence FY09, TL One-Time Allocations</p> <p>2 Literacy Coaches: TL DRA Stabilization, Title I SWP</p> <p>2 SETSS Providers: TL Fair Student Funding</p> <p>2.5 Speech Teachers: TL Mandated Speech Shared</p> <p>2 Full Time ESL Teachers: TL Fair Student Funding and TL Fair Student Funding Incremental</p> <p>1 AIS Coordinator: TL DRA Stabilization, Title I SWP</p> <p>1 Principal: TL Fair Student Funding</p>

	1 Assistant Principal: Title I SWP, TL Fair Student Funding, and TL DRA Stabilization
Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <p>2% increase in New York State Social Studies Exam, administered in November of 2010, to grade 5 students. Informal, teacher-made assessments and unit tests on Grades K-6</p> <p>Social Studies Journals Student projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Studies Assessments, 3X per year, on all grades, in Assessment Binders. • Daily Administrative walkthroughs, during alternate weeks when Social Studies is being taught, period 8.

Subject Area
(where relevant) :

Technology

Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <p>By June, 2011, 95% of the staff will significantly improve their use of technology by using SmartBoard instruction throughout the school day. 70% of students will interact with the SmarBoard during instruction during the school year, as measured by focused walkthroughs, observations, teacher and student surveys, classroom checklists, and increased production of technology-based projects.</p>
Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <p>Activities</p> <p>We will provide all classrooms on Grades K-6 with Smart Board technology and train them to infuse this into classroom activities, with lessons including PowerPoint presentations, United Video Streaming, and interactive charts and graphs.</p> <p>Outside professional development through TechSmart will be provided to each</p>

teacher, in two 2-hour, differentiated sessions.

All students will be required to have scheduled time on computers a minimum of 2 periods per week.

One teacher will be assigned on each grade to support increased reliance on technology in the classroom, assisting with integration of Smart board and Laptop/projector-assisted lessons, and data analysis to drive instruction.

Ongoing support for classroom teachers, parents, and other members of our school community, will be provided in order to facilitate knowledge and interpretation of student data, for the purpose of providing more targeted instruction.

Greater use of CD ROM's to support students in need of academic support.

Professional development will be provided by "in house" technology staff developer to train teachers in the use of Smart Boards, Laptops and Projectors, and other technology-based methods.

Classes will routinely visit the computer lab as part of the cluster schedule.

Higher-order thinking skills will be supported by increased use of technology in the classroom, i.e. project-based learning tasks such as production of a student newsletter.

Every student in grades 3-6 will be required to complete at least one project per year that utilizes Internet research, and other technology-based resources.

Smart Board technology will be used to help develop prior background knowledge and provide concrete evidence of more abstract concepts, particularly important for our more recent immigrants.

Smart Board technology will be used to differentiate instruction in the classroom.

Students will be expected to interact with the Smart Board both during classroom instruction and to create technology enhanced projects.

Teachers will be expected to support instruction with technology based resources.

Target Population(s)

All students on grades K-6, with a special emphasis on IEP and at-risk students, ELL's including recent immigrants, African-American, Hispanic, Special Education students.

1 Technology Staff Developer, 38 classroom teachers and 8 cluster teachers, 2 AIS

2 ESL teachers, 1 Principal, 1 Assistant Principal

Beginning with Professional Development on September 8, 2009, classroom teachers and our Technology Staff Developer and Computer Cluster teacher will work together, along with "technology grade leaders" and other teachers who are currently using Smart Board technology, to provide staff with strategies by which they can more effectively integrate technology into standards-based learning in all curricular areas.

As anticipated grant monies become available, classrooms will be provided with additional hardware such as Smart Boards and desktop computers.

<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include specific reference to scheduled FY'11 PS and/or OTPS budget categories that will support the actions/strategies/activities described in this action plan.</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 40 Teachers: School Support Supplement, Title IIA Supplemental, TL Children First Network, Network Support, TL Children First Operation Funds, TL DRA Stabilization, TL Fair Student Funding, TL Fair Student Funding Incremental, TL One-Time Allocations, Universal PreK</p> <p>7 Cluster Teachers: Title I SWP, TL DRA Stabilization, TL Fair Student Funding, TL FSF Legacy Teacher Supplement</p> <p>1 AIS Provider: Contract for Excellence FY09, TL One-Time Allocations</p> <p>2 Literacy Coaches: TL DRA Stabilization, Title I SWP</p> <p>2 SETSS Providers: TL Fair Student Funding</p> <p>2.5 Speech Teachers: TL Mandated Speech Shared</p> <p>2 Full Time ESL Teachers: TL Fair Student Funding and TL Fair Student Funding Incremental</p> <p>1 AIS Coordinator: TL DRA Stabilization, Title I SWP</p> <p>1 Principal: TL Fair Student Funding</p> <p>1 Assistant Principal: Title I SWP, TL Fair Student Funding, and TL DRA Stabilization</p> <p>1 Technology Staff Developer: TL DRA Stabilization</p>

<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results of teacher technology surveys Results of parent surveys Evidence of Technology-driven reports on bulletin boards, during focused walkthroughs. Posted computer-use schedules in the classrooms PD Team walkthrough results, October 2010, December 2010, February 2011, and April , 2011 Improved NYSESLAT scores, for our English Language Learners Quality review results, 2010-2011 school year • Improved inference skills as measured by Acuity and standardized test scores.
--	---

Subject Area
(where relevant) :

High Achieving Students

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>By March of 2011, 25.48%% of our students in grades 3-6 will achieve Reading Benchmark level 4, compared to 23.48% in Spring of 2010, as measured by Teachers College Assessment Pro data.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued Implementation of an Inquiry Team for "High Achieving" students, to analyze data that will guide planning for our high achieving students. This team will distribute information every month, as to their findings and implications for differentiating instruction. • Addressing the needs of the highest achieving students (level 4s in both Reading and Math), in Grades Four through Six, who have achieved a level 4 in Reading for a minimum of two years, through grade-specific enrichment classes in the Extended-day program, 3x per week, per student, for 50 minutes per day. Teachers selected for this program will receive staff development once monthly from the members of the High Achievers Inquiry Team. The High Achievers Inquiry Team will provide suggested activities and strategies which can be implemented

	<p>within the classroom setting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing professional development to classroom teachers to enable them to differentiate lessons to meet the needs of high achieving students in the classroom. The High Achieving Inquiry Team will provide suggested activities and strategies which can be implemented within the classroom setting. • Requirement that all students identified as “high achieving” plan and complete one cross-curricular, long-term independent study or “exit” project per grade. A special rubric for these projects will be created by the members of the High Achieving Inquiry Team. • Requirement that differentiation for the gifted be included in lesson planning. • Academic professional articles will be distributed each month to the entire staff to support teachers as they differentiate for our highest achieving students. <p>Target Populations: Students who have achieved a level four in Reading performance for two consecutive years, as measured by TC Assessment Pro.</p> <p>Responsible Staff: All Classroom teachers, members of the High Achieving Inquiry Team, Principal, Assistant Principal.</p> <p>Implementations Timelines: AIS program meets 4X per week beginning mid-October.</p>
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include specific reference to scheduled FY'11 PS and/or OTPS budget categories that will support the actions/strategies/activities described in this action plan.</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> High Achievers Inquiry Team: TL Children First Inquiry Teams</p> <p>40 Teachers: School Support Supplement, Title IIA Supplemental, TL Children First Network, Network Support, TL Children First Operation Funds, TL DRA Stabilization, TL Fair Student Funding, TL Fair Student Funding Incremental, TL One-Time Allocations, Universal PreK</p> <p>1 Principal: TL Fair Student Funding</p> <p>1 Assistant Principal: Title I SWP, TL Fair Student Funding, and TL DRA Stabilization</p>

<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Tracking of High Achieving students' TC Assessment growth 4X per year. These students' reading levels should be above grade level, and they should grow at least 3 levels, accordingly, by June 2011.</p> <p>50% increase in contest entries and competitions by students identified as highest achieving.</p> <p>Review of exit projects, June of 2011. All projects should exceed the standards, and should meet criteria established for independent study projects.</p> <p>4% increase in scores on the New York State Science Assessments on Grade 4, Spring, 2011, for all students identified as "highest achieving".</p> <p>5% increase in scores on the New York State Social Studies Assessments on Grade 5, in November of 2010, for all students identified as "highest achieving".</p> <p>100% student participation in Spring Science Fair, March, 2011.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content-Area theme-based instruction during all extended day classes for identified students.
--	--

