



**ROBERT A. VAN WYCK  
MIDDLE SCHOOL 217  
*THE GREEN MAGNET SCHOOL FOR CAREER  
EXPLORATION***

**2010-2011  
SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN  
(CEP)**

**SCHOOL: 28Q217**

**ADDRESS: 85-05 144 STREET BRIARWOOD, NY 11435**

**TELEPHONE: 718-657-1120**

**FAX: 718-291-3668**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE.....3**

**SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE.....4**

**SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE.....5**

**PART A: NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION.....5**

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

**SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT.....10**

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

**SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN.....12**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE**

**SCHOOL NUMBER:** MS 217      **SCHOOL NAME:** ROBERT A VAN WYCK

**SCHOOL ADDRESS:** 85-05 144 STREET BRIARWOOD, NY 11435

**SCHOOL TELEPHONE:** 718-657-1120      **FAX:** 718-291-3668

**SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON:** PATRICK M BURNS      **EMAIL ADDRESS:** PBURNS3@SCHOOLS.NYC.GOV

**POSITION/TITLE**

**PRINT/TYPE NAME**

**SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON:** Patrick M. Burns

**PRINCIPAL:** Patrick M. Burns

**UFT CHAPTER LEADER:** Mark Faraci

**PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT:** Nicola Sutherland-Marrow

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

**DISTRICT AND NETWORK INFORMATION**

**DISTRICT:** 28      **CHILDREN FIRST NETWORK (CFN):** 208

**NETWORK LEADER:** John O'Mahoney

**SUPERINTENDENT:** Dr. Ffolkes-Bryant

## 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
Patrick M. Burns	*Principal or Designee	
Mark Faraci	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Nicola Sutherland-Marrow	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
	Title I Parent Representative <i>(suggested, for Title I schools)</i>	
	DC 37 Representative, if applicable	
	Student Representative <i>(optional for elementary and middle schools; a minimum of two members required for high schools)</i>	
	CBO Representative, if applicable	
David Norment	Member/ AP	
Karen Phillips	Member/ Teacher	
Marleyne Adman	Member/ Teacher	
Yvonne Edwards	Member/ Parent	
Dhanaram Rambharor	Member/ Parent	
Linda Suber	Member/ Parent	
Tina Waldman-Wallach	Member/ Parent	

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

\* Core (mandatory) SLT members.

## **SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE**

### **Part A. Narrative Description**

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

---

Robert A. Van Wyck M.S. 217, The Green Magnet School for Career Exploration is a grade 6–8 school. The Green Magnet offers the variety of academics and extracurricular activities of a large school, while providing the intimacy and personal attention of small learning communities. Teachers meet by discipline, academy, and class teams to consistently review student work, analyze student and school data, develop and revise learning goals for students, plan parent outreach, dialogue and strategize on instructional practice, and participate in school based professional development on differentiation, goal setting, and curriculum development founded on the principles of “Understanding by Design”, that aligns Big Ideas, Essential Questions, Enduring Understandings, Assessments, and real-world projects.

Students and parents appreciate the emphasis on project-based learning and technology integration. Every student and every teacher has a laptop; every classroom has a Smart Board, and projector. Students work on-line in Literacy, Social Studies, Science, Math, Art, and Language classes. Students are involved in: blogging, digital documentaries, videoconferencing, global web based science projects, SmartMusic, and wikispaces. All students receive an Apple laptop that remains their individualized learning tool through eighth grade. Our students develop the technological skills necessary for 21<sup>st</sup> century careers.

Teachers are developing curriculum maps that are interdisciplinary and aligned with the most recent discipline-based knowledge and understandings. These maps integrate Sustainability, Inquiry, Activism, Technology, and Careers with the NYC and NYS learning standards. Learning to be stewards of our planet, students explore the social, scientific, mathematical, and aesthetic components of sustainable living. They participate with knowledge and understanding in the democratic process. Students study real world issues from multiple perspectives, formulate questions, analyze systems, draw conclusions, and take actions to make a difference.

Our magnet and Urban Advantage partnerships provide our students, parents, and staff with an array of resources from: American Museum of Natural History, Queens Botanical Garden, Queens Museum of Art, Cloud Institute for Sustainability Education, NY Hall of Science, NY Aquarium, City Lore, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Teaching Matters, and the Renzulli Learning Systems. To accomplish our magnet mandates, our partners have developed academy and discipline-related professional developments and in-class residencies.

Students have opportunities to engage in varied programs that cater to their individual interests and learning styles. Programs include: Yearbook; Journalism; Lego Robotics; Animal Science Lab; Heart Surgery Program; Stock Market Game; Future Cities Engineering Program; Specialized High School Exam Prep; Integrated Algebra Regents; Achieve 3000 On-Line Literacy Program; Teaching Matters “Voices and Choices” debates; museum studies; science competitions; class and academy trips; Science, Technology and Career Fairs; and the NYS Living Environment Regents. Students participate in the Green Team; Spirit Week; dances; band and choral concerts; architectural exhibits and trips; peer tutoring and mentoring; talent and multi-cultural performances; and the Arista achievement programs. Celebrating the success of our students is a vital part of our school culture.

The Green Magnet School Physical Education program offers: CHAMPS, basketball, volleyball, soccer, Dance Squad, cheerleading, flag rugby, Special Olympics, Fitnessgram, and Fitness for Life. Art programs include

Instrumental Music: beginning and advanced band, jazz band, and strings; Visual Art: architecture, drawing, painting, design; Dance Choreography and Performance: ballet, tap, jazz, contemporary, African, Latin, and Hip Hop; Choral Vocal Development and Performance; and coaching for auditions at LaGuardia, Frank Sinatra, and other specialized art schools.

**SECTION III – Cont’d**

**Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot (SDAS)**

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT				
<b>School Name:</b>				
<b>District:</b>		<b>DBN #:</b>		<b>School BEDS Code:</b>

DEMOGRAPHICS									
<b>Grades Served in 2009-10:</b>	<input type="radio"/> Pre-K	<input type="radio"/> K	<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> 6	<input type="radio"/> 7
	<input type="radio"/> 8	<input type="radio"/> 9	<input type="radio"/> 10	<input type="radio"/> 11	<input type="radio"/> 12	<input type="radio"/> Ungraded			
<b>Enrollment:</b>				<b>Attendance: % of days students attended*</b>					
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10		
Pre-K									
Kindergarten				<b>Student Stability: % of Enrollment</b>					
Grade 1									
Grade 2									
Grade 3				<b>Poverty Rate: % of Enrollment</b>					
Grade 4									
Grade 5									
Grade 6				<b>Students in Temporary Housing: Total Number</b>					
Grade 7									
Grade 8									
Grade 9				<b>Recent Immigrants: Total Number</b>					
Grade 10									
Grade 11									
Grade 12				<b>Suspensions: (OSYD Reporting) – Total Number</b>					
Ungraded									
Total									
<b>Special Education Enrollment:</b>									
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10		
Number in Self-Contained Classes									

DEMOGRAPHICS								
No. in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes				Principal Suspensions				
Number all others				Superintendent Suspensions				
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>								
<b>English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:</b>				<b>Special High School Programs: Total Number</b>				
(BESIS Survey)				(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	CTE Program Participants				
# in Trans. Bilingual Classes				Early College HS Participants				
# in Dual Lang. Programs								
# receiving ESL services only				<b>Number of Staff: Includes all full-time staff</b>				
# ELLs with IEPs				(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	
<i>These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.</i>				Number of Teachers				
				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals				
<b>Overage Students: # entering students overage for grade</b>								
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals				
				<b>Teacher Qualifications:</b>				
<b>Ethnicity and Gender: % of Enrollment</b>				(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school				
American Indian or Alaska Native				Percent more than two years teaching in this school				
Black or African American				Percent more than five years teaching anywhere				
Hispanic or Latino								
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.				Percent Masters Degree or higher				
White				Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)				
Multi-racial								
<b>Male</b>								

DEMOGRAPHICS							
Female							

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

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

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

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

## SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

### **Our school's strengths and accomplishments:**

1. **NCLB AYP Status: SCHOOL IN GOOD STANDING** – as per 2010 NCLB status

2. **“Closing the Achievement Gap”**:

Our school achieved exemplary gains on the April 2010 NYS ELA exam, for the following student groups:

- Self Contained SWD
- CTT
- SETSS
- English Language Learners
- Lowest Third Citywide

Our school achieved exemplary gains on the May 2010 NYS Mathematics exam, for the following student groups:

- CTT
- English Language Learners
- Lowest Third City Wide
- Self Contained SWD
- SETSS

3. **2010 School Progress Report**

Results indicate our students outperformed the median percentile for both the city and peer horizon in ELA and Math Progress.

#### **4. Curriculum Development:**

Our curriculum design team has utilized the Understanding By Design curriculum philosophy to re-write our core subject (ELA, Science , and Social Studies) curriculum. Sample units are available on our school wiki at <http://greenmagnet217.wikispaces.com/>

#### **5. Teacher Team Planning:**

During the school year 2010-2011 our teacher teams will continue to meet weekly to review student data, set grade/class/student group targets, author unit assessments, plan and execute differentiated instructional strategies. Sample teacher team plans are available at <http://ms217focusgoals2010.wikispaces.com/>

### **Areas for Improvement**

1. Our 2009-2010 Learning Environment results indicate a need for improvement in the following areas:
  - a) Increase opportunities to communicate to parents what their children are studying in school
  - b) Increase opportunities to communicate to parents information on services for the parent and/or their child such as tutoring, after school programs, or workshops the parent can attend to help their child
  - c) Address the negative concern students have in reference to “students that get good grades in my school are respected by other students.”
  - d) Address the unsatisfactory student response data to the question “Most students in my school just look out for themselves.”
  
2. Our 2010 School Progress report indicates the following areas for improvement:
  - a) Our 91.4% student attendance rate places us below the 15<sup>th</sup> percentile in comparison to our Peer Horizon, and in the 39<sup>th</sup> percentile in comparison to the City.
  - b) Our percentage of students scoring at proficiency on the NYS ELA exam is equal to 42%. This percentage places us in the 39<sup>th</sup> percentile in comparison to our Peer Horizon, and in the 44<sup>th</sup> percentile in comparison to the City.
  - c) Our percentage of students scoring at proficiency on the NYS Mathematics exam is equal to 52.4%. This percentage places us in the 33<sup>rd</sup> percentile in comparison to our Peer Horizon, and in the 41<sup>st</sup> percentile in comparison to the City.
  
3. Our 2009-2010 NYS School Report Card indicates the following areas for improvement:
  - a) The student group defined as “Students with Disabilities” failed to meet AYP on the 2010 NYS ELA exam.
  - b) The student group defined as “Limited English Proficient” failed to meet AYP on the 2010 NYS ELA exam.

## **Barriers to Achievement**

We have identified the following barriers to achievement that we will work on this year in our department and cross-content area teacher teams:

- Diverse learning needs of our student population specifically within the population of ELL, and SWD
- Diverse languages of our learning community (26 languages identified)
- Significant decrease in our school budget
- Economic challenges facing our parent population create an additional obstacle to parent-school collaboration. Our community is comprised of a strong working class. Due to the new challenges created by the economic downturn a significant number of our students' parents have been forced to work additional hours/jobs or have had to find new employment opportunities. This places a significant burden on their time to participate in school activities.
- Time for teacher team planning. Although our school program has systems built in that do provide teachers an opportunity to meet multiple times per week we still struggle with the obstacle of time as a barrier to collaborative work.

### **ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS DEPARTMENT**

#### **ANALYSIS OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE FOR THE LAST FOUR YEARS (2006 -2010)**

**Prepared by: Dr. Barbara Kendall, Assistant Principal**

#### **GRADE 6:**

The percentage of students performing at Performance Levels 3 & 4 moved from 54%, to 50% to 82% and then to 45% from 2007 to 2010. The steep decline of 37% from 2009 to 2010 forced a concentration of 17% of students at Level 1 in 2010 (see Table 1).

Even though our student performance at PL 3 & 4 in 2010 indicates a 5% above citywide performance, there is need for immediate intervention with students in PLs 1 and 2 in order to decrease the percentages at both levels.

Great instructional emphasis will be placed on **39%** of students who are at **PL2**.

#### **GRADE 7:**

The percentage of students performing at Performance Levels 3 & 4 moved from 55%, to 66% to 78% and then to 44% from 2007 to 2010. The steep decline of 34% from 2009 to 2010 forced a concentration of 11% of students at Level 1 in 2010 (see Table 2).

