



[P224Q]

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

**SCHOOL: DISTRICT 75/ QUEENS / P224
ADDRESS: 252-12 72ND AVE. BELLEROSE, NY 11426
TELEPHONE: 718 8314024
FAX: 718 8314026**

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: 75Q224 **SCHOOL NAME:** P224

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 252-12-72nd Ave Bellerose, New York 11426

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 7188314024 **FAX:** 7188314026

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Desmond Park **EMAIL ADDRESS:** dpark@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON: Anita Katz

PRINCIPAL: Desmond Park

UFT CHAPTER LEADER: D. J Meehan

PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT: Joseph Tolla, Deborah Mecir

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE:
(Required for high schools) _____

DISTRICT AND NETWORK INFORMATION

DISTRICT: 75 **CHILDREN FIRST NETWORK (CFN):** 751

NETWORK LEADER: Adrienne Edelstein

SUPERINTENDENT: Gary Hecht

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

Directions: Each school is required to form a School Leadership Team (SLT) as per State Education Law Section 2590. SLT membership must include an equal number of parents and staff (students and CBO members are not counted when assessing this balance requirement), and ensure representation of all school constituencies. Chancellor’s Regulation A-655 requires a minimum of ten members on each team. Each SLT member should be listed separately in the left hand column on the chart below. Please specify any position held by a member on the team (e.g., SLT Chairperson, SLT Secretary) and the constituent group represented (e.g., parent, staff, student, or CBO). The signatures of SLT members on this page indicates their participation in the development of the Comprehensive Educational Plan and confirmation that required consultation has occurred in the aligning of funds to support educational programs (Refer to revised Chancellor’s Regulations A-655; available on the NYCDOE website at

<http://schools.nyc.gov/NR/rdonlyres/381F4607-7841-4D28-B7D5-0F30DDB77DFA/82007/A655FINAL1.pdf>).

Note: If for any reason an SLT member does not wish to sign this plan, he/she may attach a written explanation in lieu of his/her signature.

Name	Position and Constituent Group Represented	Signature
Desmond Park	*Principal or Designee	
D.J Meehan	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Deborah Mecir	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
Joseph Tola	Member/ PTA Co-President	
Anita Katz	Chairperson	
Danielle M. Hughes	Member/Assistant Principal	
Arlene Hofler	Member/UFT	
Shelley Burt	Member/PTA	
Paula Thomas	Member/PTA	
Lisa Kruger	Member/PTA	

* 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.

P224Q, a school for children with special needs consists of 8 sites serving approximately 455 students in 49 classes, grades Pre-K to 8. Students characteristically display emotional deficits, severe developmental delays, hearing impairments and many fall within the autistic spectrum. They have typically experienced challenges in the traditional school setting and require highly specialized instructional programs and interventions to meet their variety of needs.

Our P710 site is in a self-contained building and contains 8 classes with 8:1:2 staffing ratios for Pre-K students with a disability. This site serves as a model setting and resource to both the district and regional schools. All 6 classes at our P26 site serve students with autism grades K-3, thus allowing us to provide continuity of service for more of our students from P710 who turn 5 and are diagnosed with autism.

P224 also services 5 classes of students with hearing impairments at our 115, 158 and 186 (Cochlear Implant class) sites. These students participate with their general education peers in lunch, cluster subjects and other integrated activities.

Across our 7 community school sites, PS26, PS115, PS/IS178, PS186, PS205, PS/IS266 and MS158, students are taught in classes with 6:1:1, 8:1:1, and 12:1:1 staffing ratios and have opportunities for both academic and non-academic mainstream and integrated activities. We maintain 4 inclusion classes at 3 of our sites and a successful integrated Pre-K class at our PS186 site.

Teaching methodologies and curricula differ with each disability. NYC core curricula are followed by both alternate and standard assessment students and are supported by a variety of additional programs. Components of Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA), Treatment and Education of Autistic and related Communication handicapped Children (TEACCH), Picture Exchange Communication System (PECS), Verbal Behavior and Natural Environment Teaching (NET) all produce desired outcomes with the preschool and autistic students. Multiple assessments are used to inform instruction with all students including The ABLLS, S.A.N.D.I. & NYSAA administered to alternate assessment students and Fountas & Pinnell, Scantron, Acuity, ECLAS, Treasures and Everyday Math administered to standard assessment students. We have begun to introduce and plan for the implementation of the new Common Core State Standards.

The Power of Choice (POC) behavior management program is successfully implemented with our behaviorally challenged students. To complement this program, we continue to collaborate with Yale University who are supporting us in refining Emotional Literacy-a program to deepen the children's understanding of their feelings and teach them strategies in coping, while remaining on task.

We value parents as an essential component in promoting successful outcomes for all students and communication with parents is a priority. Our on-going collaboration with outside agencies provides a myriad of supports for families.

P224's mission is to work collaboratively with staff, parents and outside agencies to create learning environments that are nurturing, supportive and accepting while continuously challenging students to reach their highest potential. Our learning environment is one that communicates feelings of respect and appreciation. This is supported by our strong Parent Teacher Association (PTA) and School Leadership Team (SLT).

SECTION III – Cont’d

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot (SDAS)

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

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

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

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>								
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:				Special High School Programs: Total Number				
(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				Number of Staff: Includes all full-time staff				
# 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				
Overage Students: # entering students overage for grade								
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals				
				Teacher Qualifications:				
Ethnicity and Gender: % of Enrollment				(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school				
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								
Male								

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)							
Individual Subject/Area Outcomes	Elementary/Middle Level (✓)			Secondary Level (✓)			
	ELA:			ELA:			
	Math:			Math:			
	Science:			Grad. Rate:			
This school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for each accountability measure:							
Student Groups	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level			
	ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad. Rate**	Progress Target
All Students							
Ethnicity							
American Indian or Alaska Native							
Black or African American							
Hispanic or Latino							

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander							
White							
Multiracial							
Other Groups							
Students with Disabilities							
Limited English Proficient							
Economically Disadvantaged							
Student groups making AYP in each subject							

Key: AYP Status

√	Made AYP	X	Did Not Make AYP	X*	Did Not Make AYP Due to Participation Rate Only
√ ^{SH}	Made AYP Using Safe Harbor Target	-	Insufficient Number of Students to Determine AYP Status		

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

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

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

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?
-

In conducting the needs assessment for P224, we reviewed several sources that provided both quantitative and qualitative data gathered on each of the different special needs populations in our school. The data sources used to evaluate alternate assessment students were The Assessment of Basic Language and Learning Skills (ABLLS), The Brigance Inventory and New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) data-folios. Data sources for standard assessment students included New York State English Language Arts (ELA), Math and Science assessments. We also reviewed formative assessments such as Performance Series Scantron, Acuity Predictive, Fountas & Pinnell Benchmark Assessment, School Wide Information Systems (SWIS) as well as the Online Occurrence Reporting System (OORS).

Qualitative data provides equally important information for all students. This includes the reviewing of teacher assessments, supervisor observations, reports from related service providers and review of progress towards Individualized Education Plans (IEP) goals and objectives. Furthermore, all students have portfolios comprised of work samples and teacher assessments in all subjects including core subjects that are also reflective of progress.

Inquiry and Action Research Teams were developed to improve outcomes for each of the disability groupings and provided data for targeted groups. All teachers now use Achievement Reporting and Information System (ARIS) which, while providing some of the aforementioned information, also provides other pertinent data such as attendance. Finally, Learning Surveys, school progress report and quality reviews were reviewed to provide feedback to ascertain if significant findings could serve to improve student outcomes.

Standard Assessment - Quantitative Data Summary

An analysis of the complete battery of state and in-house assessments administered to standard assessment students in all subjects continue to reveal that they demonstrate greater ability in class performance, as evidenced by non- standardized and teacher made assessments.

English Language Arts

Delving into the three-year trends reveal that students improved in ELA and Math the longer they are educated within the P224 organization.

The 2010 ELA assessment revealed that 53%, 32%, 45%, 22% 30% and 5% of students from grades eight to three respectively scored level II. Conversely, there was a larger percentage of students earned level I in the lower grades. Analyses reveal similar findings for level III where the longer students are educated within P224Q, they are able to exhibit more proficiency in ELA.

Students across the P224Q organization demonstrated conspicuous achievement in the 2010 New York State ELA assessment despite the states raising of level benchmark scores.

In grade 3 10% of students scored Level 2 (NYC passing score) or higher
In grade 4 32% of students scored level 2 or higher
In grade 5 25% of students scored Level 2 or higher
In Grade 6 45% of students scored Level 2 or higher
In Grade 7 37% of students scored Level 2 or higher
In Grade 8 67% of students scored Level 2 or higher

Mathematics

In 2010, 90%, 68%, 75%, 55%, 63%, and 67% of students from through three through eight scored level I respectively. Level II results revealed that 5%, 30%, 22%, 45% 32% and 53% of students in grades three through eight respectively earned level II. Similarly, 5%, 2%, 3%, 31%, 5% and 14% of students in grades three through eight respectively earned level III. Similar to the ELA results, the math scores demonstrate improved student performance in levels II, III and IV in the higher grades.

Students across the P224Q organization also demonstrated noticeable achievement in the 2010 New York State Math assessment.

In grade 3 20% of students scored Level 2 (NYC passing score) or higher
In grade 4 45% of students scored level 2 or higher
In Grade 5 45% of students scored Level 2 or higher
In Grade 6 59% of students scored Level 2 or higher
In Grade 7 58% of students scored Level 2 or higher
In Grade 8 47% of students scored Level 2 or higher

Although our students demonstrated progress across all grades in both ELA and Math in in- house assessments and some proficiency in state ELA and Math assessments, there is still considerable room for growth. In addition, a review of the Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI) and the Fountas & Pinnell Benchmark Assessment Program (F&PBAP) revealed that low indicators of fluency directly correlate with low reading comprehension scores. This was evident across all grades. A focus on fluency we believe would raise comprehension scores.

2010 Science Assessments

The results of the Science indicated that 19%, 41%, 38% and 2% of grade four students scored levels I, II, III and IV respectively.

Preschool Students with Disabilities and Students with Autism.

Pre-school children with disabilities and students with autism have very unique learning needs. Data from The ABLLS and other sources (i.e. Aligning ABLLS to IEP instruction form, NET, classroom checklists, data sheets, parent surveys and consultations with teachers and related service providers) all reveal that many of our students have severe deficits in communication which negatively impacts learning particularly in the area of social skills acquisition. Last year's Inquiry team supported these findings as they focused on the Pre-k population. By providing specific methodologies to increase skills in the above areas, we found that there was not only an increase in communication and social

skills but that there was a generalization of these skills across different settings. As a result of these findings and a review of The ABLLS assessment with the K-3 students with autism, we determined that there is a need to target these same skill sets with this population in order to accelerate independence.