Subject Area
(where relevant) :

Inquiry Teams

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> By June of 2011, 95% of our teaching staff will be participating members of an Inquiry Team, analyzing data and implementing interventions within a research model, to promote student growth within each grade, and within indetified subgroups.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain the already existing "ELL" , "High Achievers", and "Special Education" Inquiry Teams. • Teaching staff will continue to participate in Inquiry teams (one each for Pre-K-6), based on grade-specific interests and needs. Teams will meet at scheduled weekly meetings. • Teams will continue to analyze data which will potentially impact favorably on the academic success of all students, including high-achieving students, most recent

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • non-English speaking immigrants, and large special populations. • Grade level Inquiry teams will meet to analyze data, note trends, and share best practices across the grade. • Grade level Data Specialists will represent each grade to compare data across grades, note trends, and promote consistency across grades with best practices in all curricular areas. This information will be shared with the various Inquiry Teams throughout the school to avail them of new insights related to data analysis. They will meet at least once per month. • Creation and distribution of an “Inquiry Newsletter”, which will foster an environment of in-depth thinking about the educational process, and offer consistency and continuity of instruction to our students throughout their P.S. 161 career. • At the Chancellor’s Staff Development day in June, Inquiry teams will share out their findings and discuss future impact on instructional practices. <p>Target Populations: All Students, Grades K-6 Responsible Staff: All Teachers and Administrative staff; including classroom teachers, cluster teachers, ESL, Speech, AIS, and SETSS teachers, IEP teacher, Coaches, AIS Coordinator, Budget Manager, Principal, and Assistant Principal. Implementations Timelines: Inquiry Teams will have first meetings by the First Week in October.</p>
<p>Aligning Resources:Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include specific reference to scheduled FY’11 PS and/or OTPS budget categories that will support the actions/strategies/activities described in this action plan.</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 40 Teachers: School Support Supplement, Title IIA Supplemental, TL Children First Network, Network Support, TL Children First Operation Funds, TL DRA Stabilization, TL Fair Student Funding, TL Fair Student Funding Incremental, TL One-Time Allocations, Universal PreK</p> <p>7 Cluster Teachers: Title I SWP, TL DRA Stabilization, TL Fair Student Funding, TL FSF Legacy Teacher Supplement</p> <p>1 AIS Provider: Contract for Excellence FY09, TL One-Time Allocations</p> <p>2 Literacy Coaches: TL DRA Stabilization, Title I SWP</p> <p>2 SETSS Providers: TL Fair Student Funding</p>

	<p>2.5 Speech Teachers: TL Mandated Speech Shared</p> <p>2 Full Time ESL Teachers: TL Fair Student Funding and TL Fair Student Funding Incremental</p> <p>1 AIS Coordinator: TL DRA Stabilization, Title I SWP</p> <p>1 Principal: TL Fair Student Funding</p> <p>1 Assistant Principal: Title I SWP, TL Fair Student Funding, and TL DRA Stabilization</p> <p>1 Budget Manager/Tech Staff Developer-TL DRA Stabilization</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Each Inquiry team has a goal, and those goals will be routinely investigated by the groups as they meet a minimum of once per week, from September 2010 through June of 2011. Each member of the teams will be expected to analyze the data as assessments are done in the areas of their concern, and interventions will be adjusted accordingly.</p>

**Subject Area
(where relevant) :**

Mathematics

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> By Spring 2011, 82.9% of students in grades 3 through 6 will achieve level 3 or 4 in performance, as compared with 80.9% in Spring of 2010, as measured by the New York State Mathematics Assessment.</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The initial implementation of The Common Core Standards in Mathematics has reaffirmed our commitment to process rather than solely product. We recognize the importance of accessing the child’s thinking when solving a problem. This is reflected in the teacher’s lesson plans and the differentiated groups in the classroom.</p> <p>In light of the new Standards, we are aligning more of our daily instructional practices to reflect higher order thinking skills. We expect teachers to provide inter-disciplinary lessons</p>

that match learning styles and develop an understanding of the subjects' relevance. There is an expectation that the children will read, write, calculate, and defend the mathematical procedures used.

Activities:

- v Continued implementation of Everyday Math on Grades K-5 and Impact Math on Grade 6
- v Continued use of math manipulatives, helping students better understand new concepts.
- v Support of SETSS teachers, assisting both our Special Education population and those "At Risk".
- v Small group tutorials during the extended day program
- v Read Alouds supporting the understanding of complex mathematical concepts.
- v Increased use of on-line games and other interactive activities
- v Smart Board supported instruction.
- v Math journaling to reinforce concepts new and those previously introduced
- v Math process writing
- v Charting of problem solving, using a collaborative approach to support higher order thinking
- v Bulletin Board displays that honor and reinforce mathematical thought
- v ELL teacher supported math instruction for our recent immigrant population
- v Grade Level Inquiry groups studying mathematical practices and procedures
- v Emphasis on measurement activities using non-standard units of measurement
- v Friday "Math Game Day" use to reinforce and spiral concepts previously taught
- v Greater integration of science, social studies, reading, and writing into mathematics instruction
- v Math concepts reinforced by the "In House" Art Specialist that are aligned with the curriculum including visual-spatial concepts and construction of two and three-dimensional objects.
- v Student created charts that document the process of problem solving and evaluated by classmates.
- v Students thinking critically about the developmental problem solving approach to a task taken by classmates, offering suggestions, questioning, while providing the opportunity for children to defend the strategies employed.

<p>Aligning Resources:Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include specific reference to scheduled FY'11 PS and/or OTPS budget categories that will support the actions/strategies/activities described in this action plan.</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>1 Art Specialist:TL Fair Student Funding</p> <p>1 Computer/Technology Teacher:Title I SWP, TL DRA Stabilization, TL FSF Legacy Teacher</p> <p>38 Teachers: School Support Supplement, Title IIA Supplemental, TL Children First Network, Network Support, TL Children First Operation Funds, TL DRA Stabilization, TL Fair Student Funding, TL Fair Student Funding Incremental, TL One-Time Allocations,</p> <p>1 AIS Provider: Contract for Excellence FY09, TL One-Time Allocations</p> <p>2 SETSS Providers: TL Fair Student Funding</p> <p>2 Full Time ESL Teachers: TL Fair Student Funding and TL Fair Student Funding Incremental</p> <p>1 AIS Coordinator: TL DRA Stabilization, Title I SWP</p> <p>1 Principal: TL Fair Student Funding</p> <p>1 Assistant Principal: Title I SWP, TL Fair Student Funding, and TL DRA Stabilization</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> v 2% increase in New York State Assessment scores, June 2011, on grades 3-6 v Predictive Test administered two times a year to students on grades 3-6 v ITA (Instructionally-targeted Assessments) administered three times a year on grades 3-6 v Item analysis, done monthly for all classes grades K-5, on the Everyday Math Unit Test, to access student growth in specific Math Strands v Informal and teacher-made assessments and unit tests on grades K-6 v Math Journals v Conferencing Notes v Bulletin Board Displays v Problem solving charts created by students v Beginning of the year Pre Test and Mid Year Assessments on grades K-2.

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2010-2011

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

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

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

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	10		N/A	N/A				
1			N/A	N/A				
2	16		N/A	N/A				
3	28		N/A	N/A				
4	30							
5	30							
6	30							
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

- o 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.
- o 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.
- o Students in Grade 9 who performed at Level 1 or Level 2 on NYS Grade 8 ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies assessments.
- o 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. Part B - Description of Academic Intervention Services

<p>Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)</p>	<p>Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).</p>
<p>ELA:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> We currently have one AIS provider who supports struggling readers and writers with targeted, differentiated instruction. In addition to conferencing and running records, the teacher uses a variety of programs including Reader’s Theatre, Soar to Success, Pair It Books, and Leveled Guided Reading Programs, as well as on-line technology-based interventions using the Smart Board technology.</p>
<p>Mathematics:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The students receive differentiated instruction in the area of mathematics within their classrooms. The teachers implement strategies within the Everyday Math and Inpact Math programs. Since the data indicated that over 80% of the students are reaching or exceeding the standards as measured by the NYS Mathematics exam, the children do not receive additional interventions outside of the calssroom.</p>
<p>Science:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Science instruction is integrated into the literacy program in the reading and writing of non-fiction, coordinated with both the classroom and science cluster teachers. The concentration is on language acquisition for specific topics. The AIS teacher, classroom teachers, and science cluster specialist create targeted interventions to support the NYS Science Standards. Students have opportunities to go on the Internet and research and use interactive programs to investigate concepts that might otherwise by abstract and difficult to grasp. The teachers differentiate the instruction in the area of Science during regular classroom instruction.</p>
<p>Social Studies:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Social Studies instruction is integrated into the AIS literacy instruction in the reading and writing of non-fiction, in consultation with both the classroom and Social Studies cluster teacher. The concentration is on language acquisition for specific topics. Instruction includes writing remediation, including the use of graphic organizers for essay-writing, focusing on information gleaned from primary source documents. Social Studies content is also delivered during Math lessons, supporting specific lessons in the creation and interpreting charts, graphs, and tables. These lessons are connected with Social Studies, grade-specific curriculum. In addition, we have begun to differentiate the instruction in this content area by delivering lessons that address all learning styles. This too supports students who are struggling in social studies.</p>

At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:	<input type="checkbox"/> The Guidance Counselor meets with students, both individually and in small groups, to help them cope with internal conflicts and issues that are interfering with their ability to learn.
At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
At-risk Health-related Services:	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A

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

NCLB/SED requirement for all schools

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

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

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

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

Section I. Student and School Information.