Even though our student performance at PL 3 & 4 in 2010 indicates a 6% above citywide performance, there is need for immediate intervention with students in PLs 1 and 2 in order to decrease the percentages at both levels.

Great instructional emphasis will be placed on **45%** of students who are at **PL2**.

#### **GRADE 8:**

The percentage of students performing at Performance Levels 3 & 4 moved from 48%, to 50% to 62% and then to 37% from 2007 to 2010. The steep decline of 25% from 2009 to 2010 forced a concentration of 10% of students at Level 1 in 2010 (see Table 3).

Even though our student performance at PL 3 & 4 in 2010 indicates a 5% above citywide performance, there is need for immediate intervention with students in PLs 1 and 2 in order to decrease the percentages at both levels.

Great instructional emphasis will be placed on **52%** of students who are at **PL2**.

## **GRADEWIDE PERFORMANCE ON NYS STANDARDS ON THE 2010 ELA EXAM**

### **GRADE 6**

**Analysis of Data:** The items on the 2010 NYS ELA Exam were grouped under three NYS Performance Standards namely; Information and Understanding, Literary Response and Expression, and Critical Analysis and Evaluation. The data indicated that our Grade 6 students scored 79%, 74%, and 62% respectively on those standards. Our student performance on Information & Understanding and Literary Response & Expression is the same in those two areas as the citywide performance. Students, however, performed 1% higher than the citywide students on the standard of Critical Analysis and Evaluation.

Even though our students outperformed the citywide students on the standard of Critical Analysis and Evaluation, this is an area of concern for more rigorous instruction, since our students performed the lowest on this standard (17% and 14% lower compared to the other two standards respectively, see Tables 4a and 4b). Performance on this third standard bore similar results on the benchmark exam that was given to students in October, 2010.

**Action Plan:** Teachers will review test questions from 2010 NYS ELA Exam (using the item analysis) and exams from prior 4 years, in the category of Critical Analysis and Evaluation. They will analyze the structure of those questions and use appropriate text for practicing responses in this area.

### **GRADE 7:**

**Analysis of Data:** The items on the 2010 NYS ELA Exam were grouped under three NYS Performance Standards namely; Information and Understanding, Literary Response and Expression, and Critical Analysis and Evaluation. The data indicated that our Grade 7 students scored 79%, 84%, and 73% respectively on those standards. Our student performance on Information & Understanding and Literary Response & Expression is 2% higher than citywide performance. In addition, our students performed 3% higher than the citywide students on the standard of Critical Analysis and Evaluation. Even though our students outperformed the citywide students on all three standards, Critical Analysis and Evaluation still remains an area of concern for more rigorous instruction, since our students performed the lowest on this standard (6% and 11% lower compared to the other two standards respectively, see Table 5a and 5b). Performance on this third standard bore similar results on the benchmark exam that was given to students in October, 2010.

**Action Plan:** Teachers will review test questions from 2010 NYS ELA Exam (using the item analysis) and exams from prior 4 years in the category of Critical Analysis and Evaluation. They will analyze the structure of those questions and use appropriate text for practicing responses in this area.

## **GRADE 8:**

**Analysis of Data:** The items on the 2010 NYS ELA Exam were grouped under three NYS Performance Standards namely; Information and Understanding, Literary Response and Expression, and Critical Analysis and Evaluation. The data indicated that our Grade 8 students scored 71%, 81%, and 70% respectively on those standards. Our student performance on Information & Understanding indicated an even performance when compared to citywide student performance. However, in Literary Response & Expression and Critical Analysis and Evaluation, our students scored 1% higher than the citywide performance. Even though our students showed even and outperformed the citywide students on the second and third standards, Critical Analysis and Evaluation still remains an area of concern for more rigorous instruction, since our students performed the lowest on this standard (1% and 11% lower compared to the other two standards respectively, see Table 6a and 6b). Performance on this third standard bore similar results on the benchmark exam that was given to students in October, 2010.

**Action Plan:** Teachers will review test questions from 2010 NYS ELA Exam (using the item analysis) and exams from prior 4 years in the category of Critical Analysis and Evaluation. They will analyze the structure of those questions and use appropriate text for practicing responses in this area.

## **ANALYSIS OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE BY AVERAGE SCALE SCORE OF GENERAL STUDENT POPULATION (2006 – 2010 – see Table 7)**

### **GRADE 6 STUDENTS**

Students in this grade achieved an average scale score of 630 in 2007, 660 in 2008, 667 in 2009, and 667 in 2010. This marked an increasing trend in scale score from 2007 to 2010. There was a significant upswing of 30 points from 2007 to 2008.

### **GRADE 7 STUDENTS**

Students in this grade achieved an average scale score of 620 in 2006, 655 in 2007, 658 in 2008, 665 in 2009, and 662 in 2010. This indicated an upward trend from 2006 to 2009, with a slight decline of 3 points in 2010 over 2009. The scale score ranged from 620 to 665.

### **GRADE 8 STUDENTS**

Students in this grade achieved an average scale score of 663 in 2006, 658 in 2007, 660 in 2008, 664 in 2009, and 663 in 2010. This indicated a mild fluctuating trend, starting with a 5 points decrease in 2007 over 2006. Then there was an upswing from 2007 to 2009 and a slight decline of 1 point in 2010. The scale score peaked at 664 in 2009.

## **CROSS COMPARISON AMONG GRADES ON SCALE SCORE ACHIEVEMENT**

All three grades showed an upward climb of average scale scores from 2007 to 2009. Grades 7 and 8 experienced a decline in average scale score from 2009 to 2010, while grade 6 maintained the same average scale score from 2009 to 2010. In 2010, grade 6 students gained the highest average scale score when compared to grades 7 and 8.

## **ANALYSIS OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE BY SCALE SCORE BY GRADE AND BY SUB-GROUP (2006 – 2010 )**

### **WHITE STUDENTS (see Table 8)**

#### **GRADE 6 WHITE STUDENTS:**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 700 points in 2008, 690 in 2009, and 695 in 2010. Even though the average scale score was 5% higher in 2010 than 2009, student performance at PL 3& 4 plummeted from 82% in 2009 to 45% in 2010.

#### **GRADE 7 WHITE STUDENTS:**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 661 points in 2006, 658 in 2007, 660 in 2008, 655 in 2009, and 659 in 2010. Even though the average scale score was 4% lower in 2009 than 2010, student performance at PL 3& 4 significantly plummeted from 62% in 2009, to 37% in 2010. The trend of scale score achievement did not show any significant fluctuation from 2006 to 2010. The scale score ranged from 655 to 661 within this period.

#### **GRADE 8 WHITE STUDENTS:**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 659 points in 2007, 655 in 2008, 659 in 2009, and 658 in 2010. Even though the average scale score was 1% lower in 2010 than 2009, student performance at PL 3& 4 significantly plummeted from 78% in 2009 to 44% in 2010. The trend was relatively steady from 2007 to 2010 with a scale score that ranged from 655 to 659.

#### **ACROSS GRADE ANALYSIS**

White students in grade 6 gained the highest scale scores over grade 7 and grade 8 students. Grade 6 students gained scale score as high as 700 in 2008.

### **AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKAN STUDENTS (see Table 9)**

#### **GRADE 6 AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKAN STUDENTS:**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 659 points in 2007, 683 in 2008, 660 in 2009, and 670 in 2010. There was an increasing trend in the scale score. There was a steep rise of 24 points from 2007 over 2008. This was followed by a great decline of 23 points in 2009 and then an upward gain of 10 points in 2010. Even though the average scale score was 10 points higher in 2010 than 2009, student performance at PL 3& 4 significantly plummeted from 78 % in 2009 to 44% in 2010.

#### **GRADE 7 AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKAN STUDENTS:**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 650 points in 2007, 655 in 2008, 655 in 2009, and 665 in 2010. There was an increasing trend in the scale score over the four year period, with a range from 650 to 665. Even though the average scale score was 10 points higher in 2010 than 2009, student performance at PL 3& 4 significantly plummeted from 82 % in 2009 to 45% in 2010.

#### **GRADE 8 AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKAN STUDENTS:**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 547 points in 2007, 622 in 2008, 650 in 2009, and 650 in 2010. There was an increasing trend in the scale score over the four year period, with a range from 547 to 650. Even though the average scale score was the same in 2009 and 2010, student performance at PL 3& 4 significantly plummeted from 62 % in 2009 to 37% in 2010.

## **ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER STUDENTS (see Table 10)**

### **GRADE 6 ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 628 points in 2007, 668 in 2008, 679 in 2009, and 670 in 2010. There was an increasing trend in the scale score from 2007 to 2009, with a significant rise of 40 points from 2007 to 2008. This was followed by a decline of 9 points in 2010 over 2009. Even though the average scale score was 9 points higher in 2009 over 2010, student performance at PL 3& 4 significantly plummeted from 78 % in 2009 to 44% in 2010

### **GRADE 7 ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 615 points in 2006, 667 in 2007, 668 in 2008, 670 in 2009, and 668 in 2010. There was an increasing trend in the scale score over the four year period, with a range from 615 to 670 with a slight downturn of 2 points in 2010 over 2009. Even though the average scale score was 2 points higher in 2009, student performance at PL 3& 4 significantly plummeted from 82 % in 2009 to 45% in 2010.

### **GRADE 8 ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 668 points in 2006, 660 in 2007, 665 in 2008, 670 in 2009, and 670 in 2010. There was a fluctuating trend in the scale score over the four year period, with a range from 660 to 670. Even though the average scale score was the same in 2009 and 2010, student performance at PL 3& 4 significantly plummeted from 62 % in 2009 to 37% in 2010.

## **BLACK NOT HISPANIC STUDENTS (see Table 11)**

### **GRADE 6 BLACK NOT HISPANIC STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 660 points in 2008, 665 in 2009, and 667 in 2010. There was an increasing trend in the scale score from 2008 to 2010 with a range of 660 to 667. Even though the average scale score increased by 2 points in 2010, student performance at PL 3& 4 significantly plummeted from 78 % in 2009 to 44% in 2010

### **GRADE 7 BLACK NOT HISPANIC STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 600 points in 2006, 650 in 2007, 655 in 2008, 667 in 2009, and 660 in 2010. There was an increasing trend in the scale score from 2006 to 2009 and a 7 points decline in 2010 over 2009. The 7 points decline in scale score in 2010, resulted in a significant drop from 82 % in 2009 to 45% in 2010 of the performance of students at PL 3 & 4.

### **GRADE 8 BLACK NOT HISPANIC STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 658 points in 2006, 655 in 2007, 667 in 2008, 660 in 2009, and 660 in 2010. There was a fluctuating trend in the scale score over the four year period, with a range from 655 to 667. Even though the average scale score was the same in 2009 and 2010, student performance at PL 3& 4 significantly plummeted from 62 % in 2009 to 37% in 2010.

## **HISPANIC STUDENTS (see Table 12)**

### **GRADE 6 HISPANIC STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 660 points in 2008, 665 in 2009, and 667 in 2010. There was an increasing trend in the scale score from 2008 to 2010 with a range of 660 to 667. Even though the average scale score increased by 2 points in 2010. Student performance at PL 3 & 4 significantly plummeted from 78 % in 2009 to 44% in 2010.

### **GRADE 7 HISPANIC STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 600 points in 2006, 650 in 2007, 655 in 2008, 667 in 2009, and 660 in 2010. There was an increasing trend in the scale score from 2006 to 2009 and a 7 points decline in 2010 over 2009. The 7 points decline in scale score in 2010, resulted in a significant drop from 82 % in 2009 to 45% in 2010 of the performance of students at PL 3 & 4.

### **GRADE 8 HISPANIC STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 658 points in 2006, 655 in 2007, 667 in 2008, 660 in 2009, and 660 in 2010. There was a fluctuating trend in the scale score over the four year period, with a range from 655 to 667. Even though the average scale score was the same in 2009 and 2010, student performance at PL 3& 4 significantly plummeted from 62 % in 2009 to 37% in 2010.

## **NON-POVERTY STUDENTS (see Table 13)**

### **GRADE 6 NON-POVERTY STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 635 points in 2007, 672 in 2008, 680 in 2009, and 672 in 2010. There was an increasing trend in the scale score from 2007 to 2009 with a significant increase of 37 points from 2007 to 2008. The average scale score decreased by 8 points in 2010, resulting in a significant drop from 78 % in 2009 to 44% in 2010 in the student performance at levels 3 & 4.