Alternate Assessment

Alternate Assessment students continue to perform well on NYSAA with 99% of students in grades 3-8 scoring levels 3 and 4 in ELA, Math and Social Studies and 90% of 4th and 8th grade students scoring levels 3 and 4 in Science, based on the NYSAA results of 2010. The Brigance Inventory, mastery of IEP goals, related service reports and teacher made assessment all show growth in targeted areas. In reviewing this data and in consultation with key stakeholders we agree that we need to continue to develop and refine assessments and instruction in the upper grades 4-8 in the areas of personal, community and prevocational domains. Likewise in the lower grades K-5 we concur that it is necessary to appropriately assess students more globally to show growth over time in all areas. While the Brigance Inventory provides data to identify strengths and weaknesses to inform instruction it is limited in its ability to report growth. As a result, we piloted the S.A.N.D.I assessment last year. This assessment provides both formative and summative information and this year will be expanded to include all students being assessed by this tool. Information gleaned from both the S.A.N.D.I. and the Brigance, analysis of I.E.P. data, and information obtained during meetings with all stakeholders all resulted in one common finding; in order to accelerate student growth, we need to target the specific challenges that prevent a student from being more independent.

Behavior

In reviewing data from September 2009-June 2010 on behaviors gleaned from OORS, SWIS and Behavior Management Level charts revealed that 75% of students earned level II on the Power of Choice Behavior management system. There was a decrease in acting out behaviors with the Emotionally Challenged student population and a reduction in suspensions. The Power of Choice (POC) behavior management system while effective last year, the Behavior Specialist has to re-teach the program annually to students and teachers in order for it to become an effective behavioral management tool. The Action Research team also looked to our district for behavioral support and as a result, we implemented "Emotional Literacy" which complemented the POC system by helping students to develop strategies to identify and manage their emotions while remaining cognitively on-task.

Greatest Accomplishments

- Our last Quality Review (2008-2009) assigned P224 an overall rating of "Well-Developed". It indicated that this is a highly effective school that is student-centered at the same time as being data driven
- On our first Progress Report (2009-2010) P224 received an overall "B" rating
- On the School Environment Survey, which comprises 15 % of the overall score of the progress report, we received an "A" rating
- Students participating in NYSAA scored 98.9% & 98.8% in ELA & Math respectively
- Parental involvement in the 2009-2010 school year was exceptional. We offered 21 parent workshops which presented a variety of topics by various speakers; an average of 20 participants attended each workshop. An assembly program was initiated this year which was attended by an average of 30 parents per show. We also offered 27 interactive family programs for our Pre-K parents which averaged 25 participants per activity. Over 200 parents attended both the fall and spring conferences. This increase in opportunities for parental participation had a direct impact on the results of our school learning survey. Participation in the survey rose from 32% in 08-09 to 49 % in 2009-2010

- The administration has put much effort into improving communication with parents and staff. This year 100% of staff maintains active email accounts
- The Parent Coordinator and Principal initiated a monthly newsletter “The Conveyor” which continuously informs parents of important information and resources. Through this newsletter parents are kept informed about our CEP goals, Inquiry Team goals and the progress we were making toward meeting those goals. Community resources are provided and continuously updated. As a result of this there was a significant increase in parent participation in school events such as Parent Workshops, Family day, PTA meetings and the “My Family and Me” program
- This past year we successfully increased our efforts in strengthening our collaborative model of instruction. Related service providers formed caseloads by class, thus allowing services to be provided through a push in model. This method allows for techniques and strategies to be shared with all staff and provides for the generalization of skills in the student’s natural environment across different settings. Furthermore, parents were able to observe as related service providers worked with their children using specific strategies and techniques
- We successfully achieved 90% of staff participating on Collaborative Inquiry Teams
- We continue to be successful in moving students along the continuum to less restrictive settings. Seven students were decertified and 37 students moved to programs with higher ratios including those in community schools
- A 5% decrease in the number of health and crisis management paraprofessionals further demonstrates higher student independence
- We continue to manage our budget effectively in spite of fiscal challenges. The budget is aligned with our educational goals and provides the necessary resources and materials to improve student outcomes
- Our Pre-school site for students with disabilities continues to be an exemplary program. This year in order to focus instruction; we collaboratively created a more targeted planning tool for teachers (Cycle of Planning) which aligned the IEP and The ABLLS (Assessment of Basic Language and Learning Skills) to instruction while making goals more transparent for all stakeholders. This along with the numerous successful programs that have been established, new initiatives such as “Getting Ready to Learn” and continued support from our Autism coach have resulted in 75% of articulating students moving into less restrictive settings
- P224 continues to seek to develop quality Professional Development for all staff. This year staff was invited to participate in developing Professional Development Plans. These plans were aligned to the Professional Teaching Standards. Administrators reviewed these plans and helped staff select appropriate standards and aligned PD to their plans. While staff availed themselves to ample opportunities offered by the district and city, we focused resources on using our highly skilled staff to deliver in-house PD both during and after school hours. We aligned our budget resources to meet this need. Staff overwhelmingly agreed that the PD delivered by peers was highly effective

Significant Barriers

While significant accomplishments have been made several barriers continue to impede greater academic and social progress:

- Many of our standard assessment students show growth in class and school-wide assessments and have steadily shown increased improvements in standardized tests. This year the state has significantly raised the scaled score cutoffs to achieve performance levels. As a result scores dropped as reflected across all general and special populations
- Measuring progress over time in Mathematics is a challenge. Since state standard assessments often do not accurately portray growth for students with emotional challenges we rely on in- house assessments from the Everyday Math curriculum. We find these tests are

better used for placement rather than to chart growth. Finding assessments that are aligned with this curriculum is a challenge. We continue to collaborate with our district to research and find an appropriate math assessment

- While there are many assessment tools to measure standard assessment progress we continue to struggle to find appropriate instruments that measure growth and chart progress with the alternate assessment population. Last year the district piloted an assessment tool from Lakeshore with some of our AA classes. While this is a work in progress this tool seems to better assess this population and can be used both as a formative and summative assessment. Turn-keying this training in a short period of time has proved challenging
- We believe that a good Professional Development program is paramount to excellence in teaching. The Quality Review suggested that we improve upon our Professional Development program. There are now only 3 full professional development days allotted per year by the Dept of Education. We often have to meet several times per month during teachers prep periods to disseminate information. Teachers complain that this often takes from their planning time. While we are using creative scheduling and have increased the number of offerings for in-house afterschool training sessions, it is putting a strain on our budget which was greatly reduced this year

External Barriers to progress

- Our 710 site, pre-school children with disabilities is in a self contained building. While this has many advantages the main barrier is that students are not exposed to their non disabled peers. Teaching communication and social skills is an integral part of the program and children would benefit from their non-disabled peers to serve as role models
- Pre-school children need opportunities for daily physical activities to build and develop social and gross motor skills. This is especially important for students with disabilities. 710 is in need of a playground where such activities can take place. The administration and PTA have encountered numerous obstacles in this endeavor because this building is leased. This year we fought hard to secure considerable funding from the Queens Borough president's budget to build the playground but again obstacles encountered through leasing agreements and the city resulted in this project being delayed. We continue to work with all constituents to try and resolve this situation
- Elementary students with Autism are housed in a non air-conditioned building which has a significant impact on learning and behaviors during hot weather. This negative impact is further exacerbated when these students must be moved to an air-conditioned site for the summer in order to comply with providing a 12 month school year mandated on their IEP. The PTA and administration have successfully moved the school to the top of the priority list for the five year capital gains plan. However, it seems that the project will not be completed for summer 2011
- The mandates of English Language Learners are not fully met due to an allocation of 2.5 ELL teachers. While we serve on average 60 students these students are located in 7 different sites, range in ages from 5-14 and are from different disability groupings. Such barriers make it impossible to fall into full compliance with the number of minutes of service mandated by the state

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.

Alternate assessment students in grades K-2 will increase independence by acquiring and improving targeted skills as determined by an interdisciplinary needs assessment.

1. By June 2011, students in alternate assessment grades K-2 will demonstrate increased task independence by a one level increase in 50% of goals on an Individual independence plan developed by the school interdisciplinary team. Progress will be measured using a 4 point independence scale

Students in K-8 standard assessment classes will increase reading fluency.

2. By June 2011, students in standard assessment across grades 1-8 will improve reading comprehension by increasing fluency as measured by an average 10% gain on the Fountas and Pinell benchmark assessment

Teachers will receive targeted professional development directly linked to their PTS goals

3. By June 2011, there will be an increase in teacher understanding and use of different pedagogic strategies in the content areas as evidenced through formal and informal observations, review of teacher developed PTS plans and with a median increase from 6.7-7.0 on the category of professional development in the content area on the Learning Environment Survey report of 2010/2011

Students with autism in K-3 will increase independence by becoming more socially appropriate

4. By June 2011 targeted students from grades K-3 with autism will increase independence by exhibiting socially appropriate behaviors as evidenced by a 10% increase from baseline data gathered from preselected skill sets from targeted strands in The ABLLS assessment

<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include human and fiscal resources, with specific reference to scheduled FY'11 PS and/or OTPS budget categories, that will support the actions/strategies/ activities described in this action plan.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate monies for curriculum and materials (code 100, 337) 3,000 • Allocate Per Session/Training rate money for staff development 2,000 • Allocate Per Diem monies for workshop attendance 2,000 • Use creative scheduling to provide building capacity through common planning sessions and streaming
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By September 2010, Independence Plan template and Needs Assessment created • By October 2010, Plan developed for each student in grade K-2 • By October 2010, ARIS community created • Monthly, Updated goal sheets on Independence plan • By November 2010, Staff development conducted on Election Day • By February 2011, Results from Mid Year review reveal 1 level increase in 25% of goals • By June 2011, Collaborative Inquiry Team presents findings on Brooklyn/Queens Day • By June 2011, Increase in independence evidenced by 5% decrease in frequency &/or group size of related services • By June 2011: Results indicate a one level increase of 50% goals

Subject/Area (where relevant): Reading

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2011, students in standard assessment across grades 1-8 will improve reading comprehension by increasing fluency as measured by an average 10% gain on the Fountas and Pinell benchmark assessment</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September 2010: Administration and coach meet with staff to discuss goal and outline action plan • September 2010: Coach trains staff on new Fountas and Pinell assessment and running records • September 2010: Paraprofessionals trained on use of Great Leaps Reading for Fluency program to use as an AIS intervention • September 2010: Parent workshop with focus on how parents can help support fluency at home. • October 2010: Teachers assess students with Fountas and Pinell benchmark tool and determines baseline reading rate • November 2010: Staff development on fluency strategies and share best practices • Ongoing: Maintain a collaborative inquiry space in ARIS • February 2011: Mid Year review to assess for increase in fluency • Ongoing 2010: School Coach and District Coach identify and disseminate strategies to improve fluency • June 2011: Teachers share successes and best strategies to ensure sustainability • June 2011: Final review to assess for increase in reading rate
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include human and fiscal resources, with specific reference to scheduled FY'11 PS and/or OTPS budget categories, that will support the actions/strategies/ activities described in this action plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Code 100 for instructional supplies \$1000 • Per Session /training rate monies for staff development \$2000 • Per Diem teacher sub money to allow for workshop attendance \$3000 • Use creative scheduling to provide building capacity through common planning sessions and teaming

Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment

Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains

- **By September:** 2010 teachers trained in Fountas and Pinell and running records
- **By October 2010,** Paraprofessionals trained in use Great Leap intervention
- **By October 2010,** ARIS community created
- **Monthly,** running record completed for each student
- **By November 2010,** Staff development conducted on Election Day
- **By February 2011,** Results from Mid Year review reveal 5% increase in reading rate
- **By June 2011:** Teachers presents findings on Brooklyn/Queens Day
- **By June 2011:** Results indicate an average increase of 10 in reading rate on Fountas and Pinell assessment tool from grades 1-8

Subject/Area (where relevant): Professional Development

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>By June 2011, there will be an increase in teacher understanding and use of different pedagogic strategies in the content areas as evidenced by formal and informal observation and with a median increase from 6.7-7.0 on the category of professional development in the content area on the Learning Environment Survey report of 2010/2011</p>
<p>Action Plan Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September 2010: Review results of learning survey on staff development day and share goal • September 2010: Discuss action plan of goal with staff • September 2010: Administration disseminates and analyzes needs assessment to determine areas of focus • October/November: Administration meets individually with staff to craft their professional development plan aligned with Professional Teaching Standards • October/November: staff in collaboration with coach and administration select appropriate PD from D75, Protraxx, Webinars ,outside agencies and from within P224 organization • January/ February: administration meets with individual staff to review progress toward their PD goals and gauge staff satisfaction • March: Review goal at faculty conference and allow staff to share best practices learned through PD opportunities since September. • May/June: Administration meets with teachers for final review of PD and progress towards Professional Teaching Standard • Ongoing: Review and adjust budget to ensure optimal participation of staff. • Ongoing: Administration reviews feedback form on workshops attended and monitors evidence of incorporation of practices through observations and walkthroughs • Ongoing: Administration uses collective feedback from staff to plan future PD on staff development day, grade conferences and afterschool workshops
<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include human and fiscal resources, with specific reference to scheduled FY'11 PS and/or OTPS budget categories, that will support the actions/strategies/ activities described in this action plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Code 689 for educational consultants – \$2500.00 • Code 100- instructional supplies – \$7000.0 • Code 300 – equipment - \$2000.00 • Per diem teacher sub money- (for workshop coverage) \$15,000 • Per-session \$8,000 <p style="text-align: center;">Above includes monies for all other goals</p>

Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment

Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains

- Needs assessments
- PTS plan for each teacher aligned with Professional development
- Feedback forms from professional development
- Implementation of strategies from PD observed during informal and formal observations and walkthroughs
- Progress on PTS continuum on end year PTS review
- 7.0 score on 2010/2011 Learning Survey

Subject/Area (where relevant): Students with Autism-
Communication and Social Skills

<p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p>	<p>By June 2011 targeted students from grades K-3 with autism will increase independence by exhibiting socially appropriate behaviors as evidenced by a 10% increase from baseline data gather from preselected skill sets from targeted strands in The ABLLS assessment</p>
<p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June/July, 2010: Administration meets with Lead Teachers and SLT to discuss needs of population. Team identifies needs and crafts goal • July/August, 2010: Plan for professional development on expanding the use of The ABLLS with the P. 26 site • September, 2010: Form a collaborative inquiry team to support the implementation and development of goal and supporting data • September/ October, 2010: Team selects the appropriate strands and skill sets from The ABLLS in the areas of Social Skills and Communication • September/ October, 2010: Formal training on expanding The ABLLS during grade conferences, trainings and interclass visitations • October, 2010: Teachers administer The ABLLS and obtain baseline data in targeted strands • October/November, 2010: Administration, Collaborative Inquiry Team and Lead Teachers review data and plan Professional Development to focus aligning assessment with instruction to improve social skills and communication. • November, 2010: Communication sent to parents outlining goal and how parents can support goal at home • November, 2010: Lead teacher in conjunction with Collaborative Inquiry Team and speech providers deliver PD to all staff on strategies to improve social skills and communication • February, 2011: The ABLLS is re-administered and data is analyzed to chart progress toward meeting goals • February 2011: On-going communication to staff and parents to inform them of progress toward meeting goals. Suggestions and strategies to maintain progress are addressed • On-going: Assistant Principal and Lead teacher review “Aligning The ABLLS with Instruction” data sheets to ensure progress or to revise strategy used to teach objective • Ongoing: Collaborative Inquiry Team meets regularly to review and develop appropriate strategies that will increase socially appropriate behaviors • Ongoing: Grade and faculty conferences are used to reflect on effectiveness of current practices to teach social skills, communication and to introduce new strategies • June, 2011: The ABLLS is re-administered and data gathered is analyzed against baseline data to reflect growth

<p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include human and fiscal resources, with specific reference to scheduled FY'11 PS and/or OTPS budget categories, that will support the actions/strategies/ activities described in this action plan.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Code 689 for Professional Development \$1000 • Code 100 for instructional supplies (Ink, Paper, Laminating) \$1000 • Per-session /Training rate monies for staff development \$3000 • Per Diem teacher sub money to allow teacher inter-visitation \$1000 • Use creative scheduling to provide building capacity through common planning sessions- Opportunities for inter and intra-visitation are established
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval (frequency) of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing: Progress in Social Skills and Communication charted on “Aligning IEP and The ABLLS to Instruction” data sheets • Ongoing: PD and grade conference agendas • Ongoing: Cycle of Planning charts reflect growth in targeted skills • Ongoing: Formal and informal observation of teachers by AP • By February 2011, an increase of 5% will be reflected on The ABLLS assessment from baseline data gathered in September • By June 2011, an increase of 10% will be reflected on The ABLLS assessment from baseline data gathered in September

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	8	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	9	9	N/A	N/A	3	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	13	13	N/A	N/A	10	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	21	21	N/A	N/A	19	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	26	25	24	24	23	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	29	27	20	23	25	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	16	15	11	13	12	N/A	N/A	N/A
7	17	16	13	14	N/A	6	N/A	N/A
8	16	13	16	13	N/A	5	N/A	N/A
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

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

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

Part B. Description of Academic Intervention Services

Name of Academic Intervention Services (AIS)	Description: Provide a brief description of each of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) indicated in column one, including the type of program or strategy (e.g., Wilson, Great Leaps, etc.), method for delivery of service (e.g., small group, one-to-one, tutoring, etc.), and when the service is provided (i.e., during the school day, before or after school, Saturday, etc.).
ELA:	Foundations/Wilson is a service provided to the students who have difficulty decoding. Words Their Way is phonics based program. It is used to teach children letter recognition and letter sound relationship. Great Leaps is used for students in Gr. K-5 who have difficulty with fluency. Leap Frog, Triumphs, and Treasures Enrichment Activities are used to teach and reinforce comprehension skills. Scantron resources are use to improve vocabulary and comprehension. Services are provided during the school day in small groups or 1:1 instruction
Mathematics:	These activities are used to improve problem-solving skills and improve number sense and measurement skills. Everyday Math games, Triumphs Math and Scantron resources are used to improve all skill areas. Services are provided during the school day in small groups or 1:1instruction.
Science:	These activities are used to teach concepts in different modalities and prepare children for the skills needed to succeed on state and local assessments. Students will complete intervention activities as outlined in the Harcourt Teacher resource book and Foss Activity boxes. Services are delivered during the school day in small groups or 1:1 instruction
Social Studies:	These activities are used to teach concepts in different modalities and prepare children for the skills needed to succeed on state and local assessments. Students will use leveled Social Studies Readers, Harcourt activities, Brain Pop and magazines i.e. Time for Kids and Weekly Reader. Services are provided during the school day in small groups or 1:1 instruction
At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:	Teach students the strategies they need to maintain their behavior, interact appropriately in social settings and organize their time and materials. In the Middle School, the students work on pre-vocational skills and transitional skills. IEP mandated services are provided as well. Services are provided during the school day in small groups
At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	Students will be taught pre-vocational skills and transitional skills. IEP mandated services are provided as well. Services are provided during the school day in small groups
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	NA

At-risk Health-related Services:

NA

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) K-8 Number of Students to be Served: 59 LEP Non-LEP

Number of Teachers 3 Other Staff (Specify) 9 (paras)

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.

P. 224Q has 59 ELL students in K-8 classes with varying disabilities which include: ED, MR, MD, PDD, AU, SI, HH, and OHI. These students come from homes where the following languages are spoken: Spanish, Chinese (Mandarin), Russian, Bengali, Urdu, Arabic, Haitian Creole, Burmese, Japanese, Korean, Greek and Pashto. P. 224Q currently is serving students in a push-in/pull-out ESL program. These 59 students in the program are mandated as follows: Bilingual Instruction-19 students, ESL-40 students; however they are enrolled in 8:1:1/6:1:1/12:1:1 classes with Alternate Placement Paraprofessionals because we have no Bilingual Program. The proficiency levels of our ELL population are as follows: 80% Beginners, 13% Intermediate, 4.7% Advanced, 0% Proficient and 2.3% X-coded not tested.

Our Title III instructional program will take place on 5 Saturday mornings for 3 hours each throughout the 2010-2011 school year at our main site, P.S. 186. Students will be brought by their parents and will receive this supplemental instruction from 9:00 am – 12:00 pm. During the course of the day, students will receive instruction both alongside their parents and in individual or small groups. Separate parent training will be conducted as well. In addition to the Saturday instructional program, we will offer an early morning supplementary program at 2 of our sites (P.S. 186 & P.S. 205Q). Students can be brought to school on Tuesday, Wednesday & Thursday mornings (at P.S. 186) and Wednesday and Friday mornings (at P.S. 205Q) at 7:30am during days in December, January, February and March (totaling 22 sessions per site) to work in small groups with our ESL teachers. Our program will consist of using both our previously ordered technological devices purchased from the **LeapFrog** company and new material ordered from the company over the next few weeks. Our program will be offered to all our current ELL students and we plan to be able to accommodate all students whose parents wish to participate. The focus of this supplemental program will be to increase students' acquisition and competencies of skills in the area of ELA and help build their language skills using the **LeapFrog** technology.

We propose that our \$16,260.00 budget be used in the following way: The direct instruction model described above and the purchasing of additional products by the *LeapFrog* Company, including the *Family Involvement Kit*, *Read-It-All Kits*, and *Language First Theme Kits*, will be ordered. These products have proven to be very useful in enriching English language and developing essential oral language and vocabulary skills for ELL students at all four levels of English language proficiency. We will also purchase 2 iPADS and APPs for Special Education students. The iPad is a disability friendly device, opens up new worlds of possibilities for our students with autism and is a cutting edge technology used to help develop speech and language skills; one of the most sophisticated apps being one available for augmentative alternative communication, which many of our ELLs use. The purpose of our program is to increase appropriate use of the English Language using the four modalities: Listening, Speaking, Reading & Writing. **LeapFrog** technologies provide interactive devices that enrich reading skills and fluency. They are portable and easily used by parents at home.