Grade Level(s)

3, 4, 5, 6

Number of Students to be Served:

LEP 20-25

Non-LEP N/A

Number of Teachers 2

Other Staff (Specify) 1 Supervisor

School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview

Section II. Title III, Part A LEP Program Narrative

Language Instruction Program

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

□

We feel these students will benefit from participating in a program that gives additional support above and beyond their basic core service received during the school day. This program will help to foster additional English language learning and provide supplemental content-area instruction for designated students. A certified ESL teacher will instruct students. The language of instruction will be English. Classes will run one and a half hours after school, 3 days per week (Tuesday through Thursday). The grades will be grouped as follows: grades 3 and 4 (meeting Tuesday and Wednesday); and grades 5 and 6 (meeting Thursday). The program will begin in January and end in April.

Instructors will also use Achieve 3000, a nonfiction-based online literacy program to supplement the curriculum. The following instructional components and strategies will be used to help students meet the performance standards:

- All components of the balanced literacy program (independent reading and writing, shared reading and writing, interactive writing, guided reading, and read alouds)
- Use of technology (SmartBoard, laptops, streaming video, internet)
- Sheltered Instruction to ensure early content area exposure
- Direct Explicit Vocabulary Instruction
- Structured Academic Conversation
- Total Physical Response
- Role play and dramatization
- Graphic organizers/semantic maps
- Cooperative learning groups and flexible grouping
- Conceptual development

Students' progress will be measured by their ability to speak and write about the topics covered through the program curriculum. In addition, teachers will create their own assessments using a variety of informal assessment tools, including consistent observation and student work. The materials used will be based on the respective grades' curricula. The language of instruction will be English.

The program will begin at 9am and end at 11:00am, running from January through April. The school expects to enroll 10 - 15 parents in the program. The language of instruction will be English, and instruction will be provided by a NYS certified ESL teacher. The goal of the parent ESL program will be to help parents acculturate into American society and to develop their social English skills. This, in turn, will promote parent involvement in students' school activities, including student work and school-based events, as well as strengthen the home-school connection between our non-English speaking families and the school community.

The following topics will be explored during the program:

- Chores in the community (i.e., going to the grocery store, to the bank, to the library, etc)
- School-related interactions (i.e., talking with teachers, with the principal, attending school events, etc)
- American culture and symbols (food, museums, sports arenas, going to the gym, Thanksgiving, etc)

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.



Professional development will be continuous throughout the duration of the program. The ESL teachers will collaborate regularly with the school's social studies and science teachers to enhance the Title III curriculum and plan for instruction. Teachers will meet for these planning sessions one afternoon per month (6 sessions total), from 3:30 to 5pm. The teachers will be paid per session through Title III. In addition to product training and internal collaboration and planning, the ESL teachers will attend relevant workshops throughout the school year. Specific workshops will be chosen at the start of the 2010-2011 school year, when the schedule is released.

Section III. Title III Budget

School: **PS 161 Q**
 BEDS Code: **342800010161**

Allocation Amount:		
Budget Category	Budgeted Amount	Explanation of expenditures in this category as it relates to the program narrative for this title.
Professional salaries (schools must account for fringe benefits) - Per session - Per diem	\$5929.00	<input type="checkbox"/> 100 hours of per session for 2 ESL teachers to support ELL Students: 100 hours x \$49.89 (current teacher per session rate with fringe) = \$4989+ [18 hours x \$52.21 (current supervisor per session rate with fringe) = \$940] = \$5929
Purchased services - High quality staff and curriculum development contracts	\$1,098.00	<input type="checkbox"/> 18 hours of per session for 2 content area teachers to provide ESL teachers with PD: 18 hours x \$49.89 = \$898; 2 external workshops TBD - \$100/EACH

Supplies and materials - Must be supplemental. - Additional curricula, instructional materials. - Must be clearly listed.	\$500.00	<input type="checkbox"/> School supplies (pencils, paper, colored paper, paint, paint brushes, glue, markers, colored pencils, etc)
Educational Software (Object Code 199)	\$10,000.00	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieve 3000, literacy program
Travel	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Other	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
TOTAL	0	

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

Requirement under Chancellor's Regulations – for all schools

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

Part A: Needs Assessment Findings

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



The school looks at the language breakdown of parents based on the Home Language Identification Survey to determine the language spoken by parents. The school also assesses parents' interpretation needs when they interact with school staff. The school then arranges for translations of documents to be sent home to parents, as well as access to interpreters for school events (i.e., Parent Teacher Conferences, meetings with teachers, etc).

The ESL teachers have recently created a spreadsheet of all families whose home language is one other than English, indicating which parents require translation and interpretation services. Once completed, this spreadsheet will be made accessible to all school staff upon request, and each classroom teacher will be given a list of parents of students in their class who require interpretation services.

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.



There are ten languages other than English spoken in the homes of students at PS 161, with a estimated 300 parents who speak a language other than English. The predominant non-English home languages at PS 161 are Punjabi (150 parents) and Spanish (70 parents). The other languages are Hindi (20 parents), Urdu (10 parents), Bengali (10 parents), Amoy (1 parent), Romanian (1 parent), Cantonese (1 parent), Haitian (1 parent), and Tagalog (1 parent). Of these parents, approximately 150 parents require translation and interpretation services. As stated above, teachers will receive a list of parents of students in their class who require interpretation services, according to the needs assessment.

The school has learned that more parents, especially non-English-speaking parents, are willing to come to the school when notices are sent home in their respective languages and when interpretation is available. This was acknowledged and discussed at a P.T.A. meeting and during School Leadership Team meetings.

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.

The school will attempt to translate all correspondence to parents, especially letters relating to academic matters. For example, the school has a poster in the lobby of the school that welcomes parents in various languages and notifies them that interpretation services are available. The citywide informational packet, *Family Guide* and the *Bill of Parents Rights and Responsibilities*, are also translated and sent home in students' home languages. In addition, parents of ELLs receive invitations to orientation sessions, as well as Title III program and informational letters in their respective home languages.

Documents requiring translation are completed according to need and relevance. For example, when the school has an urgent message for parents, the document will be sent for immediate translation. Other documents, such as the *Family Guide*, are kept on hand in translated form, and are given to parents when necessary. Any formal written translation is processed through Legal Interpretation Services (LIS).

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.

When oral interpretation is necessary for a meeting with a parent, the school uses various resources to meet the parent's needs. The school often uses school-based staff for interpretation services. Currently, the school houses six bilingual teachers (two Russian, two Spanish, one Chinese, and one Haitian), five bilingual paraprofessionals (two Spanish, one Urdu, one Punjabi and Hindi, and one Russian), one bilingual part-time guidance counselor (Spanish), and five other bilingual school staff members (two Spanish, two Italian, and one Tagalog). If the school requires more formal interpretation services or services for a language other than the ones previously listed, the school acquires the services of Legal Interpretation Services.

The school makes interpreters available during major events, especially Parent-Teacher evening and afternoon conferences. This service is provided by either in-house staff or an outside contractor (LIS), as necessary.

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>.

A sign is placed in the school lobby in each of the school's covered languages, indicating that parents can get a copy of the translation notification in the parent coordinator's room. Parents needing an interpreter will be directed to the main office by the security officer, who

greet visitors in the lobby. The school's safety plan for the 2010-2011 school year contains procedures for ensuring that parents in need of language access services are not prevented from reaching the school's administrative offices solely due to language barriers.