### **GRADE 7 NON-POVERTY STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 628 points in 2006, 655 in 2007, 657 in 2008, 665 in 2009, and 660 in 2010. There was an increasing trend in the scale score from 2006 to 2009 and a 5 points decline in 2010 over 2009. The 5 points decline in scale score in 2010, resulted in a significant drop from 82 % in 2009 to 45% in 2010 of the performance of students at PL 3 & 4.

### **GRADE 8 NON-POVERTY STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 665 points in 2006, 659 in 2007, 661 in 2008, 663 in 2009, and 668 in 2010. There was a fluctuating trend in the scale score over the four year period, with a range from 659 to 668. Even though the average scale score increased by 5 points 2010 over 2009, student performance at PL 3& 4 significantly plummeted from 62 % in 2009 to 37% in 2010.

## **POVERTY STUDENTS (see Table 14)**

### **GRADE 6 POVERTY STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 625 points in 2007, 650 in 2008, 654 in 2009, and 664 in 2010. There was an increasing trend in the scale score from 2007 to 2010 with a climbing range of 625 to 664. Even though the average scale score increased by 10 points in 2010, student performance at PL 3& 4 significantly plummeted from 78 % in 2009 to 44% in 2010.

### **GRADE 7 POVERTY STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 620 points in 2006, 657 in 2007, 659 in 2008, 667 in 2009, and 660 in 2010. There was an increasing trend in the scale score from 2006 to 2009 and a 7 points decline in 2010 over 2009. The 7 points decline in scale score in 2010, resulted in a significant drop from 82 % in 2009 to 45% in 2010 of the performance of students at PL 3 & 4.

### **GRADE 8 POVERTY STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 659 points in 2006, 650 in 2007, 668 in 2008, 664 in 2009, and 659 in 2010. There was a fluctuating trend in the scale score over the four year period, with a range from 650 to 664.

### **CROSS COMPARISON OF NON-POVERTY Vs POVERTY STUDENTS**

Analysis of the scale scores indicated that students in grades 6 and 8 in the Non-Poverty subgroup, outperformed students in the Poverty subgroup for each year under comparison. However, grade 7, students in the Poverty subgroup outperformed students in the Non-Poverty subgroup from 2007 to 2010.

### **ELL STUDENTS (see Table 15)**

#### **GRADE 6 ELL STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 638 points in 2007, 606 in 2008, 600 in 2009, and 640 in 2010. There was a fluctuating trend in the scale score from 2007 to 2010 with a range of 600 to 640. There was a significant rise of 40 points in 2010, over 2009.

#### **GRADE 7 ELL STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 608 in 2007, 600 in 2008, 632 in 2009, and 638 in 2010. There was a decrease of 8 points in the scale score from 2007 to 2008, however there was tremendous progress of 32 points from 2008 to 2009. This increasing trend continued into 2010 with a further gain in scale score of 8 points.

#### **GRADE 8 ELL STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 605 points in 2006, 610 in 2007, 635 in 2008, 638 in 2009, and 638 in 2010. There was a steady increasing trend in the scale score over the four year period, with a range from 605 to 638.

#### **One General Observation on the ELL STUDENTS:**

When compared to ELL students in the other grades, in 2010, grade 6 ELL students outperformed other ELL students in grades 7 and 8.

### **SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS (see Table 16)**

#### **GRADE 6 SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 590 points in 2007, 588 in 2008, 585 in 2009, and 650 in 2010. There was a fluctuating trend in the scale score from 2007 to 2010 with a range of 585 to 650. There was a significant rise of 65 points in 2010, over 2009.

### **GRADE 7 SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 605 in 2007, 590 in 2008, 625 in 2009, and 630 in 2010. There was a decrease of 15 points in the scale score from 2007 to 2008, however there was tremendous progress of 35 points from 2008 to 2009. This increasing trend continued into 2010 with a further gain in scale score of 5 points.

### **GRADE 8 SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 610 points in 2006, 610 in 2007, 630 in 2008, 638 in 2009, and 637 in 2010. There was increasing trend in the scale score over the four year period, with a range from 610 to 638. There was a steep rise of 20 points in 2008 over 2007.

### **One General Observation on the SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS:**

When compared to SE students in the other grades, in 2010, grade 6 SE students outperformed other SE students in grades 7 and 8.

## **RESOURCE ROOM STUDENTS (see Table 17)**

### **GRADE 6 RESOURCE ROOM STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 678 in 2008, 660 in 2009, and 668 in 2010. There was a fluctuating trend in the scale score from 2008 to 2010 with a range of 660 to 678. There was a significant decline of 18 points in 2009, over 2008.

### **GRADE 7 RESOURCE ROOM STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 642 in 2007, 657 in 2008, 665 in 2009, and 660 in 2010. There was an increasing trend from 2007 to 2009, then a sudden decrease of 5 points in the scale score from 2009 to 2010.

### **GRADE 8 RESOURCE ROOM STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 661 points in 2006, 657 in 2007, 660 in 2008, 660 in 2009, and 658 in 2010. There was a mild fluctuating trend in the scale score over the four year period, with a range from 657 to 660.

### **One General Observation on RESOURCE ROOM STUDENTS:**

When compared to resource room students in the other grades, in 2010, grade 6 resource room students outperformed other resource room students in grades 7 and 8.

## **SETTS STUDENTS (see Table 18)**

### **GRADE 6 SETTS STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 639 in 2007, 638 in 2008, 650 in 2009, and 650 in 2010. There was a mild fluctuating trend in the scale score from 2008 to 2010 with a range of 638 to 650.

### **GRADE 7 SETTS STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 628 in 2006, 632 in 2007, 640 in 2008, 652 in 2009, and 652 in 2010. There was a steady increasing trend from 2006 to 2010 with a range from 628 to 652.

### **GRADE 8 SETTS STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 638 points in 2006, 638 in 2007, 643 in 2008, 653 in 2009, and 653 in 2010. There was an increasing trend in the scale score over the four year period, with a range from 638 to 653.

### **One General Observation on the SETTS STUDENTS:**

When compared to SETTS students in the other grades, in 2010, grade 8 SETTS students outperformed other SETTS students in grades 6 and 7.

## **TT STUDENTS (see Table 19)**

### **GRADE 6 TT STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 642 in 2008, 645 in 2009, and 660 in 2010. There was an increasing trend in the scale score from 2008 to 2010 with a range of 642 to 660.

### **GRADE 7 TT STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 630 in 2006, 625 in 2007, 638 in 2008, 648 in 2009, and 650 in 2010. There was a fluctuating trend from 2006 to 2010 with a range from 625 to 650. There was a steep rise of 10 points from 2008 to 2009.

### **GRADE 8 TT STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 615 points in 2006, 620 in 2007, 640 in 2008, 652 in 2009, and 650 in 2010. There was an increasing trend in the scale score from 2006 to 2009 and a slight decline of 2 points from 2009 to 2010.

### **One General Observation on the TT STUDENTS:**

When compared to students in the other grades, in 2010, grade 6 ELL students outperformed other ELL students in grades 7 and 8.

## **FEMALE STUDENTS (see Table 20)**

### **GRADE 6 FEMALE STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 640 in 2007, 642 in 2008, 647 in 2009, and 647 in 2010. There was an increasing trend in the scale score from 2007 to 2010 with a range of 640 to 647.

### **GRADE 7 FEMALE STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 618 in 2006, 660 in 2007, 662 in 2008, 664 in 2009, and 661 in 2010. There was an increasing trend from 2006 to 2009 and a range from 618 to 664. There was a slight decline of 3 points in 2009 to 2010.

### **GRADE 8 FEMALE STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 665 points in 2006, 659 in 2007, 662 in 2008, 668 in 2009, and 667 in 2010. There was a fluctuating trend in the scale score from 2006 to 2010, with a range from 662 to 668 over this four year period.

**One General Observation on the Female Students:**

When compared to female students in the other grades, female students in grade 8 showed a scale score average above 650 points throughout the four year period. Thus, in 2010, grade 8 female students outperformed other female students in grades 6 and 7.

**MALE STUDENTS (see Table 21)**

**GRADE 6 MALE STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 620 in 2007, 660 in 2008, 664 in 2009 and 664 in 2010. There was an increasing trend in the scale score from 2007 to 2010 with a range of 620 to 664.

**GRADE 7 MALE STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 625 in 2006, 650 in 2007, 652 in 2008, 664 in 2009, and 660 in 2010. There was an increasing trend 2006 to 2009, with a range from 625 to 664. There was a decline of 4 points from 2009 to 2010.

**GRADE 8 MALE STUDENTS**

Students in this sub-group achieved an average scale score of 662 points in 2006, 650 in 2007, 659 in 2008, 660 in 2009, and 660 in 2010. There was a decrease of 12 points from 2006 to 2007, then an upward swing of 9 points from 2007 to 2008. Performance hovered around 660 from 2008 to 2010.

**One General Observation on the MALE STUDENTS:**

When compared to male students in the other grades, in 2010, grade 6 male students outperformed other male students in grades 7 and 8.

# *Analysis Report of Mathematical Proficiency Data*

## **INTRODUCTION**

Following is an analysis of data provided by results of the 2007 through 2010 assessments of mathematical proficiency administered to all 6<sup>th</sup>-, 7<sup>th</sup>-, and 8<sup>th</sup>-grade students at M.S. 217. The aggregated data is represented by all student scale scores of the mathematics assessment of 2010. That data has been disaggregated for closer inspection. A model for Data-Driven Dialogue requires four steps for effectively utilizing data to drive discussions and assist in drawing accurate and usable information from said data. In that regard, a similar process has been implemented in my analysis of the 2010 Mathematics Proficiency and scale scores data.

## **DATA-DRIVEN ANALYSIS**

Phase 1, the prediction phase of data analysis, was utilized to make predictions and pose pertinent questions about the data to be examined. In this case, the crucial questions driving the examination of the math scale scores for 2010 are: In what areas does the data show a need for improvement? In what areas are strengths most evident? And, how can the data be used to develop an improvement plan?

Phase 2 requires the visualization of data. This enables the data to become more accessible for analysis and comparison. Please find a visualization of the 2010 scale scores following this report. The graphs contained therein enable a clear and visual analysis of the NYS mathematics scale scores disaggregated by grade level and subgroups, as well as an annual comparison.

Phase 3 requires an analysis of the data, to follow. The mathematics scale scores data has been examined for patterns and trends. In addition, an analysis of the disaggregated data has allowed scrutiny of scale scores for anomalies.

Phase 4, drawing inferences and tentative conclusions, allows for the development of a forward-looking plan for improvement based on concrete evidence in data of weakness and strength areas.

## **ANALYSIS OF 2010 NYS MATHEMATICS EXAMINATION RESULTS**

### **Performance Levels**

The Grade 6 NYS Math Exam 2010 Performance Levels Graph illustrates the percentage of students at M.S. 217 scoring at performance levels 1 through 4 as compared with citywide performance. Examination of that data reveals that the largest overall percentage of grade 6 students performed at Level 2 with 41% placing there. This was consistent with the citywide result of 35% of all students measuring at the Level 2 mark. The Grade 7 NYS Math Exam 2010 Performance Level data, however,

revealed the majority of students at M.S. 217, 37%, performing at a Level 3, beating the citywide's 29% by 6%. Level 4 achievement was reached by 20% of M.S. 217 students, just trailing the citywide's 23%. Lastly, Grade 8 NYS Math Exam 2010 Performance Level data again revealed majority student groups at levels 2 and 3, 42% and 32%, respectively, both just slightly higher than the citywide percentages for those achievement levels. Level 4 performance in Grade 8 accounted for 16%, similar to the 17% of citywide students who reached that level.

Examination of year-to-year changes in proficiency yielded expected decreases. In 2010, 44% of 6<sup>th</sup> graders scored at a Level 3 or 4, down from the prior year's 74%. Simultaneously, the percentage of students scoring at a Level 1 rose from 6% to 15% in the one-year period. Those results were consistent across grade level, as grade 7 students achieving a Level 3 or 4 dropped from 87% to 57% from 2009 to 2010, while Level 1 percentages went from 1% to 8%. In 8<sup>th</sup> grade, students scoring Levels 3 or 4 decreased to 48% from 66% from 2009 to 2010. During the same period, students scoring at a Level 1 increased from 4% to 10%.

Most important to note regarding the aforementioned data is the prior expectation and understanding of the drop in proficiency. Changes and realignment of state benchmarks and standards implemented as part of the 2010 NYS Mathematics Assessment make direct year-to-year comparison unreliable. As a result, scale scores, which remained consistent, will be examined for year-to-year purposes so that a more relevant and action-oriented discussion of the data may ensue.