We hope that now that we are offering this program on Saturdays that more of our parents will take advantage of this additional instruction and be better able to support their child's language development at home. We have found that these new technological devices work well with our population because they are portable than the *LeapPads* and appear to stay current with ever changing technology developments. Teacher made pre and post assessments will support our program as will the ongoing Leapfrog performance indicators. The Leapfrog systems we have purchased in the past are directly correlated to the instructional methods and connections to ESL, ELA and CORE

subjects as it reinforces all language skills. Our intensive supplemental instructional program will enrich and reinforce all the ELA instruction students receive throughout the school day as well. We have again chosen to use technological devices to work with our students as they traditionally are intrinsically motivating and non-threatening for our population. In addition, we continue to agree with the documented research that concludes this. Jan Lacina wrote in an article published by Childhood Education (Winter 2004/2005), that:

“Computer assisted language learning (CALL) enables English Language Learners (ELL) to construct meaning in a digital environment. McLoughlin and Oliver (1998) explained that the computer is one way to support Vygotsky’s (1978) communicative theory of learning and, if used appropriately teachers can provide an environment in which learning is authentic and activities are interesting to students and (Healey & Klinghammer, 2002). Thus, students are able to construct their own , as teachers scaffold students’ learning.”

She further adds, “As with teaching mainstream students, no one technology is better suited for using with ESL students than others. It is most important, however, to choose technology that increases students interactivity.”

We have scheduled teachers, paraprofessionals and supervisors to work from 9:00 am – 12:00 pm on 5 Saturdays throughout the school year. Refreshments (for all) and MetroCards (for adults) will be offered to encourage participation. For parents who are unable to attend the Saturday workshops, we will offer an early morning supplementary program at 2 of our sites (P.S. 186 & P.S. 205Q). In addition, we will offer 2 after school Professional Development trainings where our classroom teachers and paraprofessionals will receive training and support on how to incorporate these technologies within their teaching repertoire and enhance their skills in these areas. Additional FLIP cameras will be purchased as part of our evaluation process to monitor and assess student progress throughout the program. The program will address all strands of ELA and ESL as well as technology/science. Approximately 5 students have shown interest in the before school program and 10-12 in the Saturday Program. These 5 students will be grouped together in one class at the 186 & 205 sites in the mornings. The 12 Saturday students will be grouped as homogeneously as possible into 2 classes on the 5 weekend days. We will offer two 3:1:2 classes (1 at each of 2 sites) to accommodate the 6 ELLs during our before school instructional program and we will offer two 5:1:4 classes to accommodate the 12 ELLs in our Saturday supplemental program. Children from K-8 (4.9 years – 13.9) can attend. The language of instruction in both the before school and Saturday programs will be English and will be provided by two certified ESL teachers. Bilingual paraprofessionals of all languages will be given preference and will be determined via a posting. The before school and Saturday instructional programs will be the same except that the Saturdays will include the parent component.

Professional staff, per session, per diem

Direct Instruction:

P.224Q at P.S. 186Q from 9:00 am - 12:00 pm (5 Saturdays TBD / 3 hours each)

1 Supervisor	X \$52.21/hr	X 3 hours	X 5 Saturdays	=	\$ 783.15
3 Teachers	X \$49.89/hr	X 3 hours	X 5 Saturdays	=	\$2245.05
9 Paras	X \$28.98/hr	X 3 hours	X 5 Saturdays	=	\$3912.30

Direct Instruction:

205 & 186 Sites (AM Program Tuesdays, Wednesdays & Thursdays in Dec/Jan at P.S. 186Q: 12/1/10, 12/2/10, 12/7/10, 12/8/10, 12/9/10, 12/14/10, 12/15/10, 12/16/10, 12/21/10, 12/22/10, 12/23/10, 1/4/11, 1/5/11, 1/6/11, 1/11/10, 1/12/11, 1/13/11, 1/18/11, 1/19/11, 1/20/11, 1/25/11, & 2/26/11) & (AM Program Wednesdays & Fridays in Dec/Jan/Feb & Mar at P.S. 205Q: 12/1/10, 12/3/10, 12/8/10, 12/10/10, 12/15/10, 12/17/10, 12/22/10, 1/5/11, 1/7/11, 1/12/11, 1/14/10, 1/19/11, 1/21/11, 1/26/11, 1/28/11, 2/2/11, 2/4/11, 2/9/11, 2/11/11, 2/16/11 3/2/11 & 3/4/11)

The above 22 sessions will take place at 2 sites with 1 teacher and 2 paras at both locations

2 Teachers X \$49.89/hr X 40 minutes X 22 sessions = \$1463.44
4 Paras X \$28.98/hr X 40 minutes X 22 sessions= \$1700.16

Refreshments \$ 400.00 Assorted refreshments for parents and students \$80.00 X 5 Saturdays
Metrocards \$ 159.75 71 MetroCards @ \$2.25 for parent travel
Flip Camera \$ 460.00 2 Flip Cameras @ \$230.00 each
iPADS \$1260.00 2 iPADS @ \$499 each & Educational apps
Supplemental Materials \$ 800.00 (Backpacks, Ziplock Baggies, paper, pencils, folders, batteries, etc. to support Leapfrog take home for Parents)

1 secretary X 10 hours X \$30.74= \$307.40
(to manage payroll and material purchases)

Leapfrog Materials **

Famis #	Item	Total
249	Family Involvement Kits Read-It All Multicopy Sets	\$1539.11

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

Teachers and paras will be trained by our ESL itinerant Teacher in proper techniques for optimum use of these wonderful new materials. Professional Development will be two days after school during the 2010 Fall term, at our PS 186 site where staff will be chosen to

participate.). During this time our classroom teachers and paraprofessionals will receive training and support on how to incorporate these technologies within their teaching repertoire and enhance their skills in these areas. Priority will be given to staff members who currently have ELL students in their classes. This Professional Development will include those support staff who have applied for this per session activity as well. Participating staff will be provided with the information necessary to correctly implement the *LeapFrog Program* (such as the correct use of the Theme Kits, student devices and TAG device to maximize student outcomes in all areas of ELA.) Use of the iPADS and the special education app use will also be introduced

Professional Development

P.224Q at P.S. 186Q from 3:00 pm - 4:00 pm

2 Weekday PD Sessions for one hour each day- dates TBD

1 Teacher presenter X \$49.89/hr X 1 hour X 2 days =	\$ 99.78
9 Teacher participants X \$49.89/hr X 1 hour X 2 days =	\$ 898.02
4 Para participants X \$28.98/hr X 1 hour X 2 days =	\$ 231.84

Leapfrog Materials **

Famis #	Item	Total
	Family Involvement Kits	
	Read-It All Multicopy Sets	\$1539.11
	Language First Theme Kits	
	iPADS & apps	\$1260.00

Description of Parent and Community Participation—Explain how the school will use Title III funds to increase parent and community participation for ELLs

Parents will be trained during the Saturday training sessions. They will view what is being taught during the student sessions, explore the new materials and learn how best to use the materials at home. The parents will be provided with an opportunity to learn the technology alongside their children, with a hands-on introductory session, and obtain product/website information. Parents will work with their students for the first hour and attend an hour long workshop for parents only at the end of the session. A minimum of 1-2 paraprofessionals will be available for translation during this time. Additional parent trainings will be scheduled on an as needed basis. Refreshments (for all) and MetroCards (for adults) will be offered to encourage participation. For parents who are unable to attend the Saturday workshops, we will offer an early morning supplementary program at 2 of our sites (P.S. 186 & P.S. 205Q.) Our parent coordinator will disseminate flyers, translated in various languages (Spanish, Chinese, Russian, Bengali, Urdu, Arabic, Haitian Creole, Burmese, Japanese and Pashto) by the Translation and Interpretation Unit describing the basics of the Title III/*LeapFrog Program*. During

preliminary Parent/Teacher Workshops, we will take a survey of those parents interested in participating in the Saturday program. We will then ask if there are other areas they would like training on during the Saturday workshops. Materials for participating parents will be translated by the Translation and Interpretation Unit. To further enhance the program, we will utilize our bilingual staff to support our parents. Parents will be made aware of the provisions for them to transport the devices home to assist them in helping their child. MetroCards will also be available to parents to help them in attending the supplemental Saturday program &/or the morning supplemental program. Please note: Options for our ELL students are presented to parents during the Educational Planning Conference at the CSE level. However, if this does not occur then, it is done when the child is admitted at the school level by our ELL Teacher. District 75 parents are offered several options for their ELL children. Among the two choices are transitional bilingual classes or ESL classes. Our population of students is very diverse. Of our 59 ELL students, 40 are ESL and 19 are Bilingual. There is an insufficient number of students with the same native language background/age group/testing category and classification to make up one discrete bilingual class. Hence, 100% of our Bilingual population is serviced in the Alternate Placement model. We have given our parents the opportunity to look at bilingual programs, but they have chosen to remain at P224Q in ESL classes. Therefore, the students are in an alternate placement setting with ESL support services.