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

All Title I schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:

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

PART A: TITLE I ALLOCATIONS AND SET-ASIDES

	Title I	Title I ARRA	Total
1. Enter the anticipated Title I Allocation for 2010-11:	\$56,8057	\$16,265	0
2. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside for Parent Involvement:	\$5,843		
3. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified:	\$28,403	*	
4. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Professional Development:	\$56,806	*	

5. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2009-2010 school year:
100

6. If the percentage of high quality teachers during 2009-2010 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.

N/A

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

PART B: TITLE I SCHOOL PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT POLICY AND 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.



Sample Template for School Parental Involvement Policy:

I. General Expectations

P.S. 161 agrees to implement the following statutory requirements:

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

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

- P.S. 161 will take the following actions to involve parents in the joint development of its school parental involvement plan under section 1112 of the ESEA:

- Administrators will present Parent Involvement Policy at a Leadership meeting and share at final PTA meeting.
- Results will be disseminated to parents at a subsequent PTA meeting.
- P.S. 161 will provide the following necessary coordination, technical assistance, and other support in planning and implementing effective parental involvement activities to improve student academic achievement and school performance:
- P.S. 161 will take the following actions to conduct, with the involvement of parents, an annual evaluation of the content and effectiveness of this parental involvement policy in improving school quality. The evaluation will include identifying barriers to greater participation by parents in parental involvement activities (with particular attention to parents who are economically disadvantaged, are disabled, have limited English proficiency, have limited literacy, or are of any racial or ethnic minority background). The school will use the findings of the evaluation about its parental involvement policy and activities to design strategies for more effective parental involvement, and to revise, if necessary (and with the involvement of parents) its parental involvement policies.
- P.S. 161 will build the schools' and parent's capacity for strong parental involvement, in order to ensure effective involvement of parents and to support a partnership with the parents, and the community to improve student academic achievement, through the following activities specifically described below:
 - a. The school will provide assistance to parents of children served by the school, as appropriate, in understanding topics such as the following, by undertaking the actions described in this paragraph –
 - i. the State's academic content standards
 - ii. the State's student academic achievement standards
 - iii. the State and local academic assessments including alternate assessments, the requirements of Part A, how to monitor their child's progress, and how to work with educators:

Topics such as "Understanding the Readers/Writers Workshop", "Using the Interim Assessment website to improve your child's Math skills" and "Everyday Math activities for Families" will be discussed, as well as others, as per the aforementioned survey. The results of the periodic assessment will be communicated to parents on an ongoing basis.
 - b. The school will provide materials and training to help parents work with their children to improve their children's academic achievement, such as literacy training, and using technology, as appropriate, to foster parental involvement, by:

Offering parent tutoring classes and Saturday computer workshops to give parents special skills needed to bring their children up to standards by working with them at home.
 - c. The school will, with the assistance of its parents, educate its teachers, pupil services personnel, principal and other staff, in how to reach out to, communicate with, and work with parents as equal partners, in the value and utility of contributions of parents, and in how to implement and coordinate parent programs and build ties between parents and schools, by:

Saturday workshops, offered through the Leadership team, about "team-building", FAMILY DAY will be offered.
 - d. The school will, to the extent feasible and appropriate, coordinate and integrate parental involvement programs and activities with Head Start, Reading First, Early Reading First, Even Start, Home Instruction Programs for Preschool Youngsters, the Parents as Teachers Program, LEARNING LEADERS and public preschool and other programs, and conduct other activities, such as parent resource centers, that encourage and support parents in more fully participating in the education of their children, by:

e. **III. Discretionary School Parental Involvement Policy Components**

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

- f. providing other reasonable support for parental involvement activities under section 1118 as parents may request.

IV. Adoption

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.

1. 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.

P.S. 161, and the parents of the students participating in activities, services, and programs funded by Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) (participating children), agree that this compact outlines how the parents, the entire school staff, and the

students will share the responsibility for improved student academic achievement and the means by which the school and parents will build and develop a partnership that will help children achieve the State's high standards. This school-parent compact is in effect during school year 2010-11.

Required School-Parent Compact Provisions

School Responsibilities

P.S. 161 will:

1. Provide high-quality curriculum and instruction in a supportive and effective learning environment that enables the participating children to meet the State's student academic achievement standards as follows:
 - We will continue to recruit and hire highly motivated teachers who are selected through our SBO team process.
 - We will continue to offer ongoing professional development throughout the school year.
2. Hold parent-teacher conferences (at least annually in elementary schools) during which this compact will be discussed as it relates to the individual child's achievement. Specifically, those conferences will be held: Twice yearly, during the day and at night, according to the NYCDOE calendar, once in November, and once in March.
3. Provide parents with frequent reports on their children's progress. Specifically, the school will provide reports as follows: Grow Reports, Princeton Review, and other Interim Assessments, Report Cards (Three times yearly and twice yearly in Kindergarten in addition to two progress reports), Promotion in Doubt letters; as agreed upon by the Professional Development Team and the School Leadership Team.
4. Provide parents reasonable access to staff. Specifically, staff will be available for consultation with parents as follows: Daily, during preparatory periods, and before school hours (by appointment). Curriculum Open House Days will be conducted for three days, in the month of September, 2010.
5. Provide parents opportunities to volunteer and participate in their child's class, and to observe classroom activities, as follows: Parents may view their child's learning activities during open school week, as designated on the NYCDOE calendar, and by appointment with their child(ren)'s teacher(s). Parents may volunteer and participate in all school trips, as planned in advance with their child(ren)'s teacher(s). Parents may volunteer and participate in their child's classroom activities during special events, as invited by, and approved by, the children's teachers and the school administration. Parents who wish to offer instructional help with children other than their own must participate in Learning Leader training sessions, which are offered in a series, once yearly, by our school. This training is arranged and publicized by our Parent Coordinator.
6. Involve parents in the planning, review, and improvement of the school's parental involvement policy, in an organized, ongoing, and timely way.
7. Involve parents in the joint development of any School wide Program plan (for SWP schools), in an organized, ongoing, and timely way.
8. Hold an annual meeting to inform parents of the school's participation in Title I, Part A programs, and to explain the Title I, Part A requirements, and the right of parents to be involved in Title I, Part A programs. The school will convene the meeting at a convenient time to parents, and will offer a flexible number of additional parental involvement meetings, such as in the morning or evening, so that as many

parents as possible are able to attend. The school will invite to this meeting all parents of children participating in Title I, Part A programs (participating students), and will encourage them to attend.

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

Parent Responsibilities

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

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

Optional Additional Provisions

Student Responsibilities:

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

- Do homework every day and ask for help when it is needed.

- Complete research and other projects in a timely manner
- Utilize the Internet in a responsible manner.
- Maintain good attendance at mandated or recommended A.I.S. programs
- Read at least 30 minutes every day outside of school time.
- Give to my parents or the adult who is responsible for my welfare all notices and information received by me from my school every day.

SIGNATURES:

SCHOOL	PARENT(S)	STUDENT
DATE	DATE	DATE

(Please note that signatures are not required)

PART C: TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM SCHOOLS

Section I: Schoolwide Program (SWP) Required Components

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

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

An SLT walkthrough and subsequent discussion was held during a regular school day during May of 2010. Parent members of the team were briefed on what to look for in the classrooms, hallways, bulletin boards, etc. Results were discussed during the subsequent SLT meeting, and used to help form the needs assessment of the CEP and schoolwide goals. Dissemination of School Report Cards and Schoolwide tests results, at School Leadership Team meetings, and end of the year PTA meeting will be conducted.

2. Schoolwide reform strategies that:

a) Provide opportunities for all children to meet the State's proficient and advanced levels of student academic achievement.

Students will have opportunities to participate in AIS programs during the school day, as well as during extended day and after-school programs targeted to the lowest third, ELL's and high achieving students. Ongoing Professional development in differentiation to meet the needs of all learners, including identifying and creating learning opportunities for students with different learning styles, will be conducted.

b) Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically-based research that:

- o Increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as extended school year, before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities.

Inquiry groups allow for extra intervention time, both in extended day time, and during center time in Kindergarten, for example. Inquiry interventions are conducted for the following student populations, bottom 1/3 in Reading and/or Math on K-6, ELL's, Special Needs, and High Achieving students.

