



P771K

2008-09

SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)

SCHOOL: (75/ K/ 771)

ADDRESS: 1075 OCEANVIEW AVENUE, BROOKLYN, NY 11235

TELEPHONE: (718) 891-3600

FAX: (718) 769-0017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

SECTION III: SCHOOL PROFILE

Part A. Narrative Description

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2008-2009

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE I SCHOOLS

APPENDIX 5: NCLB/SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOLS IN NEED OF IMPROVEMENT (SINI) AND SCHOOLS REQUIRING ACADEMIC PROGRESS (SRAP)

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

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

APPENDIX 8: CONTRACTS FOR EXCELLENCE (C4E) SCHOOL-BASED EXPENDITURES FOR 2008-09

SECTION I: SCHOOL INFORMATION PAGE

SCHOOL NUMBER: 75K771 **SCHOOL NAME:** P771K

DISTRICT: 75 **SSO NAME/NETWORK #:** 3

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 1075 Oceanview Avenue, Brooklyn, NY 11235

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 718-891-3600 **FAX:** 718-769-0017

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Sharon Meyers Izzo **EMAIL ADDRESS:** sizzo@schools.nyc.gov

POSITION/TITLE

PRINT/TYPE NAME

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON Michael DeSarlo

PRINCIPAL Sharon Meyers Izzo

UFT CHAPTER LEADER Michael DeSarlo

**PARENTS' ASSOCIATION
PRESIDENT** Desiree Spadaro

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE
(Required for high schools) _____

**COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
SUPERINTENDENT** Bonnie Brown

SECTION II: SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM SIGNATURE PAGE

Directions: There should be one School Leadership Team (SLT) for each school. As per the *Chancellor’s Regulations for School Leadership Teams*, **SLT membership must include an equal number of parents and staff** (students and CBO representatives are not counted when assessing the balance), and ensure representation of all school constituencies. 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 Chancellor’s Regulations A-655 on SLT’s; available on the NYCDOE website at <http://schools.nyc.gov/Administration/ChancellorsRegulations/default.htm>*). *Note: If for any reason an SLT member does not wish to sign this plan, he/she may attach an explanation in lieu of his/her signature.*

| Name | Position/Constituency Represented | Signature |
|--------------------|--|-----------|
| Sharon Meyers Izzo | *Principal or Designee | |
| Michael DeSarlo | *UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee | |
| Desiree Spadaro | *PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President | |
| Annette Beale | Assistant Principal | |
| Margaret Tropeano | Parent | |
| Freda Russell | Parent | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

- Core (mandatory) SLT members.

Signatures of the member of the School Leadership Team (SLT), as well as any applicable documentation, are available for viewing at the school and are on file at the Office of School Improvement.

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.

School Vision and Mission

P771K exists to benefit our entire student population. The staff and parents of our school are committed to providing the best possible education for all of our students. We are committed to helping our students develop to their maximum potential and functional levels, by acquiring social, emotional and academic skills. Our programs accomplish these goals by creating a therapeutic, nurturing environment that is physically and emotionally receptive to the needs of our students and their families. We are committed to building our students capacity so that they can return to a less restrictive setting. We use a cooperative, multisensory approach involving age appropriate, individualized instruction. We believe in shared decision making that involves harmonious, cooperative, respectful policies integrating the families and community of our children. Our students have always gone on to make us proud and we are committed to seeing that this continues. It is our firm belief that all students can reach their full academic and social potential with the support of school and family.

Contextual Information about the School's Community and its Unique/Important Characteristics

P771K is located in six sites across the borough of Brooklyn and serves 379 students with various disabilities. Our students exhibit severe emotional challenges, multiple handicapping conditions, mental retardation and autism spectrum disorder.

Our school employs an interdisciplinary, multicultural approach to all subject areas. We provide grade level meetings and staff developments on a regular basis. These meetings are a forum for teachers, administrators and supervisors to discuss alternative teaching methods in order to appeal to the various learning styles and cultures of our students.

We have had and continue to have a partnership with Teachers College for the past four years. This partnership has enabled our students to progress in English Language Arts. One Hundred percent of our staff who teach standardized assessment students continue trained in the Readers and Writers Workshop. This year we began to use the Teachers College Assessments to augment our proficiency in using this model to teach literacy to children.

P771K also offers a variety of instructional programs and extracurricular activities designed to support student achievement, for standardized and alternate assessment students.