Professional staff, per session, per diem

Direct Instruction:

P.224Q at P.S. 186Q from 9:00 am - 12:00 pm (5 Saturdays TBD / tentatively scheduled for 1/22/11, 1/29/11, 2/5/11, 2/12/11, & 3/5/11)

1 Supervisor	X \$52.21/hr X 3 hours X 5 Saturdays =	\$ 783.15
3 Teachers	X \$49.89/hr X 3 hours X 5 Saturdays =	\$2245.05
9 Paras	X \$28.98 /hr X 3 hours X 5 Saturdays =	\$3912.30

Refreshments	\$ 400.00	Assorted refreshments for parents and students \$80.00 X 5 Saturdays
Metrocards	\$ 159.75	71 MetroCards @ \$2.25 for parent travel
Flip Camera	\$ 460.00	2 Flip Cameras @ \$230.00 each
Supplemental Materials home for	\$ 800.00	(Backpacks, Ziplock Baggies, paper, pencils, folders, batteries, etc. to support Leapfrog take

Parents)

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

School: P. 224Q

BEDS Code: 307500014224

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

Allocation: \$16,260.00		
Budget Category	Budgeted Amount	Explanation of Proposed Expenditure
Professional staff, per session, per diem (Note: schools must account for fringe benefits)	\$11333.74 \$ 307.40	**See Below** SU, T, P at Sat. wkshps (\$6940.50), T& P at Morning Supplemental Instruction (\$3163.60) & Afterschool PD (\$1229.64) 10 Secretary per session hours to process above payroll
Purchased services such as curriculum and staff development contracts	-0-	
Supplies and materials	\$ 1539.11 \$ 800.00 \$ 460.00 \$ 1,260.00	Leapfrog Materials **See Below** Backpacks, Ziplock Baggies, paper, pencils, folders, batteries, etc. to support Leapfrog take home for parents 2 <i>Flip</i> cameras for assessment 2 IPADs & APPs for curriculum, instruction & assessment
Travel	\$ 159.75	71 MetroCards @ \$2.25 for parent travel
Other	\$ 400.00	Refreshments served to parents/students at 5 Saturday workshop trainings
TOTAL	\$16,260.00	

ABOVE BUDGET CHART FURTHER DELINATED BELOW:

Professional staff, per session, per diem

Direct Instruction:

P.224Q at P.S. 186Q from 9:00 am - 12:00 pm (5 Saturdays/ 3 hours each- tentatively scheduled for 1/22/11, 1/29/11, 2/5/11, 2/12/11, & 3/5/11))

1 Supervisor X \$52.21/hr X 3 hours X 5 Saturdays = \$ 783.15
3 Teachers X \$49.89/hr X 3 hours X 5 Saturdays = \$2245.05
9 Paras X \$28.98/hr X 3 hours X 5 Saturdays = \$3912.30

Direct Instruction:

205 & 186 Sites (AM Program Tuesdays, Wednesdays & Thursdays in Dec/Jan at P.S. 186Q: 12/1/10, 12/2/10, 12/7/10, 12/8/10, 12/9/10, 12/14/10, 12/15/10, 12/16/10, 12/21/10, 12/22/10, 12/23/10, 1/4/11, 1/5/11, 1/6/11, 1/11/10, 1/12/11, 1/13/11, 1/18/11, 1/19/11, 1/20/11, 1/25/11, & 2/26/11) & (AM Program Wednesdays & Fridays in Dec/Jan/Feb & Mar at P.S. 205Q: 12/1/10, 12/3/10, 12/8/10, 12/10/10, 12/15/10, 12/17/10, 12/22/10, 1/5/11, 1/7/11, 1/12/11, 1/14/10, 1/19/11, 1/21/11, 1/26/11, 1/28/11, 2/2/11, 2/4/11, 2/9/11, 2/11/11, 2/16/11 3/2/11 & 3/4/11)

The above 22 sessions will take place at 2 sites with 1 teacher and 2 paras at both locations

3 Teachers X \$49.89/hr X 40 minutes X 22 sessions = \$1463.44
9 Paras X \$28.98/hr X 40 minutes X 22 sessions= \$1700.16

Refreshments \$ 400.00 Assorted refreshments for parents and students \$80.00 X 5 Saturdays
Metrocards \$ 159.75 71 MetroCards @ \$2.25 for parent travel
Flip Camera \$ 460.00 2 Flip Cameras @ \$230.00 each
iPADS \$1260.00 2 iPADS @ \$499 each & Educational apps
Supplemental Materials \$ 800.00 (Backpacks, Ziplock Baggies, paper, pencils, folders, batteries, etc. to support Leapfrog take home for
Parents)

Professional Development

P.224Q at P.S. 186Q from 3:00 pm - 4:00 pm 2 Weekday PD Sessions for one hour each day

1 Teacher presenter X \$49.89/hr X 1 hour X 2 days = \$ 99.78
9 Teacher participants X \$49.89/hr X 1 hour X 2 days = \$ 898.02
4 Para participants X \$28.98/hr X 1 hour X 2 days = \$ 231.84

1 secretary X 10 hours X \$30.74=
(to manage payroll and material purchases) \$307.40

Leapfrog Materials **

Famis #	Item	Total
249	Family Involvement Kits Read-It All Multicopy Sets Language First Theme Kits	\$1539.11
	iPADS & apps	\$1260.00

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

Requirement under Chancellor's Regulations – for all schools

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

Part A: Needs Assessment Findings

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

At the beginning of the new school semester, P224 gathers information to determine our translation and interpretation needs for incoming student enrollees. As a NYC District 75 school with a special needs population, we need to use various sources to ascertain parent languages. ATS student referral forms, NYC DOE Translation and Interpretation Language ID card use, Home Language Surveys, and Committee on Special Education IEP's are all used to flag the need for interpretation or translation service. We create a list of needed languages as a result of our review process of obtaining this data. This list delineates languages and translations by site and student and better facilitates ordering of appropriate materials for parents. Once obtained, we utilize this knowledge to help alert parents to important school policies and programs in their primary language. Furthermore, this procedure is followed for students previously enrolled in our school program.

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.

We have 59 ELL students. This is a 6 student increase from last school year. We refer to each child's parents as their primary 'main guardian' with regards to determining their needs for translation and interpretation services. The actual number of parents is unknown. The 53 primary main guardians speak the following languages: Spanish, Chinese (Mandarin), Russian, Bengali, Urdu, Arabic, Haitian Creole, Burmese, Japanese, Korean, Greek and Pashto. Of these 59 primary main guardians, 42 of them are in need of translation, 17 speak English and based on the HLIS and our conversations with them, do not require translation services. We report these findings to our ELL and classroom teachers as well as our school body through SLT, cabinet and site coordinators' meetings. They, in turn, attend to the needs of our diverse parent groups by distributing translated information and ensuring parents are informed in their native language.

Part B: Strategies and Activities

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

We have made, and will continue to make, every effort possible in order to provide our parents in need of written translation services a translated Parent Handbook, Newsletters, Parent Teacher Conference flyers, Parent Workshops flyers, Student Emergency cards, Progress Reports, Daily Behavior reports and other critical notifications pertinent to parental responsibilities. When time constraints are an issue, and Translation and Interpretation Unit Services cannot be provided in a timely fashion, school staff will be utilized in the translation of written documents in communicating with these parents. Only in an extreme emergency situation, where we are unable to provide written translated services, the use of *Quick Mark* by *Stamp-Ever Stamps* will be used to flag parents' attention to the written statement: "Important information please have this information translated."

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.

P.224Q uses in-house oral interpretation services executed by our diverse staff via phone and/or in person. We have in the past and will continue to use the NYCDOE Over-the-Phone Translation and Interpretation Unit whenever our school staff is unavailable, specifically during crucial parent teacher conferences, annual IEP meetings, parent orientations, and parent workshops. In addition, TDD services are utilized for our parents who are deaf and/or hard of hearing.

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>
 - We are in the process of obtaining the translated versions of the Parent Bill of Rights and Responsibilities from the NYCDOE Translation and Interpretation Unit and will distribute to parents once received.
 - At each of our eight sites translated signs in the covered languages are posted regarding the availability of translation and interpretation services.
 - If a parent or visitor does not speak English, they would not be prevented from reaching the school's administrative offices due to this language barrier. The SSO or staff member would try to determine the language the individual is speaking (possibly by using the NYC DOE Translation & Interpretation ID Card) and then attempt to locate a translator within the building by contacting the main office. If a translator is not available, the SSA would escort the individual to the main office. A school representative would then contact the Translation and Interpretation Unit at 718-752-7373 to request translation services via phone.

Pursuant to section VII we do not have more than 10% of children at our school whose primary language is neither English nor are covered.

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

N/A

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

N/A

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Part C: TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM SCHOOLS

Section I: Schoolwide Program (SWP) Required Components

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

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

2. Schoolwide reform strategies that:
 - a) Provide opportunities for all children to meet the State's proficient and advanced levels of student academic achievement.
 - b) Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically-based research that:
 - o Increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as extended school year, before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities.
 - o Help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.
 - o Meet the educational needs of historically underserved populations.
 - o Address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of low academic achieving children and those at risk of not meeting the State academic content standards and are members of the target population of any program that is

included in the Schoolwide Program. These programs may include counseling, pupil services, mentoring services, college and career awareness/preparation, and the integration of vocational and technical education programs.

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

3. Instruction by highly qualified staff.
4. High-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals (and, where appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff) to enable all children in the Schoolwide Program to meet the State's student academic standards.
5. Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.
6. Strategies to increase parental involvement through means such as family literacy services.
7. Plans for assisting preschool children in the transition from early childhood programs, such as Head Start, Even Start, Early Reading First, or a State-run preschool program, to local elementary school programs.
8. Measures to include teachers in the decisions regarding the use of academic assessments in order to provide information on, and to improve, the achievement of individual students and the overall instructional program.
9. Activities to ensure that students who experience difficulty mastering the proficient or advanced levels of the academic achievement standards are provided with effective, timely additional assistance. The additional assistance must include measures to ensure that students' difficulties are identified on a timely basis and to provide sufficient information on which to base effective assistance.
10. Coordination and integration of Federal, State, and local services and programs, including programs supported under NCLB, i.e., violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, vocational and technical education, and job training.

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

Explanation/Background:

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

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

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

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

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

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

of funds requirements, all the requirements of the IDEA are met, and that children with disabilities are included in school-wide activities. High-quality professional development required for all staff and designed to result in improved learning outcomes for all children, including children with disabilities, is one example of a schoolwide activity that meets the intent and purposes of the IDEA.

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

Program Name	Fund Source <i>(i.e., Federal, State, or Local)</i>	Program Funds Are “Conceptually” ¹ Consolidated in the Schoolwide Program <i>(☑)</i>			Amount Contributed to Schoolwide Pool <i>(Refer to Galaxy for FY’11 school allocation amounts)</i>	Check <i>(☑)</i> in the left column below to verify that the school has met the intent and purposes ² of each program whose funds are consolidated. Indicate page number references where a related program activity has been described in this plan.	
		Yes	No	N/A		Check <i>(☑)</i>	Page #(s)
Title I, Part A (Basic)	Federal						
Title I, Part A (ARRA)	Federal						
Title II, Part A	Federal						
Title III, Part A	Federal						
Title IV	Federal						
IDEA	Federal						

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

Tax Levy	Local						
----------	-------	--	--	--	--	--	--

Part D: TITLE I TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS

N/A

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

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

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

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

4. Coordinate with and support the regular educational program;

5. Provide instruction by highly qualified teachers;

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

7. Provide strategies to increase parental involvement; and

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

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

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

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

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

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: N/A

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

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

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

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Directions:

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

Supporting Students in Temporary Housing (STH)

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

This is a NON-TITLE 1 school.

Part A: FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

1. Please identify the number of Students in Temporary Housing who are currently attending your school (please note that your STH population may change over the course of the year).
2. Please describe the services you are planning to provide to the STH population with the Title I set-aside funds.
3. Based on your current STH population and services outlined, estimate the appropriate set-aside amount to support the needs of the STH population in your school.