After school and Saturday AIS programs sustain the intervention programs and practices that have been proven successful during previous Inquiry studies.

- o Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.

Interventions provided through careful data analysis, brainstorming discussions, scheduled and logged interventions are occurring throughout the school day, and after school, as noted in Inquiry logs. An enriched and accelerated curriculum is provided for students in the High Achieving group "Soar to the Top", 3 days per week, Mondays through Wednesdays, from 2:40 to 3:30 p.m.

- o Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.

The differentiation provided through the Teacher's College Reading Writing program is based on data from TC Assessment Pro, which is analyzed according to subgroups. Please see the Teacher's College Assessment Pro data analysis provided in the Needs Assessment section of this CEP for a discussion of meeting the needs of the underserved populations, specifically in Literacy.

- o Address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of low academic achieving children and those at risk of not meeting the State academic content standards and are members of the target population of any program that is included in the Schoolwide Program. These programs may include counseling, pupil services, mentoring services, college and career awareness/preparation, and the integration of vocational and technical education programs.

At risk guidance, SETSS, speech, OT and other services are provided to students who may be in danger of not meeting the standards, but are not ready for a referral to special education. Peer counseling programs, buddy programs, and Leadership programs provided by outside agencies are some of the ways that we meet the needs of any students in our school who may require extra services or interventions. As this is an elementary school, vocational programs do not apply at this time.

- o Are consistent with and are designed to implement State and local improvement, if any.

n/a

3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.



We recruit and select new teachers according to a rigorous process. A committee is formed, consisting interested staff members. Appropriate interview questions are discussed, and a rubric is created. Prior to the interview, each candidate must complete answer a curriculum-related question, in essay form. All candidates must prepare, and execute, and model lessons for the members of the committee. Interviewees are rated according to the rubric, and point scores tallied. A group discussion is held after the interviews, to compare and assess each candidate. Preference is given to candidates who have some exposure and experience working with the Columbia Teachers College Readers/Writers workshop model.

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.



Professional development is a top priority at P.S. 161. While we now longer have weekly after-school professional development, we provide ongoing professional development in a number of different ways. First, we have four staff developers, one UFT Teachers Center Literacy Specialist, one A.I.S. coordinator/staff developer, one Math coach, and one Technology/Data staff developer. These teachers model lessons for new teachers and teachers in need of extra instructional support. They also, along with other members of our Professional Development team, provide workshops during our once monthly Monday Faculty conferences. All teachers receive common grade preps with their colleagues each day. This allows for common planning periods, but also for a once weekly "Grade P.D." meeting. Information and best practices related to all areas of the curriculum are disseminated and discussed that these weekly meetings.

In the ongoing efforts to deepen our knowledge of, and to strengthen our delivery of the Columbia Teachers College Readers/Writers workshop, we continue to send our teachers to Monthly Calendar days at Teachers College. We have completed two years of professional development, and will continue to receive this benefit next year, from the on-site work of two Columbia Teachers College Reading/Writing staff developers. One is assigned to work with teachers on grades K-2, and the other is assigned to teachers on grades 3-6.

We have two Literacy Specialists. One Literacy Specialist is specifically assigned to Teachers on Grades K-2, and one on Grades 3-6.

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



While we do not "advertise" our positions, per se, the region is informed of our yearly vacancies, and these become posted on the Department of Education websites. We notify local schools of our vacancies, and invite staff members to recommend qualified candidates they may know. This increases the pool of candidates that are both certified and highly motivated to work in a school with rigorous standards.

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



An increase in special events has taken place at our school. On such special event, in the promotion of family literacy, is our Authors and Illustrators Night. Parents are invited to come to school and speak to a group of local published authors, and to purchase books for their students. This has been a very motivating and successful event. We intend to increase the number of special events and Curriculum-based Parent Workshops, as well as to schedule them at times more convenient to working parents.

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.



Our Pre-K teachers receive professional development in all curricular areas, with Grade K-2 materials and strategies, in addition to receiving specific Pre-K professional development. In their planning, teachers incorporate skills and concepts that help students to meet the Pre-K standards, but also will help them meet the challenges of the P.S. early childhood curriculum

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.



Professional development is offered in using data to drive instruction. One example of this is training on use of the Princeton Review Interim Assessment Website. This training enables teachers to find out what specific skills and concepts in Literacy and Math need supporting, for each individual student.

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.



We provide A.I.S. services in a variety of ways, and at a variety of times. Teachers push in during regular classroom instruction to provide differentiated instruction to students with special needs. In addition, small group instruction is offered to at-risk and special needs students four days per week, during our 50-minute Extended Day Program, three days per week. Saturday, before-school, and after-school programs, in addition to the above- mentioned, are for all students in Grades 1-6 that are performing below standards.

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.



Our students receive the benefits of a violence prevention program. Conflict resolution is the focus. It is called the Leadership program, and an outside consultant conducts residencies with selected classes, in order to complete long-term projects which integrate Literacy, research skills, art, social action, and performance activities. Final projects are presented to other students so that they may learn and benefit from the work of the students in the Leadership program.

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

Explanation/Background:

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

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

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

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

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

To be eligible for the flexibility consolidation of Federal funds enables, a Schoolwide Program school must identify in its Schoolwide plan (CEP) which programs are included in its consolidation and the amount each program contributes to the consolidated Schoolwide pool. Additionally, the school plan must document that it has met the intent and purposes of each program whose funds are consolidated. For

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

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

Program Name	Fund Source <i>(i.e., Federal, State, or Local)</i>	Program Funds Are "Conceptually" ¹ Consolidated in the Schoolwide Program			Amount Contributed to Schoolwide Pool <i>(Refer to Galaxy for school allocation amounts)</i>	Check (X) in the left column below to verify that the school has met the intent and purposes ² of each program whose funds are consolidated. Indicate goal number references where a related program activity has been described in this plan.	
		Yes	No	N/A		Check(x)	Page#(s)
Title I, Part A (Basic)	Federal	Yes			477,167	True	
Title I, Part A (ARRA)	Federal	Yes			16102	True	
Title II	Federal	Yes			130296	True	
Tax Levy	Local	Yes			3,402,351	True	
Title III	Federal	Yes			15,000	True	

¹**Reminder:** To consolidate funding in a Schoolwide Program, the school does not literally need to combine funds in a single account or pool with its own accounting code. Rather, the word "pool" is used conceptually to convey that a Schoolwide Program school has the use of all consolidated funds available to it for the dedicated function of operating a Schoolwide Program without regard to the identity of those funds.

Most Schoolwide Program (SWP) schools in NYC are conceptually consolidating all of their Federal, State, and Local funds, even though the Galaxy system reports the allocations in separate accounting codes.

²**Note:** The intent and purposes of the Federal programs indicated on the above chart are as follows:

- **Title I, Part A – Schoolwide Programs:** To upgrade the entire educational program in the school in order to improve the academic achievement of all students, particularly the lowest-achieving students.
- **Title II, Part A:** Supplementary funding to improve student academic achievement by reducing class size in grades K, 1, 2, and 3, with an emphasis on grades with average register greater than 20. If space is not available to form additional classes, funds may support push-in teacher(s) to supplement the instructional program.
- **Title III, Part A:** To help ensure that children with limited English proficiency become proficient in English, develop high academic attainment in English, and meet the same challenging State academic content and achievement standards in the core academic subjects that all other children are expected to meet. Another purpose of this program
 - is to increase the capacity of schools to establish, implement and sustain high-quality language instruction programs and English language development programs that assist schools in effectively teaching students with limited English proficiency. Title III, Part A is also designed to promote the participation of parents and communities of limited English proficient children in English language instruction programs.
- **Title IV:** To support programs that prevent violence in and around schools; prevent the illegal use of alcohol, tobacco and drugs; and involve parents and communities in efforts to foster a safe and drug-free learning environment that supports student achievement.
- **IDEA:** To ensure that all children with disabilities have available to them a free appropriate public education designed to meet their individual needs.