Standardized Assessment programs include:

- Therapeutic Crisis Intervention (TCI)
- Life Space Crisis Intervention (LSCI)
- School-Wide Information System (SWIS)
- Teachers College Writing and Reading Project (TCWRP)
- America's Choice Literacy Navigator
- Everyday Math
- Impact Math
- A+ Mobile Science Lab (Middle School)
- Debate Team- District 75
- Power of Choice-Behavior program

Alternate Assessment programs include:

- Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA)
- Picture Exchange Communication System (PECS)
- Treatment and Education of Autistic and Related Communication- handicapped Children (TEACCH)
- Structured Methods in Language Education-(SMILE) Highly structured phonetic language literacy program piloted at P329 for two 6:1:1 classes.
- Star Reporter

Extracurricular Activities

- Gateway Green House Program- camping and gardening program (P225)
- Fort Tilden-gardening program (I98)
- Highland Park-gardening program (P236)
- Cooperative Healthy Active Motivated Positive Students (C.H.A.M.P.S)-opportunity beyond the school day for middle school students for fitness and support.
- Special Olympics
- Basketball Team
- Musical Awareness program

SECTION III – Cont'd

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

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

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------|---------------|--------|----------------------------|--------------|
| School Name: | P.S. K771 | | | | |
| District: | 75 | DBN #: | 75K771 | School BEDS Code #: | 307500013771 |

| DEMOGRAPHICS | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Grades Served in 2008-09: | <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-K | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> K | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 7 |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 8 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 11 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ungrad. Ele. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ungrad. Sec. | | |
| Enrollment: | | | | Attendance: | | | | | |
| (As of October 31) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | (As of June 30 – % of days students attended) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | | |
| Pre-K | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 88.3 | 89.4 | 89.8 | | |
| Kindergarten | 2 | 31 | 2 | Student Mobility: | | | | | |
| Grade 1 | 6 | 41 | 14 | | | | | | |
| Grade 2 | 10 | 28 | 11 | (% of Enrollment as of June 30) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | | |
| Grade 3 | 11 | 54 | 10 | | 87.5 | 86.3 | 58.6 | | |
| Grade 4 | 21 | 22 | 17 | Poverty Rate: | | | | | |
| Grade 5 | 23 | 29 | 13 | | | | | | |
| Grade 6 | 20 | 21 | 13 | (% of Enrollment as of October 31) | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | | |
| Grade 7 | 23 | 18 | 22 | | 72.7 | 55.6 | 60.6 | | |
| Grade 8 | 18 | 19 | 16 | Students in Temporary Housing: | | | | | |
| Grade 9 | 6 | 4 | 3 | | | | | | |
| Grade 10 | 3 | 5 | 3 | (Total Number as of June 30) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | | |
| Grade 11 | 0 | 2 | 6 | | 4 | 7 | 3 | | |
| Grade 12 | 3 | 1 | 2 | Recent Immigrants: | | | | | |
| Ungraded Elementary | 235 | 119 | 224 | | | | | | |
| Ungraded Secondary | | | | (Total Number as of October 31) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | | |
| Total | 381 | 394 | 358 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | |
| Special Education Enrollment: | | | | Suspensions: | | | | | |
| (October 31) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | (Online Occurrence Reporting System [OORS] – Number as of June 30) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | | |
| Number in Self-Contained Classes | 381 | 391 | 358 | | | | | | |
| No. in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes | 0 | 0 | 0 | Principal Suspensions | 6 | 2 | 8 | | |
| Number all others | 0 | 0 | 0 | Superintendent Suspensions | 2 | 1 | 1 | | |
| <i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i> | | | | Special High School Programs: | | | | | |
| English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment: | | | | | | | | | |

| DEMOGRAPHICS | | | | | | | |
|---|------|------|------|--|------|-------|-------|
| (October 31) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | CTE Program Participants | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # in Trans. Bilingual Classes | 0 | 0 | 0 | Early College HS Participants | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # in Dual Lang. Programs | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| # receiving ESL services only | 14 | 0 | 5 | Number of Staff: | | | |
| # ELLs with IEPs | 23 | 19 | 31 | (As of October 31; includes all full and part-time staff) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| <i>These students are included in the General and Special Education enrollment information above.</i> | | | | Number of Teachers | 76 | 78 | 80 |
| Overage Students: | | | | Number of Administrators and Other Professionals | 104 | 9 | 102 |
| (# entering students overage for grade as of October 31) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | Number of Educational Paraprofessionals | 49 | N/A | 46 |
| | 1 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| Ethnicity and Gender: | | | | Teacher Qualifications: | | | |
| | | | | (As of October 31) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| (% of Enrollment as of October 31) | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | % fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school | 98.7 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Percent more than two years teaching in this school | 72.4 | 75.6 | 77.5 |
| Black or African American | 49.6 | 46.4 | 46.6 | Percent more than five years teaching anywhere | 57.9 | 57.7 | 58.8 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 13.9 | 16.2 | 13.4 | | | | |
| Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl. | 3.7 | 4.3 | 6.4 | Percent Masters Degree or higher | 62.7 | 91.2 | 96.9 |
| White | 32.8 | 33.0 | 33.5 | Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition) | 62.7 | 91.2 | 96.9 |
| Multi-racial | N/A | N/A | N/A | | | | |
| Male | 76.9 | 76.1 | 77.1 | | | | |
| Female | 23.1 | 23.9 | 22.9 | | | | |