Part B: FOR NON-TITLE I SCHOOLS

1. Please identify the number of Students in Temporary Housing who are currently attending your school (please note that your STH population may change over the course of the year). **Seven students**
2. Please describe the services you are planning to provide to the STH population with the Title I set-aside funds.
N/A School does not receive any set-aside funds
3. Some Non-Title I schools receive a specific allocation based on the reported number of students living in temporary housing. If your school received an allocation (please refer to the current Title I Funds Summary of School Allocation Memorandum), include the amount your school received in this question. If your school did not receive an allocation and needs assistance, please contact an STH liaison in the borough Integrated Service Center (ISC) or Children First Network.
 - **N/A As a non-geographic, administrative district, students in D 75 schools identified as STH, receive support from the STH Content Expert in each borough. The District 75 STH liaisons work with these content experts to ensure that homeless students are provided with the necessary interventions. These services include educational assistance and attendance tracking at the shelters, transportation assistance, and on-site tutoring. D 75 students are eligible to attend any programs run through the STH units at the ISC.**

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

N/A

This appendix will not be required for 2010-2011.

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

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

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT

School Name:	P.S. Q224						
District:	75	DBN:	75Q224	School		307500014224	

DEMOGRAPHICS

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

Enrollment				Attendance - % of days students attended:			
(As of October 31)	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Pre-K	69	70	70				NR
Kindergarten	50	5	20				
Grade 1	32	16	10				
Grade 2	38	23	13				
Grade 3	31	19	20				
Grade 4	31	33	26				
Grade 5	29	31	31				
Grade 6	21	18	17				
Grade 7	15	19	17				
Grade 8	15	15	17				
Grade 9	0	0	0				
Grade 10	0	0	0				
Grade 11	0	0	0				
Grade 12	0	0	0				
Ungraded	89	181	207				
Total	420	430	448				

Student Stability - % of Enrollment:			
(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
		89.9	87.2

Poverty Rate - % of Enrollment:			
(As of October 31)	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
	66.7	0.0	NA

Students in Temporary Housing - Total Number:			
(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	2	4	2

Recent Immigrants - Total Number:			
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	2	4	0

Special Education				Suspensions (OSYD Reporting) - Total Number:			
(As of October 31)	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	(As of June 30)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
# in Self-Contained Classes	356	360	0	Principal Suspensions	0	0	2
# in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	64	70	69	Superintendent Suspensions	5	2	1
Number all others	0	0	377				

These students are included in the enrollment information above.

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

English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment: (BESIS Survey)				Number of Staff - Includes all full-time staff:			
(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	89	95	0
# in Dual Lang. Programs	0	0	TBD	Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	68	71	0
# receiving ESL services only	27	55	TBD				
# ELLs with IEPs	16	93	TBD				

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

Number of Educational Paraprofessionals			
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	68	65	0

Overage Students (# entering students overage for				Teacher Qualifications:			
(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	(As of October 31)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
	0	0	4	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	98.9	97.9	0.0
				% more than 2 years teaching in this school	86.5	84.2	0.0
				% more than 5 years teaching anywhere	69.7	67.4	0.0
Ethnicity and Gender - % of Enrollment:							
(As of October 31)	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	% Masters Degree or higher	99.0	98.0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1.9	1.6	2.2	% core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers	93.7	98.4	0.0
Black or African American	32.4	32.3	32.6				
Hispanic or Latino	25.5	28.6	31.5				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific	14.5	14.0	15.6				
White	20.0	19.8	14.1				
Male	74.3	73.3	74.3				
Female	25.7	26.7	25.7				

2009-10 TITLE I STATUS

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

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

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

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

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

Individual Subject/Area AYP Outcomes:

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

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

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

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

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results – 2009-10		Quality Review Results – 2009-10					
Overall Letter Grade:	B	Overall Evaluation:					NR
Overall Score:	57.5	Quality Statement Scores:					
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data					
School Environment:	10.2	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals					
<i>(Comprises 15% of the</i>		Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals					
School Performance:	12.5	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals					
<i>(Comprises 25% of the</i>		Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise					
Student Progress:	30.3						
<i>(Comprises 60% of the</i>							
Additional Credit:	4.5						

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

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

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

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

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

Part I: School ELL Profile

A. Language Allocation Policy Team Composition

Network Cluster 1	District 75	School Number 224	School Name P. 224Q
Principal Desmond Park		Assistant Principal Danielle M. Hughes	
Coach Valerie Fata		Coach n/a	
Teacher/Subject Area Patricia Gallagher/Sped		Guidance Counselor Andrea Spadaro	
Teacher/Subject Area n/a		Parent Joseph Tola	
Teacher/Subject Area n/a		Parent Coordinator Susan Gelman	
Related Service Provider Beth Summerhayes/SLP		Other Erin Betito /ESL	
Network Leader Adrienne Edelstein		Other Celina Nunez/ESL	

B. Teacher Qualifications

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

Number of Certified ESL Teachers	2.5	Number of Certified Bilingual Teachers	0	Number of Certified NLA/Foreign Language Teachers	0
Number of Content Area Teachers with Bilingual Extensions	0	Number of Special Ed. Teachers with Bilingual Extensions	0	Number of Teachers of ELLs without ESL/Bilingual Certification	0

C. School Demographics

Total Number of Students in School	446	Total Number of ELLs	115	ELLs as Share of Total Student Population (%)	25.78%
------------------------------------	------------	----------------------	------------	---	---------------

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.

Part I : Presently, P224Q does not have a TBE program nor do we have Special Ed teachers holding a Bilingual Extension.

Part II : In order to initially identify ELL students in the P224Q organization, the following occurs:

Our Pupil Accounting Secretary has been instructed to share three reports with our New York State Certified ESL/ ELL Compliance Liaison, Mrs. Celina Nunez, to assist her in locating P224Q's new potential ELLs. These documents include the New Admits Report, the NYC School Transfers Report, and a report generated each Monday alerting us to new students who have an indicator for LEP status. She also uses the New York City Department of Education Student Referral Form, the Child Assistance Program (CAP) - Student Inquiry Placement Screen, student IEP, and Place of Birth report in the ELL identification process. From these various records the ELL information is then gleaned. In addition to reviewing these documents for potential ELLs, a Home Language Identification Survey (HLIS) is administered to parents of all new student arrivals entering Kindergarten for the first time and to those students entering a New York City public school from either another state, country or New York State school. Once the informal oral HLIS interview is administered to these parents, the survey is then analyzed to ascertain whether or not a student is eligible to be administered the LAB-R. Once the LAB-R is given and the potential ELL falls below the cut-score, the ELL is then deemed entitled to receive services. The administration of the LAB-R is given within the first ten days of the student's initial school start date. In addition, students of Hispanic origins are also administered the Spanish LAB, in the event that they fall below the LAB-R cut score. The Spanish LAB score determines native language strengths and assists us in providing these students with Native language support, if necessary. When a student falls below the LAB-R cut score, this information is passed on by our ELL liaison to our unit coordinators who in turn inform the SBST of the student's eligibility. This practice only occurs in the event that CSE has not followed procedural protocols for new ELL admits. If a student is a new transfer to our P224Q organization from another NYC school, we use the same reports mentioned above, as well as investigate student files, to obtain any information that helps us determine their ELL status. Finally, our ELL liaison utilizes our ARIS system as another tool in researching the ELLs at P224Q.

Our ELL staff consist of two full-time ESL NYS certified teachers: Mrs. Celina Nunez, our ELL Liaison, and Mrs. Erin Betito our newest member; and one half-time ESL teacher *Mrs. Luciene Tonini, also NYS certified. All three ELL staffers are involved in the initial HLIS screenings and LAB-R testing. These HLIS screenings take place during P224Q's parent orientations, which are scheduled the first ten days of school, allowing us to LAB-R our students within the CR Part 154 guidelines. During our parent orientations, we identify parent language needs by handing out I Speak Cards supplied by our Parent Coordinator, Mrs. Susan Gelman, which are obtained from the Translation and Interpretation Unit. Based on parental response, the needs for translation services are then provided by utilizing the services of our Bilingual Staff and/or the NYCDOE Translation Service Unit. Parents are further assisted with HLIS in their native language provided by the NYCDOE, if available in their particular language.

Our ELL students are formally evaluated annually, during the spring, on the NYSESLAT test to determine English language proficiency levels. The NYSESLAT is administered by our District 75 trained ESL staff, Mrs. Celina Nunez, Mrs. Erin Betito, and Mrs. Luciene Tonini. If necessary, due to increased ELL student numbers, other staff members are utilized in the event that the ELLs to be tested exceeds the capabilities of being handled by our three ESL staff members. Consequently, prior to the NYSESLAT, turnkey training is given to those staff members designated by our Principal, Mr. Desmond Park, to assist with testing. Please note that these staff members are not used from year to year in the administration of the test and thus their names can not be supplied due to such variability. As an aside, our ELLs are given the opportunity to do well on the NYSESLAT, through test preparation using NYSESLAT exemplars, and Attanasio & Associates Inc. NYSESLAT support products.

NYC Public Schools offer three ELL program options: Transitional Bilingual Education, Dual Language and Freestanding ESL. Presently, P224Q offers only a Freestanding ESL program. This option is offered to parents during the Educational Planning Conference at the CSE level. However, if this does not occur, it is done forthwith by our ELL staff once the HLIS and LAB-R are administered and student eligibility has been determined. At P224Q, a NYC District 75 Public School, parents are offered two options for their ELL children. The two choices are: Transitional Bilingual Education or a Freestanding ESL program. Program Entitlement letters, Parent Surveys and Program Selection Forms are distributed to parents at the CSE level, where they can then make program

choices. Based on CSE recommendations, service to our ELL students is given. Furthermore, once ESL eligibility is determined, either at the CSE level or by our ESL staff, parents are notified of said eligibility and the program options. Our parents are given the opportunity to look at bilingual programs, but have chosen to remain at P224Q with ESL services only. This has been the trend. Our student population is diverse, of our 59 entitled ELL students, 40 are ESL and 19 are Bilingual. Due to P22Q's ELL student native language background variability/age grouping/testing category, and classroom ratio classification we have insufficient numbers to make up one discrete bilingual class. Hence, 100% of our Bilingual ELL student population is serviced in the Alternate Placement model, with ESL support services.