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.

n/a

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

n/a

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;

n/a

b. Help provide an accelerated, high –quality curriculum, including applied learning; and

n/a

c. Minimize removing children from the regular classroom during regular school hours;

n/a

4. Coordinate with and support the regular educational program;

n/a

5. Provide instruction by highly qualified teachers;

n/a

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

n/a

7. Provide strategies to increase parental involvement; and

n/a

8. Coordinate and integrate Federal, State and local services and programs.

n/a

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:

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

Supporting Students in Temporary Housing (STH)

As included in your Office of School and Youth Development Consolidated Plan STH Section and in accordance with the federal McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act and Chancellor's Regulation A-780, schools must identify, serve, and report on students living in temporary housing (STH). For more information on using Title I set-aside funds to support your STH population, please refer to the Frequently Asked Questions document on DOE's website:

<http://schools.nyc.gov/NR/ronlyres/9831364D-E542-4763-BC2F-7D424EBD5C83/58877/TitleIPartASetAsideforStudentsinTemporaryHousing.pdf>

Part A:

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 students

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

We will offer these students a place in our extended day program.

We will offer at-risk guidance services, including periodic monitoring.

Our Parent Coordinator will extend outreach to the family of these students, taking special care to invite them to all schoolwide events, encouraging PTA participation, etc.

Part B:

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).
N/A We are a title 1 school
2. Please describe the services you are planning to provide to the STH population with the Title I set-aside funds.
3. Some Non-Title I schools receive a specific allocation based on the reported number of students living in temporary housing. If your school received an allocation (please refer to the current Title I Funds Summary of School Allocation Memorandum), include the amount your school received in this question. If your school did not receive an allocation and needs assistance in identifying resources to assist STH students, please contact an STH liaison in your Children First Network.

CEP RELATED ATTACHMENTS

Attachment for 'Appendix 2 - Program Delivery for English Language Learners (ELLs)'

File Name - 28_28Q161_110410-150410.doc

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	District 28	School Number 161	School Name Arthur Ashe
Principal Jill Hoder	Assistant Principal Janice Egan		
Coach	Coach		
Teacher/Subject Area Reginald Pierre-Louis/ESL	Guidance Counselor		
Teacher/Subject Area Jane Ragno/ESL	Parent		
Teacher/Subject Area Nicole Gippetti/Special Ed.	Parent Coordinator Kathy Knowles		
Related Service Provider	Other Jennifer VanBenschoten/Grade 4		
Network Leader	Other Jesse Kahn/Grade 4		

B. Teacher Qualifications

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

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

C. School Demographics

Total Number of Students in School	799	Total Number of ELLs	94	ELLs as Share of Total Student Population (%)	11.76%
------------------------------------	------------	----------------------	-----------	---	---------------

Part II: ELL Identification Process

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

1. Describe the steps followed for the initial identification of those students who may possibly be ELLs. These steps must include administering the Home Language Identification Survey (HLIS) which includes the informal oral interview in English and in the native language, and the formal initial assessment. Identify the person(s) responsible, including their qualifications, for conducting the initial screening, administering the HLIS, the LAB-R (if necessary), and the formal initial assessment. Also describe the steps taken to annually evaluate ELLs using the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT).
2. What structures are in place at your school to ensure that parents understand all three program choices (Transitional Bilingual, Dual Language, Freestanding ESL)? Please describe the process, outreach plan, and timelines.
3. Describe how your school ensures that entitlement letters are distributed and Parent Survey and Program Selection forms are returned? (If a form is not returned, the default program for ELLs is Transitional Bilingual Education as per CR Part 154 [see tool kit].)
4. Describe the criteria used and the procedures followed to place identified ELL students in bilingual or ESL instructional programs; description must also include any consultation/communication activities with parents in their native language.
5. After reviewing the Parent Survey and Program Selection forms for the past few years, what is the trend in program choices that parents have requested? (Please provide numbers.)
6. Are the program models offered at your school aligned with parent requests? If no, why not? How will you build alignment between parent choice and program offerings? Describe specific steps underway.

Paste response to questions 1-6 here

PS 161 is located in the Richmond Hill section of Queens. The school has a total of 799 students in grades pre-kindergarten to grade six. The student population is 46% female and 54% male. The school population's ethnic breakdown is: 72% Asian or Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian, 16% Hispanic, 9% African or Caribbean American, 2% Caucasian, and less than 1% Multi-Racial and American Indian or Alaskan Native students.

Screening for possible English language program eligibility begins with an analysis of newly admitted students' Home Language Identification Surveys (HLIS), as well as an informal interview with the student and parents. If there is an indication through the survey or the interview that the home language is one other than English, the student is then administered the Language Assessment Battery-Revised to determine program eligibility. The test is scored in-house, and the student is placed accordingly using the scoring guide in the current LAB-R Memorandum. The entire screening and identification process is performed by two NYS certified ESL teachers. Once a student has been tested and is found to be entitled to receive English language services, an Entitlement letter is sent home to the parents in English and in the native language. Our school currently offers an ESL program only, based on parent choice. However, we continually monitor parent choices to look for changing trends. Parents who choose a program that is not offered in our school based on the numbers are referred to a school in the district that offers the program. Students whose home language is Spanish are administered the Spanish LAB by a bilingual Spanish-English teacher. Students who are eligible for ESL services as per their LAB-R scores are given services based on their proficiency levels and are assessed annually using the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT). The ESL teachers administer this test as well.

In order to ensure receipt of Parent Survey and Program Selection forms from all parents, the ESL teachers pull parents at the time of registration to view the video and complete the survey. If the parents are not able to see the video at the time of registration, the ESL teachers contact the parent and schedule an orientation session within the required 10-day period. Translation services at these sessions are provided by a combination of hired interpreters and bilingual school staff (ie, paraprofessionals). These sessions are offered both during the day and in the evening to accommodate all parents. Letters are sent home in English and in the home language. The survey and selection forms are also offered in the home language. During the orientation sessions, parents view the NYC DOE Orientation Video in their native language. Information concerning the three program choices is described in the video, and questions are then addressed, using interpreters as needed. Parents then complete the survey and selection forms at the end of the orientation session.

An analysis of the parent survey letters indicates that the majority of parents have been selecting English as a Second Language as their first program of choice.

Part III: ELL Demographics

A. ELL Programs

This school serves the following grades (includes ELLs and EPs)

K 1 2 3 4 5

Check all that apply

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 (60%:40% → 50%:50% → 75%:25%)														0
Dual Language (50%:50%)														0
Freestanding ESL														
Self-Contained														0
Push-In						1	1							2
Total	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

B. ELL Years of Service and Programs

Number of ELLs by Subgroups					
All ELLs	94	Newcomers (ELLs receiving service 0-3 years)	75	Special Education	14
SIFE	3	ELLs receiving service 4-6 years	16	Long-Term (completed 6 years)	3

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									Total	
	ELLs (0-3 years)			ELLs (4-6 years)			Long-Term ELLs (completed 6 years)				
	All	SIFE	Special Education	All	SIFE	Special Education	All	SIFE	Special Education		
TBE											0
Dual Language											0
ESL	75	3	2	16	0	9	3	0	3		94
Total	75	3	2	16	0	9	3	0	3		94

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

C. Home Language Breakdown and ELL Programs

Transitional Bilingual Education														
Number of ELLs by Grade in Each Language Group														
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOTAL
Spanish														0
Chinese														0
Russian														0
Bengali														0

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
Urdu														0
Arabic														0
Haitian														0
French														0
Korean														0
Punjabi														0
Polish														0
Albanian														0
Yiddish														0
Other														0
TOTAL	0													

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

Number of ELLs by Grade in Each Language Group

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

This Section for Dual Language Programs Only

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

Native American:	White (Non-Hispanic/Latino):	Other:
------------------	------------------------------	--------

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	6	3	2	8	3	2	2							26
Chinese														0
Russian														0
Bengali		2			2									4
Urdu	3	1	1	2	3									10
Arabic														0
Haitian														0
French														0
Korean														0
Punjabi	14	8	6	5	15	2	3							53
Polish														0
Albanian														0
Other		1												1
TOTAL	23	15	9	15	23	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

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.

Paste response to questions 1-4 here

The school has a freestanding ESL program, with a combination of the pull-out and push-in instructional models. In general, ELLs are grouped by proficiency level within the grade. Students are also serviced in both homogeneous and heterogeneous groups (ie, mixed proficiencies by grade level, and mixed proficiencies and mixed grade levels). In order to ensure that students receive the mandated number of instructional minutes, students are divided between the two ESL teachers. One teacher services Kindergarten through Grade 2; the other teacher services Grades 3 through 6.