| 2008-09 TITLE I STATUS | | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP) | <input type="checkbox"/> Title I Targeted Assistance | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Title I | | |
| Years the School Received Title I Part A Funding: | <input type="checkbox"/> 2005-06 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2006-07 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2007-08 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2008-09 |

| NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| SURR School: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> | | If yes, area(s) of SURR identification: | | |
| Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2007-08): | | <input type="checkbox"/> In Good Standing | <input type="checkbox"/> School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1 | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | School in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> NCLB Corrective Action – Year 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> NCLB Corrective Action – Year 2/Planning for Restructuring (PFR) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | NCLB Restructured – Year ____ | <input type="checkbox"/> School Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP) – Year ____ | | |
| Individual Subject/Area Ratings | Elementary/Middle Level | | Secondary Level | |
| | ELA: | | ELA: | |
| | Math: | | Math: | |
| | Science: | | Grad. Rate: | |
| This school's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for each accountability measure: | | | | |

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

| Student Groups | Elementary/Middle Level | | | Secondary Level | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|------|---|-----------------|---|------------|
| | 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 | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | |
| <i>Note: NCLB/SED accountability reports are not available for District 75 schools.</i> | | | | | | |

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

| Progress Report Results – 2007-08 | | Quality Review Results – 2007-08 | |
|--|--|--|---|
| Overall Letter Grade | | Overall Evaluation: | W |
| Overall Score | | Quality Statement Scores: | |
| Category Scores: | | Quality Statement 1: Gather Data | W |
| School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score) | | Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals | W |
| School Performance (Comprises 30% of the Overall Score) | | Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals | W |
| Student Progress (Comprises 55% of the Overall Score) | | Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals | W |
| Additional Credit | | Quality Statement 5: Monitor and Revise | W |
| <i>Note: Progress Report grades are not yet available for District 75 schools.</i> | | | |

SECTION IV: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

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

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

o 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?
-

Based on a comprehensive review of all summative and formative data available to the SCEP committee we have found that over the past few years, P771K has made gains in ELA for students in Standardized Instruction Classes. A review of 2008 standardized test data indicates that approximately 53.1% of all students are approaching the State Standard (Level 2) in English Language Arts, which is an increase of approximately 15% from the previous year. According to NYCDOE Data 43% of elementary students in Standardized Instruction Classes are approaching the State Standard (Level 2) in English Language Arts which is an increase of approximately 17% from the previous year. 62% of middle school students in Standardized Instruction Classes are approaching the State Standard (Level 2) in English Language Arts which is an increase of approximately 13% from the previous year.

Performance Trends for ELA

- 25% of Students in Standardized Instruction Classes in grade 3 achieved a performance level of 2 or higher on the NYS ELA exam. This is an increase of approximately 2% from the previous school year.
- 38.9% of Students in Standardized Instruction Classes in grade 4 achieved a performance level of 2 or higher on the NYS ELA exam. This is an increase of approximately 20% from the previous school year.
- 64.3% of Students in Standardized Instruction Classes in grade 5 achieved a performance level of 2 on the NYS ELA exam. This is an increase of approximately 30% from the previous school year. 21.4% of students in that same grade achieved a performance level of 3 or higher. This is an increase of approximately 10% from the previous school year.
- 64.3% of Students in Standardized Instruction Classes in grade 6 achieved a performance level of 2 on the NYS ELA exam. This is an increase of approximately 12% from the previous school year. 21.4% of students in that same grade achieved a performance level of 3 or higher. This is an increase of approximately 20% from the previous school year.
- 61.9% of Students in Standardized Instruction Classes in grade 7 achieved a performance level of 2 on the NYS ELA exam. This is an increase of approximately 9% from the previous school year. 19.1% of students in that same grade achieved a performance level of 3 or higher. This is an increase of approximately 8% from the previous school year.
- 58.8% of Students in Standardized Instruction Classes in grade 8 achieved a performance level of 2 on the NYS ELA exam. This is an increase of approximately 17 % from the previous school year. 5.9 % of students in that same grade achieved a performance level of 3 or higher.
- 74% of students in the Alternate Assessment Classes scored Level 4 on the NYSAA. This is a decrease of approximately 12% from the year before.