### **Year-to-Year Scale Scores**

Overall, scale scores trended downward from 2009 to 2010. Grade 6 average scale scores fell from 685.1566265 to 672.5284091. Grade 7 average scale scores fell less, at roughly 5.5 points down in 2010 from the year before. Grade 8 average scale scores were tallied at 671.5891608 in 2010, down approximately 10 points from 2009. The decreases warrant a closer examination of the subgroup performance before conclusions may be drawn. However, once again, it is vital to recognize the impact of state alterations to the testing content as a result of the state-level testing and standard changes aforementioned. These factors must be considered whenever analyzing year-to-year data against 2010 results. Testing considerations likely account for a sizeable portion of downtrends visible in 2010 results.

### **Scale Scores Comparisons by Ethnicity Subgroups**

*Please note that in the following section, ethnicity was determined by codes selected at the time of registration by parents/guardians. In some cases, the ethnic group title may actually include additional ethnic groups. This may be due in part to confusion on the part of registering students and parents over which ethnic groups choice best represents their backgrounds.*

Upon examination of the scale scores for the ethnicity subgroups, only minor variations are evident. Each grade's scale scores were examined from the perspective of the following ethnic subgroups (as provided by ATS): Asian/Pacific Islander, White-Not Hispanic, Hispanic, Black-Not Hispanic, American Indian/Alaskan. For the Hispanic subgroup, results appear insignificant. Hispanic students at the 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> grade levels experienced a drop in scale score of roughly 8, 6, and 9 points, respectively. Similarly insignificant, the Black-Not Hispanic subgroup scale scores decreased 7, 1, and 7 points from grade levels 6 through 8, as well. Again, seemingly insignificant, the White-Not Hispanic subgroup scale scores trended downward approximately 8 and 9 points in grades 6 and 7. However, in grade 8, this subgroup's scores fell roughly 19 points, much greater than the same grade students in the aforementioned subgroups. Similarly anomalous was the 20-point drop seen within the

Asian/Pacific Islander subgroup at the 6<sup>th</sup>-grade level, though 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade scores within this subgroup were insignificant ranging from 6-10 points down on the year. The least in line with the other subgroups, however, was the American Indian/Alaskan ethnic subgroup, whose scores were higher on the year by 1 and 4 points in the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> grades, but down 6 in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade.

Although some anomalies were noted in the ethnic subgroup analysis of data, their randomness makes drawing concrete conclusions difficult, if not impossible. Overall, ethnicity does not appear to have played a significant role in the downward trend taken by scale scores from 2009 to 2010.

### **Scale Scores Comparison by Special Education Subgroups**

Data compiled collectively for grades 6,7, and 8, were examined for strengths and deficits in regard to scale scores in the 2009-2010 examinations. Analysis of that data indicates general increases in scores achieved in 2010 by Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) classes, across grades 6 through 8. SETSS classes in grades 6 and 7, however, posted losses consistent with other subgroups, while grade 8 SETTS class scale scores rose roughly 5 points in 2010. With similarly mixed results, self-contained classrooms boasted a 5-point gain in the 7<sup>th</sup> grade, while their 6<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade counterparts dropped up to 11 points on the year. Students received related services in grades 6 and 7 were down 5 and 12 points, respectively, and those in grade 8 had scores that were roughly even with the prior year's.

### **Scale Scores Comparison by English Language Learners Subgroups**

Scale score trends for grades 6 through 8 English Language Learners were isolated and examined for significance. The data showed downtrends consistent with that of the whole school environment. In the 6<sup>th</sup> grade, scale scores dropped approximately 10 points in 2010. English Language Learner scores in the 7<sup>th</sup> grade were down about 2.5 points and in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade by about 5 points. Across grade level, these results appear insignificant from a perspective of cause.

### **Scale Scores Comparison by Gender Subgroups**

Data compiled collectively by gender across grade levels 6 through 8 revealed no significance. Female students in grades 6 through 8 realized scale score decreases ranging from 7 to 10, on average. Similarly, male students in grades 6 through 8 had average scale score drops of 4 to 16.

### **Scale Scores Comparison by Socio-Economic Subgroups**

Scale score changes from 2009 to 2010 were examined by socio-economic subgroups for significant trending contrary to those trends already seen for the school population as a whole. No such unique trending was found by socio-economic subgroup. Under the classification of Non-Poverty, students in grades 6 through 8 realized drops in scale scores of between 5 and 11 points, while students in the Poverty classification also fell between 3 and 13 points across grade level.

### **Performance by Strand**

The results data for the NYS Mathematics Assessment 2010 was examined by strand to identify areas of weakness as well as to determine if M.S. 217 strand-related performance was consistent with that of

citywide performance. From the second perspective, M.S. 217 students scored very consistently with that of the citywide results. Grades 7 and 8 outperformed the city with just slightly higher than, but still consistent with, the city by strand. Oppositely, grade 6 performance was slightly outpaced by, though still consistent with, the rest of the city.

An analysis of the item numbers sorted by strand was conducted to identify questions that achieved less than 50% correct. Once those items were identified, they were then checked for their placement within a strand. Finally, they were crosschecked to see if they were members of the same strand. This close examination of the item analysis at grade 6 showed 3 question items with below 50% correct within the Number Sense and Operations strand. The same type of examination revealed a 3-item weakness within the Algebra strand in the 7<sup>th</sup>-grade data, and a 2-item weakness within both the Geometry and Number Sense and Operations strands. However, at the 8<sup>th</sup> grade level, only one item was identified as achieving less than 50% correct. That item was within the Geometry strand.

### **ANALYSIS OF M.S. 217 BENCHMARK MATHEMATICS EXAMINATION**

Inspection of the 6<sup>th</sup> Grade Mathematics Benchmark Examination results revealed consistency with the strand data findings of the NYS Mathematics Assessment data. Item analysis of the benchmark exam showed deficits in the Number Sense and Operations area for 6<sup>th</sup> grade students. Of the 6 items with a lower than 40% correct rate, 3 of them fell within the area of Number Sense and Operations. Additionally, 2 of the 6 items with a high rate of incorrect responses were Geometry-related questions.

However, the results of the 7<sup>th</sup> Grade Mathematics Benchmark Examination did not support the notion of a weakness present within the strand of Algebra, as indicated by NYS assessment. It did, however, reiterate Geometry and Number Sense and Operations deficiencies, as found in the NYS assessment. Four of the 35 questions on the benchmark examination received correct responses by fewer than 40% of students taking the exam. Those 4 items were evenly split between the Geometry and Number Sense and Operations strands.

Lastly, the 8<sup>th</sup> Grade Mathematics Benchmark Examination results were examined for consistency with NYS Mathematics Assessment data and for overall weakness areas. Data showed that the questions with the lowest percentage of correct answers numbered 4 altogether, and fell into the categories of Algebra and Number Sense and Operations, a finding not consistent with NYS results.

### **INFERENCES**

Based on the above analysis of the 2010 mathematics proficiency data, the following areas are concluded to be in need of development and thus, are targeted for improvement:

1. Further study of new testing criteria.
2. Examination preparation across classes and grades 6 through 8.
3. Grade 6 remediation and enrichment within Number Sense and Operations strand, based on NYS assessment, and Geometry strand, based on benchmark examination.
4. Grade 7 remediation and enrichment within Algebra Strand, based on NYS assessment, and Number Sense and Operations and Geometry strands, based on benchmark examination.

5. Grade 8 remediation and enrichment within the Geometry strand, based on NYS assessment, and Number Sense and Operations and Algebra Strands, based on benchmark examination.
6. Further exploration and analysis of individual class performance.

## **IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

### **Target 1 and 2**

*Further study of new testing criteria.*

*Examination preparation across classes and grades 6 through 8.*

1. Department teachers compare and analyze NYS Mathematics Assessment materials for 2009 and 2010.
2. Department-wide review and alignment of new NYS scoring scales.
3. Professional development in examination preparation for all mathematics department teachers consistent with #1 and 2.
4. Aforementioned examination preparation requirement bi-weekly for all mathematics department teachers.
5. Aforementioned examination preparation required as part of classroom environment for all mathematics teachers.

### **Target 3 and 4**

*Grade 6 remediation and enrichment within Number Sense and Operations strand, based on NYS assessment, and Geometry strand, based on benchmark examination.*

*Grade 7 remediation and enrichment within Algebra Strand, based on NYS assessment, and Number Sense and Operations and Geometry strands, based on benchmark examination.*

*Grade 8 remediation and enrichment within the Geometry strand, based on NYS assessment, and Number Sense and Operations and Algebra Strands, based on benchmark examination.*

1. Additional instructional professional development in aforementioned areas for grades 6 and 7 teachers.
2. Additional usage of pre-, medial, and post- assessments in affected strand areas.

### **Target 5**

*Further exploration and analysis of individual class performance.*

1. Mathematics teachers will conduct similar microanalysis of NYS Mathematics Assessment results for their own classrooms.

2. Mathematics teachers will present microanalyses to department.
3. Mathematics teachers will develop applicable micro-improvement plan.
4. Monthly administrator/teacher conference regarding progress within micro-improvement plan.

## 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.

---

By June 2011, 100% of mathematics teachers will implement student portfolios for alternate assessment to better evaluate student readiness, progress and equity resulting in a 5% transition of higher outcomes for students on the NYS Mathematics exam.

By June 2011, 100% of our ELA department will participate in teacher teams. The teams will create and administer unit assessments to measure the progress of our students and differentiate instruction resulting in a 5% increase in student achievement on the NYS ELA exam

By June 2011, 100% of our special education subject area teachers (ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies) will supplement current subject area curriculum maps with rigorous targeted instructional lesson plans and tasks to meet the differentiated goals of our SWD student population. This goal is designed to address our QR recommendation of increasing rigor in SWD classes and will result in a 5% transition to higher outcomes on the NYS ELA and Mathematics Exams.

By June 2011 we will increase the opportunities for communication between our school and parents by 5% as evidenced by parent response rates on the Learning Environment Survey, attendance at school events, completion of school created surveys, and ARIS Parent link usage reports.





<b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b> <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Department meeting agendas and minutes</li> <li>2) ARIS teacher teams</li> <li>3) Development and administration of unit assessments</li> <li>4) Lesson observations</li> <li>5) ARIS notes</li> <li>6) Student sample work</li> </ol>
---	--

**Subject/Area (where relevant):** Special Education Core Subjects

<b>Annual Goal</b> <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i>	<p>By June 2011, 100% of our special education subject area teachers (ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies) will supplement current subject area curriculum maps with rigorous targeted instructional lesson plans and tasks to meet the differentiated goals of our SWD student population. This goal is designed to address our QR recommendation of increasing rigor in SWD classes and will result in a 5% transition to higher outcomes on the NYS ELA and Mathematics Exams.</p>
<b>Action Plan</b> <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i>	<p>1) Implementation of Renzulli Learning Program- a web based program that assesses students interests and skills and selects differentiated instructional grade level assignments based on students interest. It provides students with options to complete multiple tasks. The program will specifically address differentiated instruction in the Special Education classroom. PD facilitated by Renzulli staff developer. 2) Extensive professional development and lesson planning in vocabulary instruction through content specific writing assignments and quarterly assessments. Special focus on developing students’ academic language, Tier II and Tier III words. PD facilitated by Teacher Center staff developer, LSO instructional specialists, lead data team members, Teaching Matters staff developer •Targeted professional development on familiarizing teachers and students with the specific question types found on NYS exams. Use the same type of questions and align them with the multiple choice questions, short constructed response, and document based questions. •Utilize technology across the curriculum to build communication between subject area teachers: blogs, wikis, iMovies and PowerPoint presentations. Staff will be supported to produce interdisciplinary based projects. PD and support provided by school technology lead teacher, and Teaching Matters staff developer. •Special Education Data Inquiry Team to collect and analyze data, and to make recommendations of how this data can drive instruction (use data to target instruction and set individual student goals). •Achieve 3000 is a web based diagnostic reading program that assesses each students reading ability, based on the diagnostic, each student is given a lexile score which is used to create reading passages, questions, and activities that are leveled for individual students. The program addresses teachers ability to differentiate their classroom based on reading ability</p>