To determine the number of minutes of service each student is mandated to receive, the ESL teachers, at the start of the school year, analyze the previous year's NYSESLAT scores and chart students according to grade and proficiency level. Newly admitted students are administered the LAB-R, and their grade and proficiency levels are included in the chart, as well. The teachers then determine which students scored at the Beginner and Intermediate levels and, therefore, require 360 minutes of English language instruction per week, versus those students who scored at the Advanced level, requiring 180 minutes of language instruction per week. In general, the two ESL teachers each service a range of students: students in Kindergarten through grade 2, and students in grades 3 through 6. In order to ensure that all students receive the mandated number of instructional minutes, the teachers see all students for one 45-minute period per day, plus an additional period per day for those requiring the 360 minutes per week. For example, an Advanced proficiency fourth grader receives one 45-minute period of ESL, whereas a Beginner level fourth grader receives two. For those Advanced students requiring 180 minutes of English Language Arts instruction, these students are not pulled for ESL during literacy, and therefore receive their mandated ELA instruction in their classroom.

ESL teachers provide content area support through the use of the school-based content area curricula, as well as the NYS content standards. The school's content area teachers provide the ESL teachers with a content calendar, which allows ESL teachers to plan a content-based ESL curriculum for ELLs. Text supported is provided in part by National Geographic's leveled nonfiction texts. Support is provided through the SIOP model, CALLA, and technology such as SmartBoard and internet tools. The ESL teachers regularly provide explicit instruction of language functions and structures that are taken directly from the content curriculum. They then follow this explicit instruction with contextualized modeling of the structures.

In order to make content comprehensible, the ESL teachers scaffold lessons with pictures and slide shows, videos (unitedstreaming.com), realia, graphic organizers, adaptation of text, TPR, and native language support (dual language dictionaries, translation through other students or staff, where possible).

Students in ELL subgroups receive a variety of support throughout the school. Students who get required services receive age and grade level appropriate services and resources. There are currently three identified SIFE students enrolled at the school. All three of these students receive extended-day AIS. In addition, two of the students receive AIS in Literacy during the school day, and one receives at-risk SETSS. These students' literacy and language progress is closely monitored by both the ESL, AIS, and SETSS teachers.

As per their IEP, ELLs with special needs are either placed in a grade-level Integrated Co-Teaching class, or they receive support through a number of service providers (speech, OT/PT, SETSS, guidance). With exception of the bussed children, kindergartener, and first grader, all of these students receive extended-day AIS as an additional support. Finally, the SETSS and AIS service providers meet with the ESL teacher regularly to assess the students' progress, evaluate their own teaching, and plan for instruction accordingly.

Newcomers are supported through highly-interactive lessons that include, for example, TPR, role-play, singing, and interactive reading and writing. One-on-one instruction is provided during class time when students are engaged in student-centered tasks. Newcomers receive additional language support through the LeapFrog Language First program, which is thematically-based. For those students who have been in an ESL program for less than 3 years, instruction is heavily content-based and is supported by various scaffolds. For example, graphic organizers, provision of background information, maps, and explicit language instruction focusing on academic language are used to support student learning. ESL teachers and classroom teachers provide ample practice of test-taking strategies to prepare ELLs for taking the NYS ELA exam.

Instruction for ELLs who have been receiving ESL services for 4 to 6 years is also highly content-based. In general, these students' greatest area of need is writing. To confront this challenge, students are supported through continuous and consistent emphasis on schema building, vocabulary development (including academic vocabulary), sentence structure, and planning for literacy tasks (ie, pre-reading and pre-writing strategies). These students also stay for an extended period of AIS three days per week for 45 minutes per session. There, the teacher focuses on each child's needs in a small-group format (fewer than 10 students). Currently, the school has three long-term ELLs. All three of these students have special needs and are receiving services based on those needs. In addition, they receive extended-day AIS for additional support.

NYS CR Part 154 Mandated Number of Units of Support for ELLs, Grades K-8

	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced
--	------------------	---------------------	-----------------

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

Paste response to questions 5-14 here

Students who have attained proficiency on the NYSESLAT within the last two years are supported by either an extended day period of AIS or consistent consultation between the ESL teachers and the classroom teacher (students who need more support are receiving extended day AIS, whereas students who are on or above grade level are monitored). In addition, these students receive the same testing modifications as do current ELLs on New York State standardized assessments, for up to two years after achieving proficiency on the NYSESLAT.

Intervention programs at PS 161 include Academic Intervention Services in literacy (1 teacher), and SETSS (2 teachers). All services are offered in English, unless otherwise specified by a student's IEP. ELLs at PS 161 receive these services based on their needs, which are assessed through their scores on the NYS ELA and Math tests. Because these intervention programs are provided to the entire student population, based on need, they are not limited to any subgroup of ESL student, nor are subgroups of ELLs inherently eligible to receive these services. Traditionally, the school offers a Title III after school program for ELLs in grades 3 through 6 that focuses on the content areas, as well as a Saturday school program in literacy for ELLs in grades 1 and 2. In addition, the school has created an ELL Inquiry Team that researches the effects of specific interventions on a targeted ELL population. The current population under inquiry includes ELLs in grades 3 and 4 who have been receiving ESL services for 3 years or more, and who have scored at the Advanced proficiency level for 2 years or more. The team attempts to identify interventions that will prepare Advanced proficiency children to pass the NYSESLAT, thereby becoming 'Proficient.'

There are two programs at PS 161 that the school plans to improve this year. Both programs are funded by Title III; thus, at this point, they are still speculative. The first program is the Title III After School Program for ELLs in grade 3 through 6. The major improvement that would be made to this program is to purchase and use Achieve 3000, the nonfiction-, technology-based literacy program. This addition would enhance the technology use in the program and also allow students and teacher a more systematic approach to accessing current events and topical issues that are an effective basis for language and content learning. The second program to be improved is the Title III Parent ESL Program. Last year, the program met for one and a half hours sessions, and the parents and teacher often stayed later. Due to the positive response from parents, the school plans to increase the session meeting times from one and a half to two hours to allow for more instructional time.

The school also plans to continue its content-based Title III after school program for ELLs and will apply for Title III funding to start a program for parents of ELLs. The school is also continuing its effort to make English language instruction a school-wide priority by providing professional development for all teachers of ELLs. The one program that will be discontinued is Achieve 3000, a literacy program. This program will be discontinued due to lack of funding; however, the school has been persistent in searching for grants that might allow for the reinstatement of the program.

In the past, PS 161 has offered several extracurricular programs to all of its students, including ELLs. These programs included after school and Saturday programs in test preparation, physical education, art, violin, and tennis. Due to budget cuts, the fate of these programs is currently unknown. Traditionally, however, ELLs have participated in all of these programs. ELLs have also been members of PS 161's student council. Participation in these programs is based on the desire of the students.

The school has a variety of content and language materials, including technology, to support ELLs. Texts include National Geographic's nonfiction library, big books, leveled and themed readers, dual language books, and English and dual-language dictionaries. For the lower grades, the predominant language-specific program used is Avenues by Hampton-Brown. Technology includes SmartBoards, Macbooks,

streaming video, digital voice recorders, and LeapFrog.

Native language support is provided through access to dual language dictionaries in English and the students' native languages. Students also have access to native language literature in the ESL classrooms and in the school library. These native language collections contain books in all languages currently spoken by students at PS 161. Within the ESL classroom, students provide each other with native language support, especially to newcomers. In the general education classroom, newcomers are paired with a 'buddy' who speaks his/her native language. Through Title III, the school has established a bilingual library for parents of ELLs. The library is located in the parent coordinator's room and is accessible to parents during school hours and parent-teacher conferences. Finally, when necessary, interpretation services are provided by in-house bilingual school staff (ie, paraprofessionals, teachers).

The school currently does not have any programs for newly-enrolled ELLs prior to the start of the school year, nor does it offer any language electives to its students, including ELLs.

C. Schools with Dual Language Programs

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

Paste response to questions 1-5 here

D. Professional Development and Support for School Staff

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

Paste response to questions 1-3 here

The school will enhance the skills of all teachers of ELLs through workshops. Professional development for the staff will be continuous throughout the school year. Professional development is and will be provided by members of the professional development team (literacy coaches, content area teachers, and ESL teachers). This professional development is provided during the school's designated common professional development period for teachers on each grade, and on days when students are not present. When possible, the school also intends to hire the help of qualified consultants. Among other topics, professional development will focus on the following areas:

Balanced Literacy components: Shared reading and writing, guided reading, independent reading and writing, reading aloud, and interactive writing

Academic Language (vocabulary, sentence structure)

Comprehensible Input

Adaptation of Materials

Scaffolding for ELLs

Strategies for ELLs at Different Proficiency Levels

Teachers will receive their required 7.5 hours of ELL training through these professional development workshops.