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	To t #
Transitional Bilingual Education <small>(60%:40% → 50%:50% → 75%:25%)</small>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dual Language <small>(50%:50%)</small>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Freestanding ESL														
Self-Contained	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Push-In	5	10	13	6	5	13	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	59
Total	5	10	13	6	5	13	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	59

B. ELL Years of Service and Programs

Number of ELLs by Subgroups					
All ELLs	115	Newcomers (ELLs receiving service 0-3 years)	96	Special Education	115
SIFE	4	ELLs receiving service 4-6 years	9	Long-Term (completed 6 years)	13

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)			
		All	SIFE	Special Education	All	SIFE	Special Education	All	SIFE	Special Education	Total
<input type="checkbox"/>											
<input type="checkbox"/>											

TBE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dual Language	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ESL	93	3	96	18	1	18	4	0	4	115			
Total	93	3	96	18	1	18	4	0	4	115			

Number of ELLs in a TBE program who are in alternate placement: 19

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

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

Dual Language (ELLs/EPs)										
9-12										
Number of ELLs by Grade in Each Language Group										
	9		10		11		12		TOTAL	
	ELL	EP	ELL	EP	ELL	EP	ELL	EP	ELL	EP

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chinese	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Russian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Korean	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Haitian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
French	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other <u>0</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0									

This Section for Dual Language Programs Only

Number of Bilingual students (students fluent in both languages): 0 Number of third language speakers: 0

Ethnic breakdown of EPs (Number):

African-American: 0 Asian: 0 Hispanic/Latino: 0
 Native American: 0 White (Non-Hispanic/Latino): 0 Other: 0

Freestanding English as a Second Language

Number of ELLs by Grade in Each Language Group

	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOTAL
Spanish	6	8	13	8	8	10	4	8	3	0	0	0	0	68
Chinese	1	1	0	2	1	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	12
Russian	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Bengali	2	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Urdu	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
Arabic	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Haitian	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
French	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Korean	1	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Punjabi	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Polish	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Albanian	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Other	0	0	1	0	0	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	8
TOTAL	11	12	18	10	17	25	8	10	4	0	0	0	0	115

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.

P224Q does not presently have a Transitional Bilingual Education program it is a Pre-K-8 school that has a freestanding ESL program for students in grades K-8, consisting of a push-in/pull-out program. Out of our 59 eligible ELLs, 18 are currently being serviced in a push-in model, the remaining 41 are being pulled-out for service. Of our 56 X-coded ELLs, 9 are benefitting from the push-in services. The breakdown by grade, including eligible and x-coded ELLs in our push-in program, is as follows: grade K - 7 students; 1st grade- 3 students; 2nd grade - 1 student; 3rd grade - 4 students; 4th grade - 0 students; 5th grade - 4 students; 6th grade 3 students; 7th grade - 3 students; and finally 8th grade - 2 students. We have two full-time certified ESL Special Education teachers and one part-time (2 ½ days weekly) certified ESL Teacher servicing our push-in/pull-out model at our seven sites. These ESL teachers divide amongst themselves the ELL students requiring ESL service, thereby providing continuity when students move from the elementary to the middle school level. They also group their students homogenously, according to their proficiency levels, abilities, and learning styles when designing their schedules.

Based on the New York State CR Part 154 mandates, P224Q ELL students are underserved. In order to comply with said mandates, we had hired Mrs. Erin Betitio, a full time ESL certified teacher with all intentions of fully serving our ELL children. We now have two full-time and one half-time NYS certified ESL pedagogues. Our ESL practitioners are aware that ELL students in grades K-8, at the beginning and intermediate proficiency levels require 360 minutes per week of ESL instruction as per NYS CR Part 154 mandates. They are also aware that students who have achieved an advanced level on the NYSESLAT, are mandated to receive 180 minutes of ELA instruction and 180 minutes of ESL according to the NYS regulations. In order to deliver the mandated ESL instructional minutes to our students, our ESL teachers have optimally maximized their student groupings on their schedules, in order to comply with the CR Part 154 mandated ESL instructional minutes based on proficiency levels. Our school continually makes every effort to fully comply with the CR Part 154 mandate. In our Freestanding ESL Program, we deliver content area instruction through thematic units. We use a variety of ESL approaches such as: TPR, LEA, and CALLA; use scaffolding techniques and differentiate instruction by adapting materials to facilitate learning. We also target ELL learning styles in order to make content comprehensible and thus enrich language development.

P224Q is a Special Education school that presently has 4 SIFE students. The services available to these students include tutoring, technology, community awareness, support of native language and culture, and a nurturing environment to facilitate language production. We also encourage a high level of parental involvement for SIFE students to engage their parents in the school community as well. This is done through our large number of parent workshop offerings, our PTA meetings and many other school events. The use of our translation plan also helps to reach out to these parents. These intensive services are offered to newcomers and ELLs receiving service 4 to 6 years.

P224Q has a plan in place for our long term ELLS. We continue to provide students with extensive exposure to the English language in the 4 modalities using the ESL standards and core curriculum; continue scaffolding instruction to support long term ELLs; differentiate instruction using learning styles and multiple intelligences; provide opportunities for practice using learned strategies; provide explicit instruction in grammar, vocabulary development and oral expression; use L1 native language to improve L2 comprehension, where relevant, via cognates; provide comprehensible input using visuals, realia, and technology; tap into students background culture (knowledge) to help make L1 to L2 connections; and finally, provide learning experiences that target the four language modalities:

speaking, listening, reading and writing.

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

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

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

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

Native Language Arts and Native Language Support

The chart below is a visual representation designed to show the variation of NLA usage/support across the program models. Please note that NLA support is never zero.



B. Programming and Scheduling Information--Continued

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

Ongoing instructional intervention services help students improve language proficiency; thematic units address all content areas; use of scaffolding strategies as well as differentiate instruction using learning styles support all subgroups. Explicit ELA for any student at the advanced level will be given for 180 minutes per week. It is provided through the workshop model for Balanced Literacy.

For those students who score at a proficient level in the NYSESLAT, a two-year Transition Plan of ESL support services will be provided. Our ESL teachers, in consultation with the monolingual classroom teacher(s) will collaborate and determine the needs of the transitioning student(s). Based on this information, the ESL teachers will then provide services as often as needed, and whenever possible, to facilitate the student(s) transition. Transition services will be provided for two years according to state mandates.

All school programs are available to all of our students, including our ELLs, and occur during the regular school day. Presently, no new programs are being considered for the upcoming school year, and services for ELL students will not be discontinued. P224Q does provide supplemental services to our ELLs, through our Title III Program funding, during before school activities, and Saturday sessions. To assist parents and their ELL children in accessing this Title III Program, an extensive outreach is held by our staff. We invite our ELL parents to participate in our before school and Saturday program through translated letters and phone calls. We also offer MetroCards and breakfast to make participation in the program more appealing. We further add that the program not only benefits the children, but is an all inclusive program geared to assist parents as well with strategies that will help them with their children at home.

Instructional materials presently used in our ESL program include: LeapFrog Language First Program for grades K-5/Audio Support in six languages, Attanasio & Associates, Inc./NYSESLAT Test Preparation materials grades K-8, RADIUS Audio Learning System by Learning Resources (targets science concepts and vocabulary; mathematics concepts and vocabulary; language patterns and vocabulary; picture vocabulary; and conversations and vocabulary), Children's Press Soundbox Books (targets initial sounds - vowels and consonants), Lakeshore's photo cards to build language, Word and Sentence Flip Books, Word Family Stamps and Teaching Cards (targets homophones, idioms and multiple meanings), Alpha Chants, music, puppets, ESL libraries (in the process of increasing libraries through Harcourt/Houghton and Mifflin/Rigby Publishers), Amazing English by Addison Wesley, A Chorus of Cultures: Developing Literacy Through Multicultural Poetry, thematic teaching materials, graphic organizers, multicultural charts, teacher-made materials, and use of laptops.

Our school does not presently have a TBE program that targets Native Language Arts, however our ESL teachers deliver native language support through NLA libraries, dictionaries, and use of bilingual paraprofessionals in the school. Native language culture is valued in a variety of ways. To support native language, instructors enhance their vocabulary for foreign languages whenever possible, plan

multicultural events and continue cultural explorations. For those students with formal education in native language arts, instruction will be offered with the understanding that a basic education has already been established. Therefore, we will concentrate initially making connections between native and English language instructions.

ESL support services and resources are differentiated to correspond to ELLs' ages and grade levels.

Presently, District 75 schools do not offer Project Jump Start for newly enrolled ELL students.

Language electives are not offered at our school, but we do offer Spanish language instruction to our middle school students.

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)?

P. 224Q has no Dual Language Program .

D. Professional Development and Support for School Staff

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

Professional development provided by P224 to all staff in curriculum, computer technology, literacy and language development have resulted in effective instruction for our ELL students. Each professional development encompasses a focus on ESL relevance and accompanying suggested strategies for this population. ESL teachers plan common meetings with teachers of ELL's to assist them in providing content area instruction using ESL techniques and methodology.

This year on Election Day and Brooklyn Queens days we will offer training on the the following:

- Training in Language Experience Approach, TPR, the integration of the Arts and use of multi-cultural literature with ESL instruction
- Training in learning strategies required to develop Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) in ELL students
- Workshops using Multiple Intelligence Approach to differentiate instruction
- Workshops on scaffolding strategies to target critical thinking skills

Throughout the year we will offer:

- On-Going Jose P training to ensure all SPED Teachers meet 10 hour requirement
- Turn-key training based on the ESL Academy workshops
- Opportunities for classroom and ESL teachers to collaborate on units of study/CORE Curriculum

In order to support ESL staff, opportunities to attend QTEL training is provided to them to develop strategies and ideas to assist those standardized students transitioning from elementary to middle school.

Teachers who require 10 hours of Jose P. instruction are directed to register for professional development training sessions offered by D75 ELL dept.

All staff including related service providers, paraprofessionals and administrators are encouraged to avail of ELL training offered by D75 and New York City

E. Parental Involvement

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

In order to involve parents at our school, outreach efforts are made to all of our parents, including those of ELL students, to attend Parent Orientations, Parent Breakfast, events/workshops, PTA meetings, and Parent Teacher Conferences. Our Parent Coordinator continues to assist in the planning of parent events/workshops that include topics specific to our ELL students. This year her outreach resulted in securing a workshop presented by Sinergia to assist ELL parents on a variety of issues of interest for ELL parents. Her previous outreach efforts have demonstrated an increase in parental attendance at school events/workshops that target community based organizations and topics that pertain to specific Special Education concerns.. Furthermore, interpreters are provided when requested and when possible. When in-house interpreters are unavailable, we use the NYCDOE Interpretation Unit to assist us. During scheduled parental events, consideration of parental needs are evaluated and addressed. At all times P224Q's staff take into consideration the language and cultural needs of our ELL 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)	11	11	16	10	10	15	5	9	4	0	0	0	0	91
Intermediate(I)	0	1	1	1	2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	10
Advanced (A)	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Total	11	12	17	11	13	22	8	10	4	0	0	0	0	108

NYSESLAT Modality Analysis														
Modality Aggregate	Proficiency Level	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
LISTENING /SPEAKING	B	0	2	1	1	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0
	I	0	3	6	4	7	7	3	4	4	0	0	0	0
	A	0	0	2	1	2	8	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
	P	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
READING/ WRITING	B	0	4	8	5	6	11	5	7	4	0	0	0	0
	I	0	1	0	1	1	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
	A	0	0	1	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

	P	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
--	----------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

NYS ELA					
Grade	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total
3	3	1	0	0	4
4	6	1	1	0	8
5	5	3	1	0	9
6	6	0	0	0	6
7	2	0	0	0	2
8	1	1	0	0	2
NYSAA Bilingual Spe Ed	0	0	0	28	28

NYS Math									
Grade	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Total
	English	NL	English	NL	English	NL	English	NL	
3	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4
4	5	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	8
5	6	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	10
6	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	7
7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
NYSAA Bilingual Spe Ed	0	0	0	0	1	0	27	0	28

NYS Science									
	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Total
	English	NL	English	NL	English	NL	English	NL	
4	2		4		2		0		8
8	0		2		0		0		2
NYSAA Bilingual Spe Ed	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10

NYS Social Studies									
	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Total
	English	NL	English	NL	English	NL	English	NL	
5	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	9
8	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
NYSAA Bilingual Spe Ed	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	7

New York State Regents Exam

	Number of ELLs Taking Test		Number of ELLs Passing Test	
	English	Native Language	English	Native Language
Comprehensive English	0	0	0	0
Math <u>0</u>	0	0	0	0
Math <u>0</u>	0	0	0	0
Biology	0	0	0	0
Chemistry	0	0	0	0
Earth Science	0	0	0	0
Living Environment	0	0	0	0
Physics	0	0	0	0
Global History and Geography	0	0	0	0
US History and Government	0	0	0	0
Foreign Language	0	0	0	0
Other <u>0</u>	0	0	0	0
Other <u>0</u>	0	0	0	0
NYSAA ELA	0	0	0	0
NYSAA Mathematics	0	0	0	0
NYSAA Social Studies	0	0	0	0
NYSAA Science	0	0	0	0

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)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chinese Reading Test	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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.