<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b>  <i>Include human and fiscal resources, with specific reference to scheduled FY'11 PS and/or OTPS budget categories, that will support the actions/strategies/ activities described in this action plan.</i></p>	<p>1. Purchase of Renzuli Learning Program and PD- funded by Magnet Grant 2. Teacher Center staff developer funded through Title I SWP 10% set aside. 3. Lead Data Team members per session funded through TL Children First Operating funds, TL FSF, TL Children First Inquiry Team and TL Inquiry Team. 4. Teaching Matters staff developer and PD funded through Title I SWP 5. Technology lead teacher funded through TL FSF, TL Children First Operating Funds and Title I SWP 6. Achieve 3000 purchased with NYSSL funds</p>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b>  <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p><b>1) Lesson observations</b>  <b>2) Student sample work</b>  <b>3) Department created rubrics</b>  <b>4) Department agendas and minutes</b></p>

**Subject/Area (where relevant):**  PARENT COMMUNICATION

<p><b>Annual Goal</b>  <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>By June 2011 we will increase the opportunities for communication between our school and parents by 5% as evidenced by parent response rates on the Learning Environment Survey, attendance at school events, completion of school created surveys, and ARIS Parent link usage reports.</p>
<p><b>Action Plan</b>  <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>1. August newsletter informing parents of ARIS Parent link information, and Back to School information. - Parent Title I 1% Set aside will be used to mail letters home 2. “Back to School Night” – focus on CEP goals and Objectives, school rules and responsibilities, ARIS Parent link 3. Monthly Newsletter mailing – Parent Title I 1% Set aside will be used to mail letters home every other month. 4. Use of Title I Parent Set Aside dollars to support the distribution of our Monthly Newsletter in various languages 5. Due to SBO approval we will hold three mandatory Parent-Teacher Conference Nights. (November, February, April) 6. Distribution and collection of a school created survey titled “Tell Us About Your Child” Distributed in October and again in January. 7. Quarterly Parent Survey via use of Survey Monkey on-line tool. Focus of survey will be to continually assess parent feedback on items we have identified as in need of improvement as per the 2009-2010 Learning Environment Survey 8. Quarterly invites to parents for attendance at House meetings 9. Student of the Month celebration 10. Honor Roll breakfast 11. Student recruitment events – Magnet funding 12. Subject Area Family Nights</p>

<p><b>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule</b>  <i>Include human and fiscal resources, with specific reference to scheduled FY'11 PS and/or OTPS budget categories, that will support the actions/strategies/ activities described in this action plan.</i></p>	<p>1. Title I Parent 1% Set Aside 2. Magnet Grant</p>
<p><b>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment</b>  <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<p>1) Attendance at parent events  2) School on-line surveys  3) Agendas and minutes form parent events  4) ARIS Parent data  <b>5) School web site data</b></p>

## **REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2010-2011**

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

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

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

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

**APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENT FOR ALL TITLE I SCHOOLS**

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

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

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

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

**APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM**

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

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

Grade	ELA	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	At-risk Services: Guidance Counselor	At-risk Services: School Psychologist	At-risk Services: Social Worker	At-risk Health-related Services
	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS				
K			N/A	N/A				
1			N/A	N/A				
2			N/A	N/A				
3			N/A	N/A				
4								
5								
6	96	89	30	28	12	1	2	1
7	296	267	42	36	38	4	3	1
8	304	240	48	39	31	3	3	2
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

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

- Students in Grades 10 – 12 who scored below the approved passing grade on any Regents examination required for graduation in English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies.

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

<p>Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)</p>	<p><b>Description:</b> Provide a brief description of <b>each</b> of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).</p>
<p><b>ELA:</b></p>	<p>Wilson – small group. Provided during and after school (90 mins per week). RIGOR – provided during and after school (60 mins per week). Saturday Academy – homogeneous small group during Saturdays (3 hrs per Sat). After School Academy – writing workshop (Tues – Thurs, 1.5 hrs, Jan – April). Extended Day Academy – test prep</p>
<p><b>Mathematics:</b></p>	<p>Extended Day – Small group, 4 days per week, 40 mins per day. After School Academy – homogeneous by grade level, 3 days per week, 60 mins per day. Saturday Academy – homogeneous by grade, 2 hrs. 5:1 – during school day, 80 mins per week, Level 1 students.</p>
<p><b>Science:</b></p>	<p>Academic Intervention Services (AIS) in Science will be offered Monday through Friday from 2:30 PM until 5:30 PM. These services provide an excellent opportunity for students to receive enrichment from a variety of electives students can choose from via our community based organization (CBO), St. John’s University After-School All-stars. In a small group setting, students can choose forensic science, Lego robotics, veterinary technology, or a heart surgery program.</p>
<p><b>Social Studies:</b></p>	<p>Extended Day Program – Mon – Thurs - Targeted AIS students will be focusing on vocabulary remediation and reading comprehension. We will utilize materials from Curriculum Associates, Inc. entitled Passwords: Social Studies Vocabulary.</p>
<p><b>At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:</b></p>	<p>Extended Day program, and general school day:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meetings with students, parents, and teachers are scheduled to allow all constituents to become aware of the findings of diagnostic evaluations. In addition, counselors conduct extensive parent sessions on homework issues, library services, truancy issues, motivation issues, and adolescent rebellion. Parents are made aware of the importance of the M.S. 217 website and how this site is utilized by teachers to post and describe classroom instructional goals, homework assignments, grading policies, and learning experiences.</li> <li>• Counselors create contracts with students for specific expected achievement and related behavior improvements. Parents and students make a commitment to these contracts by reading them, giving their input, signing them, and making follow-up meetings with counselors about the outcomes of these contracts. In this way, students are best-served by differentiated academic and behavior management.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For ED students (those students dealing with emotional issues), counselors develop behavior interventions plans (BIPs) with students and review them with parents and teachers so that actions and outcomes are communicated effectively to all constituents. For an at-risk student, counselors develop the BIP, but they also consult with teachers on the BIP development.</li> <li>• Counselors will continue to maintain a high rate of parent involvement at EPC meetings. We have had a 95 % attendance rate with parents involved in EPCs.</li> <li>• Counselors provide the following services to A.I.S students: Teaching organizational skills Monitoring student attendance and academic progress Communicating with parents regarding student progress and available intervention services Individual and group counseling as needed Referral to academic services and outside agencies</li> </ul>
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:</b>	On a needs basis, the school psychologist will meet with referred students and their parents during the school day in order to access and address the needs for special services
<b>At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:</b>	On a needs basis, the school social worker will meet with referred students and their parents during the school day in order to access and address the needs for special services
<b>At-risk Health-related Services:</b>	The school nurse identified students with special conditions such as asthma, diabetes and any other severe medical condition during a review of their medical records during the school day. In addition, the school nurse reviewed student medical records during the school day in order to ensure that student immunizations were complete and up to date.

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

*NCLB/SED requirement for all schools*

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

---

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

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

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

**Section I. Student and School Information**

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

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

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

**Section II. Title III, Part A LEP Program Narrative**

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

grade level(s); language(s) of instruction; rationale for the selection of program/activities; times per day/week; program duration; and service provider and qualifications.

---

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

---

**Section III. Title III Budget**

School: \_\_\_\_\_ BEDS Code: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Allocation Amount:</b>		
<b>Budget Category</b>	<b>Budgeted Amount</b>	<b>Explanation of expenditures in this category as it relates to the program narrative for this title.</b>
<b>Professional salaries (schools must account for fringe benefits)</b> - Per session - Per diem	(e.g., \$9,978)	<b>(Example: 200 hours of per session for ESL and General Ed teacher to support ELL Students: 200 hours x \$49.89 (current teacher per session rate with fringe) = \$9,978.00)</b>
<b>Purchased services</b> - High quality staff and curriculum development contracts.	(e.g., \$5,000)	<b>(Example: Consultant, Dr. John Doe, working with teachers and administrators 2 days a week on development of curriculum enhancements)</b>
<b>Supplies and materials</b> - Must be supplemental. - Additional curricula, instructional materials. Must be clearly listed.	(e.g., \$500)	<b>(Example: 1 Books on Tape, Cassette Recorders, Headphones, Book Bins, Leveled Books)</b>
<b>Educational Software (Object Code 199)</b>	(e.g., \$2,000)	<b>(Example: 2 Rosetta Stone language development software packages for after-school program)</b>
<b>Travel</b>		
<b>Other</b>		
<b>TOTAL</b>		

### **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.
  - a) Review of ATS RESI file to determine language targets
  - b) Review of Blue card information
  - c) Review of ELL surveys
  - d) Administration of language survey via Survey Monkey
  
2. Summarize the major findings of your school's written translation and oral interpretation needs. Describe how the findings were reported to the school community.
  - a) ATS RESI file indicates the following home languages:
    - 1) Major languages = Arabic, Bengali, Punjabi, Spanish, Urdu, English
  
  - B) Findings reported to community via SLT, PTA, school web site

#### **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.

School will provide written translation of school-wide documents mailed or backpacked home. School will utilize DOE translation services when applicable. Outside approved vendor service will be utilized to translate written school-wide documents when necessary.
  
2. Describe the oral interpretation services the school will provide, and how they will meet identified needs indicated in Part A. Indicate whether oral interpretation services will be provided by an outside contractor, or in-house by school staff or parent volunteers.

Oral translation services will be offered to parents during all mandatory parent conferences. In addition teachers have been provided DOE oral translation service information to be utilized on individual student need basis.

3. Describe how the school will fulfill Section VII of Chancellor's Regulations A-663 regarding parental notification requirements for translation and interpretation services. Note: The full text of Chancellor's Regulations A-663 (Translations) is available via the following link: <http://docs.nycenet.edu/docushare/dsweb/Get/Document-151/A-663%20Translation%203-27-06%20.pdf>.

## APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

*All Title I schools must complete this appendix.*

### Directions:

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

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

	Title I Basic	Title I ARRA	Total
1. Enter the anticipated Title I, Part A allocation for 2010-11:	848,303	38,502	886,805
2. Enter the anticipated 1% set-aside for Parent Involvement:	8,483	385	8,868
3. Enter the anticipated 5% set-aside to insure that all teachers in core subject areas are highly qualified:	42,415	*	
4. Enter the anticipated 10% set-aside for Professional Development:	84,830	*	

5. Enter the percentage of High-Quality Teachers teaching in core academic subjects during the 2009-2010 school year:    99%   

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

**Teacher completed his certification requirements at the end of the 2009-2010 year. We anticipate 100% HQ.**

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

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

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

**Explanation – School Parental Involvement Policy:** In support of strengthening student academic achievement, each school that receives Title I, Part A funds must develop jointly with, agree on with, and distribute to, parents of participating children a written parental involvement policy that contains information required by section 1118(a)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The policy establishes the school's expectations for parental involvement and describes how the school will implement a number of specific parental involvement activities, including the required **Title I Annual Parent meeting**. A sample template was created by the Office of School Improvement in

collaboration with the New York State Education Department and Office for Family Engagement and Advocacy and is available in the nine major languages on the NYCDOE website. It is **strongly recommended** that schools, in consultation with parents, use the sample template as a framework for the information to be included in their parental involvement policy. Schools, in consultation with parents, are encouraged to include other relevant and agreed upon activities and actions as well that will support effective parental involvement and strengthen student academic achievement. The school parent involvement policy must be provided to all parents and disseminated in the major languages spoken by the majority of parents in the school.

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

## **Part C: TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM SCHOOLS**

### **Section I: Schoolwide Program (SWP) Required Components**

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

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

See section IV

2. School-wide reform strategies that:
  - a) Provide opportunities for all children to meet the State's proficient and advanced levels of student academic achievement.  
Magnet Program. Re-enforcing the restructuring plan; developing a signature focus for each house; increasing parent involvement; Expansion from single school DIT to mini-departmental DIT that focus on individual student achievement, goal setting, and multiple teacher-created assessments. Part of the restructuring process includes a movement away from teacher-centered learning to differentiated instruction, and flexible grouping with small group instruction to increase student interactions. Expansion of assessment tools to include more conferencing, teacher-student goal-setting with increased parent communication. Teachers are using awards certificates, praise letters home, positive phone calls. Use of ARIS by both teachers and parents.

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

- Continued use of comprehensive balanced literacy strategies. Use of Achieve 3000 assessment tools, assignment of differentiated reading materials, and grading of student written response with feedback. Students are reading and writing in different genres. Teaching Matters *Writing Matters*, *Voices and Choices* (Social Studies), and Integration of magnet themes including environmental knowledge, stewardship, and career exploration.
- Use of Reading Instructional Goals for Older Students (RIGOR) in order to assess, differentiate, and monitor student progress for SIFE and new-comers.
- Vocabulary reading and writing instruction through the ExC-ELL professional development provided by Margarita Calderon and her coaches for ELL, ELA, and other content area teachers.
- Technology integration across the curriculum including: blogs, Powerpoints, iMovies; wikis; Math – GeoSketch Pad; Literacy – Achieve 3000; Science – FOSS; Social Studies – Voices & Choices
- Special Education Initiatives funding for per session and per diems for Special Education Inquiry Team.