In addition to internal professional development, the school frequently sends to teachers to workshops at Teacher's College. The administration is also flexible in sending teachers to other external workshops within New York City.

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?

Paste response to questions 1-4 here

PS 161 welcomes and encourages parental involvement in several ways. The Parent Teacher Association (PTA) meets regularly once per month, as does the School Leadership Team, which also includes parents. Additionally, in the past few years, the school has increased its number of special events per year. These are open to all parents and families, and include Author/Illustrator night, Halloween Costume Ball, Thanksgiving potluck, Red-and-White Valentine's Day celebration, and Family Fun Day. The parent coordinator creates a calendar of parent activities that is sent home monthly. On days when there is no parent activity planned, the parent coordinator's room remains open to parents for inquiries and concerns, as well as for access to the internet, among other things.

As discussed above, PS 161 created a Title III bilingual library for parents of ELLs. The purpose of the library is to encourage literacy activities between parents of ELLs and their children, while building ELLs' comprehension skills and overall strength of their native language. In addition to the library, the school offers a Title III Parent ESL program. Last year (2009-2010) was the first year of the program, and it proved to be a great success. Since the start of this school year, several parents have asked for program information. The school plans to continue this program, pending Title III money. The school currently does not collaborate with external or community-based organizations to provide support for parents.

The school evaluates the needs of its parents primarily through its 'open door' policy that allows parents to make their requests known to the ESL teachers, and predominantly, to the Parent Coordinator. The Parent Coordinator is in consistent contact with the administrators and ESL teachers, forwarding information and discussing future parent activities. For example, the inception of the Title III Parent ESL Program was the result of several parents' inquiries made through the Parent Coordinator, who then passed these queries on to the ESL teachers.

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)	7	5	0	0	1	0	0							13
Intermediate(I)	5	7	2	1	6	1	1							23
Advanced (A)	11	3	7	14	16	3	4							58
Total	23	15	9	15	23	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

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

	A		1		14	15	3	3						
	P		1	7				1						

NYS ELA					
Grade	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total
3	4	7	5		16
4	2	1	1		4
5	1	4			5
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	1		11		7		1		20
4	1		1	1	2		1		6
5			2			1	2		5
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			1		2		2	1	6
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	2				3	1			6
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				
Math				
Math				
Biology				
Chemistry				
Earth Science				
Living Environment				
Physics				
Global History and Geography				
US History and Government				
Foreign Language				
Other				
Other				
NYSAA ELA				
NYSAA Mathematics				
NYSAA Social Studies				
NYSAA Science				

Native Language Tests

	# of ELLs scoring at each quartile (based on percentiles)				# of EPs (dual lang only) scoring at each quartile (based on percentiles)			
	Q1	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

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

Paste response to questions 1-6 here

The school uses the Teacher's College Reader's and Writer's Project as its literacy assessment tool for early literacy. An evaluation of assessment data from the kindergarten class in the spring of 2010 shows that most ELLs begin kindergarten with some emergent literacy skills. At the end of the school year, most ELLs are moving past the emergent literacy stage and into the early literacy stage. However, the expectation for students (non-ELLs) beginning first grade is a level D. Only one ELL scored at this level or higher. In view of these data, the ESL teachers will attempt to focus on bolstering the literacy skills of ELLs in Kindergarten, as well as taking a closer look at the TCRWP as a valid literacy assessment for ELLs.

An analysis of NYSESLAT and LAB-R data shows that students are progressing as they move up the grades. This is evident in the fact that there are fewer students at the beginner and intermediate levels as the grades progress. The data also show that most of the ELLs at PS 161 are at the Advanced proficiency level. Looking at the NYSESLAT modality data, we can see that nearly half of our students are proficient in Listening and Speaking, whereas about 12% of students scored proficient on the Reading and Writing. This is a continuous pattern and reflects research on second language learning that contends that reading and writing are the most challenging modalities and usually the last to master.

Looking at the students' proficiency levels and the content area test, there is no correlation between proficiency level and test score. However, we did notice that there is a greater ratio of student who scored a 1 on the ELA versus students who scored a 1 on the Math test. In fact, the number of students who scored a level 1 on the ELA is rather high, at nearly 30% (7 of 25 students).

In the past, the ESL teachers have used the results of the ELL Periodic Assessment to determine which areas of instruction (listening, reading, writing) need attention. The results of the Periodic Assessment tend to correlate with those of the NYSESLAT, showing that students' greatest areas of need are in reading and writing.

The school evaluates its ESL program based on a comparison of beginning and end-of-year data. At the start of the school year, the ESL teachers analyze students' NYSESLAT, ELA, and content area test scores. Additional consideration is given to factors such as years of service, attendance, home support, and special needs. The ESL teachers then create goals based on this analysis. As test scores become available during the school year and at the start of the subsequent year (for the NYSESLAT), they are reevaluated against the initial goals. This evaluation allows the ESL teachers to reflect on and modify instruction accordingly.

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		

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT

School Name:	P.S. 161 Arthur Ashe School					
District:	28	DBN:	28Q161	School		342800010161

DEMOGRAPHICS

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

Enrollment				Attendance - % of days students attended:			
<i>(As of October 31)</i>	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	<i>(As of June 30)</i>	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Pre-K	28	30	24		94.6	95.5	94.6
Kindergarten	100	111	106				
Grade 1	102	106	119	Student Stability - % of Enrollment:			
Grade 2	118	101	107	<i>(As of June 30)</i>	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Grade 3	100	123	102		94.4	93.3	93.0
Grade 4	112	113	136				
Grade 5	124	115	108	Poverty Rate - % of Enrollment:			
Grade 6	124	111	94	<i>(As of October 31)</i>	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Grade 7	0	0	0		84.3	92.1	94.4
Grade 8	0	0	0				
Grade 9	0	0	0	Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:			
Grade 10	0	0	0	<i>(As of June 30)</i>	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Grade 11	0	0	0		3	5	3
Grade 12	0	0	0				
Ungraded	0	0	1	Recent Immigrants - Total Number:			
Total	808	810	797	<i>(As of October 31)</i>	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
					3	3	3

Special Education				Suspensions (OSYD Reporting) - Total Number:			
<i>(As of October 31)</i>	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	<i>(As of June 30)</i>	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
# in Self-Contained Classes	0	0	0	Principal Suspensions	6	0	0
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	68	64	56	Superintendent Suspensions	0	2	2
Number all others	46	34	45				

These students are included in the enrollment information above.

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

English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment: (BESIS Survey)				Number of Staff - Includes all full-time staff:			
<i>(As of October 31)</i>	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	<i>(As of October 31)</i>	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
# in Transitional Bilingual Classes	0	0	TBD	Number of Teachers	63	63	61
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	TBD	Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	9	9	5
# receiving ESL services only	96	82	TBD				
# ELLs with IEPs	3	9	TBD				

These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	6	6	8
--	---	---	---	---

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	2	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	96.8	100.0	100.0
				% more than 2 years teaching in this school	73.0	81.0	95.1
				% more than 5 years teaching anywhere	58.7	68.3	78.7
Ethnicity and Gender - % of Enrollment:							
(As of October 31)	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	% Masters Degree or higher	95.0	94.0	98.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1.7	0.2	0.3	% core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers	100.0	98.8	100.0
Black or African American	10.0	9.6	9.0				
Hispanic or Latino	19.8	18.0	16.7				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific	65.3	68.3	71.3				
White	3.0	3.3	2.0				
Male	52.5	53.8	53.5				
Female	47.5	46.2	46.5				

2009-10 TITLE I STATUS

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

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

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:

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

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

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

American Indian or Alaska Native							
Black or African American	v	v	-				
Hispanic or Latino	v	v	-				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	v	v					
White	-	-	-				
Multiracial							
Students with Disabilities	v	v	-				
Limited English Proficient	v	v	-				
Economically Disadvantaged	v	v					
Student groups making	7	7	1				

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results – 2009-10		Quality Review Results – 2009-10					
Overall Letter Grade:	A	Overall Evaluation:					NR
Overall Score:	71.8	Quality Statement Scores:					
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data					
School Environment:	8.9	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals					
<i>(Comprises 15% of the</i>		Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals					
School Performance:	10.6	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals					
<i>(Comprises 25% of the</i>		Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise					
Student Progress:	40.5						
<i>(Comprises 60% of the</i>							
Additional Credit:	11.8						

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