This year P. 224Q has 59 entitled ELL students. Assessment data reveals that 43 students are in alternate assessment and 16 students are in standardized assessment. Of the 43 ELL students in alternate assessment, 21 of them will participate in NYSAA Datafolios this year. They will be assessed either in ELA and Math or in ELA, Math, Science and Social Studies based on their birthdates and grade equivalent.

In 2009-2010 a total of 93 Alternate Assessment students were assessed using NYSAA. Of these, 28 were Alternate Assessment ELL students (includes eligible and X-coded). These students, in grades 3 through 8, were assessed using NYSAA data folios based on their age/grade equivalent. They were assessed either in ELA and Math or in ELA, Math, Science and/or Social Studies. Based on a 4 scale rubric, level 4 indicated that a task was completed with 100% level of independence and 100% level of accuracy. All 28 ELL students, who participated in NYSAA, grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8 achieved level 4's as per their student reports with the exception of 1 4th grader who didn't receive a math score and 2 5th graders, 1 of whom scored a level 2 in social studies and 1 of whom did not receive a score. All of the exceptions were due to clerical errors.

Additionally, in 2009-2010, there were 31 standardized assessment ELL students in grades 3-8 who were eligible for state tests.

The following is a breakdown of State ELA Test Results for Spring 2010.

3rd Grade-all standardized assessment students (includes non-ELL and ELL): 20 students participated

90% scored level 1

5% scored level 2

5% scored level 3

No students scored level 4

Of the 4 ELL students who took the test, 3 scored a level 1 and 1 scored a level 2

4th Grade-all standardized assessment students (including non-ELL and ELL): 31 students participated

68% scored level 1

30% scored level 2

2% scored level 3

No students scored level 4

Of the 8 ELL students who took the test, 6 scored a level 1, 1 scored a level 2 and 1 scored a level 3

5th Grade-all standardized assessment students (including non-ELL and ELL): 32 students participated

75% scored level 1

22% scored level 2

3% scored level 3

No students scored level 4

Of the 9 ELL students who took the test, 5 scored a level 1, 3 scored a level 2 and 1 scored a level 3

6th Grade-all standardized assessment students (including non-ELL and ELL): 20 students participated

55% scored level 1

45% scored level 2

No students scored level 3

No students scored level 4

Of the 6 ELL students who took the test all scored a level 1

7th Grade-all standardized assessment students (including non-ELL and ELL): 19 students participated

63% scored level 1

32% scored level 2

5% scored level 3

No students scored a level 4

Of the 2 ELL students who took the test both scored a level 1

8th Grade-all standardized assessment students (including non-ELL and ELL): 15 students participated

33% scored level 1
53% scored level 2
14% scored level 3
No students scored a level 4
Of the 2 ELL students who took the test, 1 scored a level 1 and 1 scored a level 2

The following is a breakdown of State Math Test Results for Spring 2010

3rd Grade-all standardized assessment students (includes non-ELL and ELL): 20 students participated
80% scored level 1
15% scored level 2
No students scored a level 3
5% scored level 4
Of the 4 ELL students who took the test, 2 scored a level 1, 1 scored a level 2 and 1 scored a level 4

4th Grade-all standardized assessment students (including non-ELL and ELL): 31 students participated
55% scored level 1
32% scored level 2
13% scored level 3
No students scored level 4
Of the 8 ELL students who took the test, 5 scored a level 1, 1 scored a level 2 and 2 scored a level 3

5th Grade-all standardized assessment students (including non-ELL and ELL): 33 students participated
55% scored level 1
27% scored level 2
18% scored level 3
No students scored level 4
Of the 10 ELL students who took the test, 6 scored a level 1, 1 scored a level 2 and 3 scored a level 3

6th Grade-all standardized assessment students (including non-ELL and ELL): 19 students participated
37% scored level 1
58% scored level 2
No students scored level 3
5% scored level 4
Of the 7 ELL students who took the test 3 scored a level 1 and 4 scored a level 2

7th Grade-all standardized assessment students (including non-ELL and ELL): 19 students participated
42% scored level 1
37% scored level 2
16% scored level 3
5% scored a level 4
Of the 2 ELL students who took the test both scored a level 1

8th Grade-all standardized assessment students (including non-ELL and ELL): 15 students participated
53% scored level 1
20% scored level 2
27% scored level 3
No students scored a level 4
The 1 ELL student who took the test scored a level 1

Eight standardized ELL students were in the K-2 grade range and therefore did not take state tests. They scored levels 1 through 6 on ECLAS-2, which is consistent with the majority of their non-ELL peers in the same age/grade range.

In comparing data from ELL versus non-ELLs there is no significant difference in levels achieved, therefore implications for instruction are no different than those mentioned throughout. ELL & non-ELL students receive AIS daily (Wilson/Fundations, Ramp-Up, Great Leaps Reading & Math, ELSB, Math Steps, EveryDay Math Games, Meville to Weville, LeapFrog, Access to Computer Technology) as well as modifications and adaptations to the CORE curriculum to help close the gap between where they are functioning and where they should be functioning.

Current data includes NYSESLAT scores from May 2010 and recent LAB-R scores for all 115 ELLs (59 entitled + 56 'X' coded) Students' scored as follows: 78.3% scored at the beginning level, 9.6% scored at the intermediate level, 6.0% scored at the advanced level, .90% scored at the proficient level and 5.2% of X-coded ELLs were not tested. (Though we are seeing scores rise progressively in all four categories, (i.e. listening, speaking, reading and writing), our students continue to need greater support in the areas of reading and writing.

In determining patterns of proficiency we reviewed testing/diagnostic data, teacher reports and observations. In reviewing NYSESLAT/LAB-R results, patterns show that fewer students are reaching intermediate levels of proficiency. It is important to recognize that the majority of our ELL students are both younger and more cognitively challenged than in the past; therefore they tend to only attain a beginner level. In lower grades K-2, standardized assessment ELL students were able to converse and follow two-step directions in English with little teacher support. Their reading ability was significantly below level and their writing ability was limited to simple short sentences. ELL students in grades 3-6 appear to show significant improvement in conversational skills. Progress was noted in reading, while writing skills lagged behind as indicated by students' daily performance, in house evaluations, teacher observations, and NYSESLAT results. Analysis of proficiency patterns show that ELL students' disabilities appear to be a greater factor in student performance than were their deficiencies in ESL. ELL students improved in all four areas of NYSESLAT. They showed the greatest improvement in the areas of Speaking followed by Listening, then Reading & Writing. The Reading & Writing Modalities revealed the least improvement. Reading and Writing need to be aggressively addressed in order to improve skills. These patterns are similar across grade levels.

Our plan for our ELL students is to schedule on-going instructional intervention services through ability grouping, one-to-one tutoring, the use of specialized materials, and test prep opportunities to help students achieve improvement in Language Proficiency. Assessment is obtained through ECLAS-2, Standardized Testing, Brigance Inventory Scale, ELL Periodic Assessment, and Informal Teacher Observations. This data is necessary in designing lessons that meet specific areas of need.

Implications for LAP: During the LAP process we have evaluated our program needs. Staffing, materials, and programs available at our school are addressing most ELL needs. We offer Alternate Placement Paraprofessionals for students mandated for bilingual services, and ESL itinerant teachers who provide pull-out and push-in service. We cluster students to facilitate the delivery of services whenever possible. We need to provide more opportunities to turnkey training and common preps for targeted staff. Additional materials for our older students need to be expanded.

Implications for Instruction: We will continue to use a variety of ESL approaches (TPR, LEA, and CALLA, Scaffolding Techniques and Differentiated Instruction) to facilitate learning. In addition to our ESL libraries, we need more materials that align with the needs of our ELL students. The data implies that our focus continue to be on developing reading and writing skills. The ELL Periodic Assessment will be administered to appropriate students to help teachers plan in depth ELL instruction for the standard ELL students; this will address individual deficits, and drive instruction. ELA State Test results imply that it is necessary to group students based on their strengths and weakness. Further, we will continue to provide AIS to students and professional development to staff in the area of instruction for reading and writing skills. NYSAA data assist us in future planning by giving us information on the child's ability to work independently and accurately on given tasks. This information drives decisions as to the next steps in skill development and level of instruction. It also clearly illustrates to parents a task their child can accomplish and what level of independence they can achieve. Opportunities for students to participate in the Arts in order to promote language expression will continue to be offered. Our schedule of multicultural events will foster the recognition and appreciation of a diverse community.

Additional Information

Please include any additional information that would be relevant to your LAP and would further explain your program for ELLs. You may

Additional Information

attach/submit charts. This form does not allow graphics and charts to be pasted.

Please note: In Part V. Assessment Data section A. Only 108 students are represented in this section because 6 students were never tested on the NYSESLAT or the LAB-R, and 1 student scored proficient on the NYSESLAT. The Assessment Data Section does not allow us to show the variables that represent these 7 students. Also, in the NYSESLAT Modality Analysis section we did not include 40 students who have a LAB-R score, nor 6 students who were never tested on either test .

Part VI: LAP Assurances

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

Name (PRINT)	Title	Signature	Date (mm/dd/yy)
	Principal		10/29/10
	Assistant Principal		10/29/10
	Parent Coordinator		10/29/10
	ESL Teacher		10/29/10
	Parent		10/29/10
	Teacher/Subject Area		10/29/10
	Teacher/Subject Area		10/29/10
	Coach		10/29/10
	Coach		10/29/10
	Guidance Counselor		10/29/10
	Network Leader		10/29/10

	Other		
	Other		
	Other		
	Other		