### 3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.

- UFT Teacher Center with varied content-area materials, technology, and duplicating equipment.
- Resources allocated for teachers to have weekly departmental meetings.
- Resources allocated for small learning community meetings.
- Resources allocated for departmental data inquiry day-long work sessions.
- Professional development for teachers of ELLs and differentiated on-line reading program, Achieve 3000
- Renzulli Learning Systems Differentiated Instructional PD and curriculum map units
- Understanding by Design curriculum development 24 hour workshop opportunities
- On-site mentoring, The New Teacher Induction Program, provided by UFT Teacher Center coach

### 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.

- Weekly PD provided by on-site UFT Teacher Center staff developer – focus on differentiation, reading comprehension
- Weekly PD provided by Lead Math Teacher – focus on differentiation, writing in mathematics, Problems of the Wee
- Weekly departmental planning periods led by subject supervisor
- Weekly PD provided by on-site Teaching Matters professional developer

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

- NA

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

- PA workshops,
- ARIS Parent Workshops
- Family Subject Nights

- Magnet organization workshops
  - ELL parent literacy workshops
  - School Messenger System
  - Monthly news letter
  - Parent Association workshops
  - High school night with guidance counselors
  - Family Museum Night with Student Docents at the Queens Museum of Art
  - Family involvement in Arts & Tech Pollinators' Garden
  - The parent coordinator will work with the magnet teacher specialists and develop programs with our magnet partners for parents: Queens Botanical Garden, Queens Museum of Art, NY Hall of Science, and Center for the Urban Environment.
  - The full-time parent coordinator at M.S. 217 will continue to serve as a liaison with parents and address their concerns and needs in the school community.
7. Plans for assisting preschool children in the transition from early childhood programs, such as Head Start, Even Start, Early Reading First, or a State-run preschool program, to local elementary school programs.
8. Measures to include teachers in the decisions regarding the use of academic assessments in order to provide information on, and to improve, the achievement of individual students and the overall instructional program.
- Teacher teams author subject unit assessments during departmental planning periods. Teams utilize Apperson and/or Exam View software.
  - Teacher teams meet weekly to review assessment results and to target student deficiencies.
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.
- Baseline exams administered in Sept 2010.
  - Checkpoint exams administered every 6 weeks.
  - Teachers meeting in teams weekly to review student progress.
  - Monthly parent meetings.
  - Use of School Messenger and school web site to communicate more effectively with parents.
  - Saturday Academies
  - AIS/ Extended Day Programs
  - Achieve 3000

- Cognitive Tutor software
- Academy Projects – School Beautification-Pollinators’ Garden
- Future Cities Engineering Program
- Library Media – iMovies; Powerpoints; students blogs; class wikis
- Use of teacher Circular 6 for small group and one-to-one instruction.

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

## **Section II: “Conceptual” Consolidation of Funds in a Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP)**

### ***Explanation/Background:***

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

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

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

- Consolidating Federal funds eases the requirements for accounting for funds from each specific program separately, because a Schoolwide school is not required to distinguish among funds received from different sources when accounting for their use.

- A school that consolidates Federal funds in its Schoolwide Program is not required to meet most of the statutory and regulatory requirements of the specific Federal programs included in the consolidation (e.g., semi-annual time and effort reporting for Title I). However, the school must ensure that it meets the intent and purposes of the Federal programs included in the consolidation so that the needs of the intended beneficiaries are met.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

		Schoolwide Program ( <del>P</del> )			(Refer to Galaxy for FY'11 school allocation amounts)	funds are consolidated. Indicate page number references where a related program activity has been described in this plan.	
		Yes	No	N/A		Check ( <del>P</del> )	Page #(s)
Title I, Part A (Basic)	Federal	X			\$712,575	X	44-48
Title I, Part A (ARRA)	Federal	X			\$38,117	X	44-48
Title II, Part A	Federal						
Title III, Part A	Federal		X			X	
Title IV	Federal						
IDEA	Federal		X				
Tax Levy	Local	X			\$6,171,749		

#### Part D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS

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

1. Use program resources to help participating children meet the State standards.
2. Ensure that planning for students served under this program is incorporated into existing school planning.
3. Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically based research that strengthens the core academic program of the school and that:
  - a. Give primary consideration to providing extended learning time, such as, extended school year, before/after school, and summer programs and opportunities;
  - b. Help provide an accelerated, high –quality curriculum, including applied learning; and
  - c. Minimize removing children from the regular classroom during regular school hours;

---

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.

4. Coordinate with and support the regular educational program;
5. Provide instruction by highly qualified teachers;
6. Provide professional development opportunities for teachers, principals and paraprofessionals, including, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff;
7. Provide strategies to increase parental involvement; and
8. Coordinate and integrate Federal, State and local services and programs.

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

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

**NCLB/SED Status:** \_\_\_\_\_ **SURR<sup>3</sup> Phase/Group (If applicable):** \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

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

---

School Under Registration Review (SURR)

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

*All SURR schools must complete this appendix.*

**SURR Area(s) of Identification:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SURR Group/Phase:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Year of Identification:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Deadline Year:** \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

*All schools must complete this appendix.*

### **Directions:**

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

### **Supporting Students in Temporary Housing (STH)**

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

---

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

1. Please identify the number of Students in Temporary Housing who are currently attending your school. (Please note that your current STH population may not be the same as officially reported in DOE systems and may change over the course of the year.)  
11
2. Please describe the services you are planning to provide to the STH population.
  1. Purchased school uniforms for students
  2. Issued students book bags, and school supplies
  3. Issued students metro passes
  4. Students receive free lunch

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

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

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

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

*This appendix will not be required for 2010-2011.*

**Please Note:** Since the system-wide expectation is that schools will maintain effort for 2008-09/2009-10 programs funded with Contract for Excellence dollars in 2010-11, schools will not be required to complete a new version of CEP Appendix 8 this year. Please see the FY11 SAM #6 "Contracts for Excellence Discretionary Allocations" for details about other documentation that schools may be required to complete in conjunction with the spending of their C4E dollars.

**(THIS SECTION WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK FOR 2010-11)**

**SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT**

<b>School Name:</b>	J.H.S. 217 Robert A. Van Wyck					
<b>District:</b>	28	<b>DBN:</b>	28Q217	<b>School</b>		342800010217

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

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

<b>Enrollment</b>				<b>Attendance - % of days students attended:</b>			
(As of October 31)	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Pre-K	0	0	0		91.7	93.6	91.4
Kindergarten	0	0	0				
Grade 1	0	0	0				
Grade 2	0	0	0				
Grade 3	0	0	0				
Grade 4	0	0	0				
Grade 5	0	0	0				
Grade 6	159	224	184				
Grade 7	491	567	581				
Grade 8	535	533	610				
Grade 9	0	0	0				
Grade 10	0	0	0				
Grade 11	0	0	0				
Grade 12	0	0	0				
Ungraded	0	1	1				
<b>Total</b>	<b>1185</b>	<b>1325</b>	<b>1376</b>				

  

<b>Student Stability - % of Enrollment:</b>			
(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	92.0	90.5	90.9

  

<b>Poverty Rate - % of Enrollment:</b>			
(As of October 31)	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
	69.0	85.1	85.1

  

<b>Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:</b>			
(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	12	27	37

  

<b>Recent Immigrants - Total Number:</b>			
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	69	62	55

<b>Special Education</b>				<b>Suspensions (OSYD Reporting) - Total Number:</b>			
(As of October 31)	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
# in Self-Contained Classes	65	80	89	Principal Suspensions	117	125	163
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	24	37	63	Superintendent Suspensions	24	25	35
Number all others	82	88	70				

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

<b>English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment: (BESIS Survey)</b>				<b>Number of Staff - Includes all full-time staff:</b>			
(As of October 31)	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
# in Transitional Bilingual Classes	0	0	TBD	Number of Teachers	88	86	89
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	TBD	Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	21	15	12
# receiving ESL services only	152	205	TBD	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	5	5	9
# ELLs with IEPs	13	72	TBD				

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
	3	3	47	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100.0	98.8	95.1
				% more than 2 years teaching in this school	81.8	83.7	93.3
				% more than 5 years teaching anywhere	71.6	74.4	85.4
Ethnicity and Gender - % of Enrollment:							
(As of October 31)	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	% Masters Degree or higher	91.0	92.0	94.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.5	0.6	0.6	% core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers	94.8	99.1	94.3
Black or African American	13.7	14.8	15.0				
Hispanic or Latino	44.2	43.5	41.6				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific	38.2	35.9	37.1				
White	3.4	5.1	4.9				
<b>Male</b>	52.7	52.2	50.1				
<b>Female</b>	47.3	47.8	49.9				

#### 2009-10 TITLE I STATUS

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

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

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

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

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

#### Individual Subject/Area AYP Outcomes:

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

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

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

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	v	v	-				
Multiracial							
Students with Disabilities	v	v					
Limited English Proficient	v	v					
Economically Disadvantaged	v	v					
<b>Student groups making</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>				

**CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY**

<b>Progress Report Results – 2009-10</b>		<b>Quality Review Results – 2009-10</b>					
<b>Overall Letter Grade:</b>	B	<b>Overall Evaluation:</b>				P	
<b>Overall Score:</b>	57.8	<b>Quality Statement Scores:</b>					
<b>Category Scores:</b>		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data				P	
School Environment:	5	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals				P	
<i>(Comprises 15% of the</i>		Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals				UPF	
School Performance:	9.6	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals				WD	
<i>(Comprises 25% of the</i>		Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise				P	
Student Progress:	36.2						
<i>(Comprises 60% of the</i>							
Additional Credit:	7						

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

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

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

## **Appendix 4: NCLB Requirements for Title I Schools 2010-2011**

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

#### **I. School Parent Involvement Policy**

The school will put into operation programs, activities and procedures for the involvement of parents, consistent with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). These programs, activities and procedures will be planned and operated with meaningful consultation with parents.

Parental Involvement means the participation of parents in regular, two-way, and meaningful communication involving student academic learning and other school activities, including ensuring:

- that parents play an integral role in assisting their child's learning;
- that parents are encouraged to be actively involved in their child's education at school;
- that parents are full partners in their child's education and are included, as appropriate, in decision-making and advisory committees to assist in the education of their child.

#### Process of Implementation

- 1) MS 217 will involve parents in the process of school review and improvement. The School Leadership Team with parent members will periodically review the school Learning Environment Survey, Progress Report, School Report Card, and Quality Review and make recommendations of programs and strategies for improvement.
- 2) MS 217 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. The school will provide timely notices via phone messenger, and backpacked flyers, promotion in doubt letters, curriculum workshop notices, monthly school newsletter, high school notices, and school-wide mails for all Parent Teacher Association monthly meeting and curriculum based workshops for parents.
- 3) MS 217 will foster the school's 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 attending the school in understanding topics such as:
    - i. The State academic content standards
    - ii. The State student academic achievement standard

- iii. How to monitor their child's short-term and long-term goal progress.
  - iv. Parents will learn about the school's various curriculums during the fall 2010 Curriculum Night.
  - v. The school will conduct workshops to inform parents about the New York State testing program in ELA, Mathematics, and Science.
  - vi. School will conduct workshops on how to look at student data.
  - vii. The magnet program will provide parents with workshops to understand the curriculum and to involve themselves in school-wide trips and activities.
- b. The school will provide materials and training to help parents work with their children at home to improve their child's academic achievement.
  - c. The school will, with the assistance of its parents, educate its teachers, pupil service personnel, principal and support staff, in how to reach out to, communicate with and work with parents as equal partners.
  - d. The school will take the following actions to ensure that information related to the school and parent programs, meetings and other activities are sent to the parents in an understandable and uniform format parents can understand. MS 217 will provide translation and interpretations of important school notices in English as well as the other targeted major languages of the school population. The Parent Coordinator has access to parental information which enables the school to meet the language needs of the homes.

***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 at <http://schools.nyc.gov/Parents/NewsInformation/TitleIPIG.htm>. Schools, in consultation with parents, are encouraged to include other relevant and agreed upon activities and actions as well that will support effective parental involvement and strengthen student academic achievement. The school parent involvement policy must be provided and disseminated in the major languages spoken by the majority of parents in the school. For additional information, please refer to the 2008-09 Title I Parent Involvement Guidelines available at the NYCDOE website link provided above.

**1. School-Parent Compact - Attach a copy of the school's Parent Involvement Policy.**

## **II. School-Parent Compact**

MS 217 and the parents agree that this compact outlines how the parents, the entire school staff and the students will share responsibilities for improved student achievement. In addition it will state how the school and parents will build and develop a partnership that will support children to achieve the State's high standards. This school-parent compact is in effect during school year 2010-2011.

### School Compact Provisions:

#### ***1. School Responsibilities:***

MS 217 will-

- Provide high-quality curriculum and instruction in a supportive and effective learning environment that enable the participating children to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.
- M.S. 217 will monitor curriculum development by reviewing and revising curriculum-mapping projects in all areas.
- Monitor instruction by conducting formal and informal observations, holding monthly faculty and weekly departmental conferences, holding Parent-Teacher Conferences in November, February, and April, holding monthly house meetings, informing parents through workshops in overviews and formats of the NYS testing program, maintaining well-running safety and policy committees which meet monthly to share concerns and to find solutions to school-wide problems, and using support services of guidance and the pupil personnel committee to assist with student progress.
- Conduct Parent-Teacher Conferences where parental concerns and issues concerning their children will be addressed at these times. In addition, M.S. 217 will provide parents with follow-up conference time if their concerns and issues need further intervention. M.S. 217 will promote an open door policy for parents to remain updated at all time with their students' progress with individual teachers.
- Provide parents' opportunities to volunteer and participate in their child's class, and to observe classroom activities, during open school week, for scheduled student work celebration, for scheduled trips.
- Involve parents in the planning, review and improvement of the school's parental involvement policy and School Wide Program plan in an ongoing and timely way by having a well functioning Parent Teacher Association (PTA), through PTA meeting, parent teacher conference and during School Leadership Team monthly meetings.
- Conduct monthly surveys for feedback from parents on pertinent school issues, through Survey Monkey.
- Publish magnet related school information on our school website.
- Update homework, resources, and calendar events on our school web site weekly.
- Utilize our school phone messenger system to update parents on student attendance, punctuality, and events.

## **2. *Parent Responsibilities***

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

- Monitor attendance by sending our children to school on time each day, sending absent notes when our children are absent and responding to calls from the school when there are unexplained absences.
- Making sure that homework is completed on a daily basis according to the requirement of subject-area teachers.
- Participating, as appropriate, in decisions relating to my children's education, such as high school, class trips and other extracurricular activities.
- Promoting positive use of my child's extracurricular time by encouraging participation in activities such as AIS (Academic Intervention Services) program, Queens Community House, St. Johns Program, Supplemental Educational Services, Specialized High school tutoring sessions and the school's newspaper production.
- Serving, to the extent possible, on policy advisory groups, such as Title I, School Leadership Team, Parent Teacher Association and volunteering as a Learning Leader.
- Attend a minimum of four school events per school year. (Events may include Parent-Teacher Conferences)
- Utilize ARIS Parent link monthly
- Check school web site weekly for student homework, resources, and calendar events.

## **3. *Student Responsibilities***

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

- Maintaining a minimum of 93% daily attendance.
- Arriving to school and all of my classes including lunch on time.
- Arriving to school prepared with a double strapped school bag large enough to carry a laptop, a loose-leaf binder, a pen/pencil, a USB thumb drive, and all materials required by my assigned teachers.
- Doing all homework every day and asking for help from teachers when I need to.
- Attending Extended Day tutorials if mandated by my teacher.
- Keeping an agenda of assignments, projects, tests and homework on a daily basis.
- Checking the school web site daily for homework and project assignments, resources, and calendar events.
- Following all NYCDOE behavior responsibilities.

- Respecting my fellow classmates and the staff members of my school community.
- Reading at least 30 minutes every day outside of school time and keep an at home log of books, genres, pages and content annotations.
- Giving to my parents or guardian all notices and information received from my school.

***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 at <http://schools.nyc.gov/Parents/NewsInformation/TitleIPIG.htm> 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 at the NYCDOE website link provided above.

**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 <b>208</b>	District <b>28</b>	School Number <b>217</b>	School Name <b>Robert Van Wyck</b>
Principal <b>Patrick Burns</b>		Assistant Principal <b>Barbara Kendall</b>	
Coach <b>type here</b>		Coach <b>type here</b>	
Teacher/Subject Area <b>Grace Nelson/ESL</b>		Guidance Counselor <b>M. Gottlieb</b>	
Teacher/Subject Area <b>Perla Bautista/ESL</b>		Parent <b>type here</b>	
Teacher/Subject Area <b>type here</b>		Parent Coordinator <b>Aletta Hall</b>	
Related Service Provider <b>type here</b>		Other <b>Angela Stauffer/Pupil Secretar</b>	
Network Leader <b>John O Mahoney</b>		Other <b>type here</b>	

### 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	<b>3</b>	Number of Certified Bilingual Teachers	<b>0</b>	Number of Certified NLA/Foreign Language Teachers	
Number of Content Area Teachers with Bilingual Extensions	<b>2</b>	Number of Special Ed. Teachers with Bilingual Extensions	<b>1</b>	Number of Teachers of ELLs without ESL/Bilingual Certification	

### C. School Demographics

Total Number of Students in School	<b>1377</b>	Total Number of ELLs	<b>188</b>	ELLs as Share of Total Student Population (%)	<b>13.65%</b>
------------------------------------	-------------	----------------------	------------	---	---------------

## 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.

1. Middle School 217 offers an (ESL) English as a Second Language Program. At the time of enrollment, parents are required to complete the HLIS (Home Language Inventory Survey). The ESL Coordinator uses this survey to determine if the students are required to take the LAB-R assessment. This assessment is administered by an ESL teacher within ten days of enrollment in the NYC school system. The results of the LAB-R determine if a student is eligible for ESL services by the state of New York. The LAB-R is administered only once. Students who are eligible to receive services are placed by the ESL coordinator, Pupil Secretary, and Guidance Counselor into an appropriate ESL class. The NYSESLAT exam is administered at the end of the school year to measure progress. Every ELL must take this exam. The NYSESLAT determines if a student is required to continue with ESL services for the following school year.
2. The parents of newly enrolled students are invited to a Parent Orientation in which the ESL teachers provide information, goals and expectations of each program that the school offers. Videos, pamphlets and parent guides are provided in the parents' native languages. Parents can select the instructional program of their choice, however, at this time, MS 217 offers ESL Programs in grades 6-8.
3. Following the administration of the LAB-R, entitlement letters are given to the students' parents requiring a signature. The letters are collected by the ESL teacher and/or the Pupil Accounting Secretary. These letters are kept on file.
4. Through the school's Translation/Interpretation Budget, we are able to provide personnel who can assist parents with their translation needs. Videos, pamphlets and parent guides are provided in the parents' native languages.
5. For the past few years, parents have chosen the Freestanding Self-Contained ESL Program.
6. Our school keeps a careful count of ELLs by language group, and will initiate the offering of Bilingual classes for the students whose parents selected a Bilingual program as their first choice.

## Part III: ELL Demographics

### A. ELL Programs

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

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

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

ELL Program Breakdown														
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total #
<b>Transitional Bilingual Education</b> (60%:40% → 50%:50% → 75%:25%)														0
<b>Dual Language</b> (50%:50%)														0

<b>Freestanding ESL</b>														
<b>Self-Contained</b>							1	4	4					9
<b>Push-In</b>														0
<b>Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	0	0	0	0	9

**B. ELL Years of Service and Programs**

Number of ELLs by Subgroups					
All ELLs	188	Newcomers (ELLs receiving service 0-3 years)	109	Special Education	
SIFE	27	ELLs receiving service 4-6 years	21	Long-Term (completed 6 years)	58

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

ELLs by Subgroups										
	ELLs (0-3 years)			ELLs (4-6 years)			Long-Term ELLs (completed 6 years)			Total
	All	SIFE	Special Education	All	SIFE	Special Education	All	SIFE	Special Education	
TBE										0
Dual Language										0
ESL		19	2		7	5		1	1	0
<b>Total</b>	0	19	2	0	7	5	0	1	1	0

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

**C. Home Language Breakdown and ELL Programs**

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

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

Number of ELLs by Grade in Each Language Group																				
	K		1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		TOTAL	
	EL L	EP																		
Spanish																			0	0
Chinese																			0	0
Russian																			0	0
Korean																			0	0
Haitian																			0	0
French																			0	0
Other																			0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>																			

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
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>									

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

Freestanding English as a Second Language														
Number of ELLs by Grade in Each Language Group														
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOTAL
Spanish							9	44	51					104
Chinese							0	0	0					0
Russian							0	0	1					1
Bengali							6	11	15					32
Urdu							1	2	4					7
Arabic							1	12	8					21
Haitian							0	0	1					1
French							0	0	2					2
Korean							0	0	0					0
Punjabi							0	3	2					5

## 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
Polish							0	0	0					0
Albanian							0	0	0					0
Other							3	7	5					15
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>188</b>

## Part IV: ELL Programming

### A. Programming and Scheduling Information

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

1. a. The models we currently use are , Pull-Out and Self-Contained.
  - b. In our self-contained sixth, seventh and eighth ESL classes, all of the content areas are taught in English using ESL instructional strategies. Our sixth grade ELLs are pulled out as a group for ESL instruction. The beginners and intermediates receive ESL instruction for 360 minutes a week and the advanced receive 180 minutes a week of ESL instruction. Currently, we have one seventh grade class and one eighth grade class which are leveled according to students' English proficiency as assessed by the NYSESLAT and LAB-R assessments. Newcomer, Beginner, Intermediate, and SIFE (Students with Interrupted Formal Education) students are grouped together and receive 360 minutes of ESL instruction per week. Based on research, school data, and NYSESLAT scores, we have placed the advanced students in general education classes with non-ELLs and former ELLs. The advanced ELLs are pulled out 180 minutes a week to receive ESL instruction as well as ten ELA periods per week. Our school also provides an extra daily period of ESL for Enrichment and Test Sophistication purposes.
2. a. Based on the NYSESLAT scores, ESL teacher programs are created to ensure all beginners and intermediate ELLs receive 360 minutes of ESL instruction a week. The advanced ELLs receive 180 minutes of ESL instruction, as well as ten periods a week of ELA instruction.
3. ELLs receive instruction in Math, Social Studies, and Science by licensed content area teachers who implement ESL strategies in their daily instruction. Currently, our sixth grade ELLs receive Science instruction from a licensed ESL teacher, our self-contained 7<sup>th</sup> grade class receives Math and Science from a licensed ESL teacher and our 8<sup>th</sup> grade self-contained class receives Math instruction from a licensed ESL teacher. Our school utilizes bilingual staff members to provide native language support for English Language Learners.
 

Our goal is to empower ELLs to acquire the listening, speaking, reading and writing skills they need to become proficient. We, as educators provide students with the tools they need to achieve this goal by implementing various instructional programs and strategies.

In the ESL curriculum, a balanced literacy approach is used. Students are assessed through reading, running records and writing samples. An enriching literacy program is offered through read-alouds, author studies, independent reading choices, and writing workshops. Students work with task specific rubrics and maintain portfolios containing their work. This balanced literacy approach combined with the integration of ESL strategies and methodology and technology addresses the needs of our ELLs. ESL teachers and other subject area teachers utilize research based strategies such as Total Physical Response, Language Experience Approach, explicit vocabulary development ExC-ELL strategies and QTEL scaffolding techniques, in addition to ongoing articulation between the teachers to reinforce concepts taught in subject areas. The Achieve 3000 program is used by all ELLs. Achieve 3000 provides a web-based, individualized learning program with vocabulary development, reading comprehension, and writing components. It uses accepted and proven benchmarks for assessment and instruction from the lexile framework to the principles of Bloom's Taxonomy. The content is non-fiction high-interest articles customized to the students' individual lexile level. This provides differentiation of content for our ELLs. The Writing Workshop is enhanced by the Writing Matters Institute. Writing Matters provides differentiated writing lessons using visuals, graphic organizers, animations and a variety of mentor texts to support students through the Writing Process. Students can publish their writing in a public online forum called an EZine where others can enjoy and comment on their writing. All ELLs have their individual laptop through ITEACHILEARN.

In addition through the ITEACHILEARN program, Teaching Matters, and the Learning Technology Grant, ELLs are taught a variety of computer skills and programs such as Inspiration, PowerPoint, WorldBook, Wordpress Blogs, I-documentaries, Writing Process, and Word Processing. There are increased opportunities for hands-on instruction in Math, Science and Social Studies and increased shared reading and writing during the Literacy/ESL periods. Content area and ESL teachers differentiate instruction through the use of flexible grouping, goal setting, alternate texts and scaffolding strategies. ELLs who are mandated to take city and state ELA exams receive additional instruction with the support of a Literacy teacher who prepares the students for these assessments. Teachers use Smart Boards and Smart Notebooks to deliver lessons.

All ESL classes are provided multilevel classroom libraries in a variety of genres. These books are utilized on a daily basis for independent reading, read-alouds, and shared reading. Our school has extensive materials on teaching practical English skills, as well as skills in listening, speaking, reading and writing. Class sets of interesting adapted novels are used with intermediate, advanced and long-term ELLs. Audio books and visual aides are used to facilitate the learning of beginner, newcomer ELLs and SIFE students. As mentioned above, ESL teachers use The Achieve 3000 program. Achieve 3000 provides a web-based, individualized learning program with vocabulary development, reading comprehension, and writing components. The content is non-fiction high-interest articles customized to the students' individual lexile level, as determined by a pre-assessment. This provides differentiation of content for our ELLs.

All math teachers use IMPACT MATHEMATICS along with test preparation materials specific to each grade. Science and Social Studies teachers use textbooks, as well as alternate text sets aligned with the New York State Standards and follow a specific curriculum and pacing calendar in each grade. Charts, visual aides, technology, and hands-on materials are incorporated in all lessons.

4. The instructional plan for all subgroups: Teachers assess the students and through item analysis they create lesson plans utilizing ESL strategies and scaffolding techniques to teach to the needs of the students. Then the teacher reassesses the students.

a. Teachers provide differentiated instruction for these students using the tools and strategies mentioned above. SIFE students set goals with the teacher to target their specific needs. Teachers assess their progress via, assessments, projects, individualized activities, and portfolios. In addition, Middle School 217 offers a variety of AIS and TITLEIII programs, and additional instruction during the 37 ½ minutes for these students. These programs provide instructional assistance in ESL, Literacy, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies. SIFE students are highly encouraged to attend our ESL Saturday Academy and/or Extended Day program, which provides additional support for ELLs to improve their mathematics and ESL skills and prepare them for the state examinations. The Saturday Academy focusing in Mathematics and ESL will also be offered to all SIFE, beginner, intermediate and long term ELLs.

b. Newcomers and beginner ELLs, as determined by LAB-R and NYSESLAT assessments, are placed in a beginner ESL class. They receive 360 minutes of intensive ESL instruction per week by a licensed ESL teacher as well as two additional periods of ESL instruction. Middle School 217 offers a variety of AIS programs for newcomers. These programs provide instructional assistance primarily in Literacy and Mathematics. A Saturday and Summer Academy focusing in Mathematics and ESL will also be offered to all beginner and newcomer students. Newcomers are highly encouraged to attend our ESL Saturday Academy and/or Extended Day program, as well as the 37 ½ minute tutorial sessions where they are homogenously grouped and receive targeted instruction to meet their needs in listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

c. Our ELLs in this category fall into the high intermediate and Advanced levels of English proficiency as assessed by the 2010 NYSESLAT. The Students are offered rigorous instruction in ESL as well as the content areas. Teachers use on-level texts as well as alternate text sets to scaffold learning and provide additional support. ELLs are often grouped together according to similar needs and

academic vocabulary is a major focus. Teachers use a variety of skills to teach vocabulary and give students ample opportunities to use academic language (ExC-ELL method). Students use technology to complete projects using Powerpoint, Geo Sketchpad, IMovies, Excel, and Inspiration. The Achieve 3000 program (described above) is used two to three times a week.

d. Our school has approximately 57 long term ELLs. Long term ELLs receive additional instruction in literacy by a licensed teacher. This instruction is targeted to strengthen the students' reading and writing skills that they will need to perform well on the New York City and New York State ELA exams. The ESL and content area teachers of this class are trained using a variety of strategies such as QTEL and ExC-ELL. All of the ESL and content area teachers are fully licensed in their areas of instruction. Both Transitional students (former ELLs) and long term ELLs are highly encouraged to attend the AIS extended-day programs offered by the school, as well as the 37 ½ minute tutorial sessions. Transitional ELLs are granted time extensions on state examinations for two years after they pass the NYSESLAT.

e. Special Education students in a monolingual class receive ESL instruction via the pull-out model. According to IEP indications, some Special Education ELLs travel with a language paraprofessional at all times. Teachers provide differentiated instruction for these students using the tools and strategies mentioned above. Special Education students set goals with the teacher to target their specific needs. Teachers assess their progress via, assessments, projects, individualized activities, and portfolios. In addition, Middle School 217 offers a variety of AIS and TITLEIII programs, and additional instruction during the 37 ½ minutes for these students. These programs provide instructional assistance in ESL, Literacy, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies. Special Education students are highly encouraged to attend our ESL Saturday Academy and/or Extended Day program, which provides additional support for ELLs to improve their mathematics and ESL skills and prepare them for the state examinations. This Saturday Academy focusing in Mathematics and ESL will also be offered to all SIFE, beginner, intermediate and long term ELLs.

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

	<b>Beginning</b>	<b>Intermediate</b>	<b>Advanced</b>
ESL instruction for <i>all</i> ELLs as required under CR Part 154	360 minutes per week	360 minutes per week	180 minutes per week
ELA instruction for <i>all</i> ELLs as required under CR Part 154			180 minutes per week
<b>FOR TBE /DL PROGRAMS:</b> Native Language Arts	60-90 minutes per day	45-60 minutes per day	45 minutes per day

**NYS CR Part 154 Mandated Number of Units of Support for ELLs, Grades 9-12**

	<b>Beginning</b>	<b>Intermediate</b>	<b>Advanced</b>
ESL instruction for <i>all</i> ELLs as required under CR Part 154	540 minutes per week	360 minutes per week	180 minutes per week
ELA instruction for <i>all</i> ELLs as required under CR Part 154			180 minutes per week
<b>FOR TBE /DL PROGRAMS:</b> Native Language Arts	45 minutes per day	45 minutes per day	45 minutes per day

**Native Language Arts and Native Language Support**



target the ELLs: Extended Day (37 1/2) Tutorial Sessions, Wilson Program, Achieve 3000, Saturday Academy, and ESL/Math Extended

### **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)?

Our school does not have a Dual Language Program.

9. ELLs have equal access to all school programs except Talent classes because they are given additional ESL periods. ELLs are offered an AIS program such as St. John's University. St. John's University works with at risk students doing curriculum work. The Heart Surgery

### **D. Professional Development and Support for School Staff**

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

1. ESL teachers will continue to receive professional development with Margarita Calderon, ExC-ELL strategies and RIGOR.
2. The staff assists ELLs as they transition from elementary to middle school in many ways. The guidance counselors work with the students to help them acclimate. The students attend weekly assemblies which address change and transitions.
3. Middle School 217 will design and deliver Professional Development that will focus on the following:
  - Learning Styles
  - UBD- Understanding by Design
  - Implementing and using the Achieve 3000 program with ELLS
  - QTEL strategies will be modeled and shared with ESL, Literacy and content area teachers
  - Exc-ELL Strategies (vocabulary, reading and writing) across all contents areas, ESL, and Special Education
  - More effective questioning techniques to foster higher level thinking (using Bloom's Taxonomy)
  - Vocabulary Development through word study
  - Increased Writing Opportunities Across the Contents Areas (Teaching Matters)
  - Flexible Grouping Strategies
  - Pre-assessment Strategies
  - Aligning all instruction to New York State Standards
  - Increased use of classroom libraries
  - Ongoing acquisition of computer skills /technology in instructional practice through the Learning Technology Grant for ELLS, Teaching Matters, and iTeachiLearn
  - Green Magnet PD- Water and The Environment (Queens Botanical Gardens), Digital Storytelling- Telling the Story of Water (Queens Museum of Art)
  - Using I Movies

vocabulary development, reading comprehension, and writing components. The content is non-fiction high-interest articles customized to

### **E. Parental Involvement**

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

1. Middle School 217 offers helpful workshops, events, and meetings for parents to integrate them into the school community. Interpreters or translating equipment are provided through the school's Translation Budget.

Workshops/Events for Parents:

In order to encourage parent involvement, our school will provide the following workshops and meetings:

- Parent information sessions on State and City Exams in the Content Areas
  - Open School Night
  - Math and ELA Test Preparation Tips
  - How to Choose a High School for your Child
  - PTA Monthly Meetings
  - Three Parent Teacher Conferences
  - Family Science, Social Studies, and Literacy Nights
2. Our school does not partner with other agencies or Community Based Organizations to provide workshops for ELL parents.
  3. We meet the needs of our parents by reviewing and analyzing the data from the Learning Environment Survey.
  4. Our school has an open door for parents. Parents can make appointments with teachers to follow up on their child's progress.
- Interpreters in the building are always available to assist parents with their translation needs. To increase the communication between parents and teachers, our teachers have an Echalk account. Echalk is found on the school's website and it's very easy to access. Teachers post daily homework assignments and special announcements. Students and parents can access Echalk at any time to receive information. In addition to the mandated Parent Teacher Conferences, Middle School 217 holds an Open School Night for parents in September. Parents are invited to come to the school and meet the teachers, visit classrooms, and learn about the expectations for the school year. There is ongoing articulation between the PTA president and the principal to meet the needs of the parents.

## 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)							5	17	36					58
Intermediate(I)							9	33	24					66
Advanced (A)							5	32	27					64
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	82	87	0	0	0	0	188

NYSESLAT Modality Analysis														
Modality Aggregate	Proficiency Level	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
LISTENING /SPEAKING	B							0	4	3				
	I							3	14	13				
	A							7	37	23				
	P							5	22	29				
READING/ WRITING	B							1	10	18				
	I							7	33	24				
	A							6	33	26				
	P							0	1	0				

NYS ELA									
Grade	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Total
3									0
4									0
5									0
6		9		1		0		0	10
7		22		23		0		0	45
8		24		25		1		0	50
NYSAA Bilingual Spe Ed									0

NYS Math									
Grade	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Total
	English	NL	English	NL	English	NL	English	NL	
3									0
4									0
5									0
6		7		6		2			15
7		31		40		5			76
8		30		33		5			68
NYSAA Bilingual Spe Ed									0

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

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

**New York State Regents Exam**

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

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

**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.
  - c. What is the school learning about ELLs from the Periodic Assessments? How is the Native Language used?
5. For dual language programs, answer the following:

2. The data pattern reveals that our ELLs progress quickly in the areas of listening and speaking, however they have difficulty and plateau with reading/writing. Based on research, we have placed students, scoring Advanced on the NYSESLAT, in general education classes for academic rigor and pulled-out for ESL 180 minute a week. There is ongoing articulation among the ESL teachers and the content area teachers as well as guidance counselors to help the students acclimate. The feedback from the non-ESL teachers has been positive and is benefiting those students.

3. Due to the patterns across the NYSESLAT modalities, ESL and ELA teachers focus on reading and writing with a major focus this year on reading comprehension.

4. a. Listening/Speaking The majority of students (52%) scored at the Advanced and Intermediate levels in grades 6-8. Newcomer and beginner students scored at the Beginner level in grades six, seven and eight. About 33% of students scored at the Proficient level in grades 6-8.

Speaking was the strongest of all modalities across all grades. This may be due to the fact that speaking skills are acquired before reading and writing skills are developed.

Reading and Writing- The majority of students across all grades scored at the Advanced and Intermediate levels. Most of the students that scored at the Beginner level were newcomers and beginners. 30% of students scored at the Beginner level, 35% scored at Intermediate level as well as 35% at the Advanced level. One student with seven years of ESL services scored at the Proficient level. Even long term ELLs showed weakness in these areas, especially in Writing.

b. Teachers will use the results of the ELL Periodic Assessment to set individual goals for students. Students struggling with the same skills will work together in a group to target that skill. Progress will be assessed by the following ELL Periodic Assessment.

c. The results of the ELL Interim Assessment determined that a large number of ELLs need to improve their Reading and Writing skills. ESL teachers will focus instruction on reading and writing by increasing the number and quality of read-alouds, shared reading, independent reading, focused mini lessons on reading skills, and various opportunities to improve writing skills. Teachers will assess students with accountable talk to demonstrate their understanding. Writing also continues to be a struggling skill for ELLs. Through modeling, revision skills and embedded grammar lessons teachers can help students master writing skills.

5. We do not have a Dual Language Program.

### Additional Information

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

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		