As a result of a comprehensive needs assessment, including focus walks conducted by the principal and members of the Cabinet and School Leadership Team, analysis of data by members of the Inquiry Team, including the New York State Accountability Status Report and data available on ARIS and ATS, and assessment of student work and portfolios, the school has identified the following priorities:

- P771K middle school Standardized Instruction Classes are in need of strategies to improve Comprehension Skills as evidenced by the Performance Series Learning Objectives. We are continuing our inquiry team focus at the Main site (P225) by looking at middle school standardized students and assessing how we can increase their proficiency in English Language Arts .
- P771K elementary school Standardized Instruction Classes are in need of strategies to improve Decoding Skills as evidenced by the Performance Series Learning Objectives.
- P771K Alternate Assessment Classes focus is to augment our teaching strategies so that the students in our school, who do not have the ability to use speech effectively, will be able to communicate their needs and wants in society.
- P771K Alternate Assessment teachers and speech therapist are focusing on Picture Exchange Communication System this school year to augment speech and language communication skills for students. Our inquiry team at P329K is focusing on using the data from the Picture Exchange System to assess student progress and communication.
- P771K will expand professional development and move our staff and students forward to support these initiatives. Throughout our school day and in every subject we strive to augment differentiated instruction in our classes.
- P771K's Learning Environment Survey revealed that only 16% of parents completed the Parent Survey. However, 92% of those parents are satisfied with the school's communication between home and school.
- As sited in our Quality Review the school needs to improve upon disaggregating data by ethnicity to identify possible trends and explore different cultural attitudes.

P771K's Greatest Accomplishments

- We have improved our overall Quality Review rating from Proficient to Well-Developed.
- An increase in the # of students moving to Less Restrictive Environments (LRE) from 93 in 2007-2008 to 98 in 2008-2009.
- 100% of self-contained 8th grade students moved onto Community High Schools in school year 2007-2008
- 100% of all 12th graders graduating from our school have gone onto College each year since 2002 when we obtained a High School Program.
- Recipient of several grants. Such grants include Reso A Grant, Second Step-behavior grant, A+ Mobile Science Lab, and Capezio and Danskin
- P771K's partnership with two Community based organizations. Mason's Phoenix #205 Brooklyn and The Mill Basin Lions Club Brooklyn.
- Cooperative Healthy Active Motivated Positive Students (C.H.A.M.P.S)-opportunity beyond the school day for middles school students for fitness and support.
- Increased students performance scores form Level 1 to Level 2 in ELA and Math as evidenced by the NYCDOE data on the standardized exams.
- Gateway Green House Program- camping and gardening program (P225)
- Fort Tilden-gardening program (I98)
- Highland Park-gardening program (P236)
- As evidence of P771K's 2007-2008 Quality Review the staff collects and uses data routinely as the basis of programming and instruction across the school. The curriculum and approaches to it have been carefully chosen to fit the needs of the students.

P771K's Barriers

- We are spaced challenged.
 - P236-we do not have access to the general gym.
 - P225-related service providers share one small office.
 - Brooklyn Studio-our 3 SETSS teachers share a small office with General Education Resource teacher. They also use this room for AIS and for teacher and student discussions.
 - I98-Our students only have access to the gym once a week.
- We are annually faced with a high teacher turn-over rate.
 - Teaching fellow requirements to teach for a minimum of 2 years.
 - Teacher relocation
 - Child Care Leave
 - Career changes
- Cost and effort to train new teachers is detrimental to our organization.
- Parent involvement continues to be an on-going dilemma.
 - Parents come from neighborhoods throughout Brooklyn which is a traveling hardship for many of them.

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 2008-09 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 (SINI/SRAP/SURR 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 presumably be aligned to the school's annual goals described in this section.

By June 2009

SMART Goal #1:

Thirty percent of MS students scoring within Level II on the NYS ELA test will show a 3% score increase. Student progress will be assessed using Performance Series approximately every 14 weeks (3x a year) and TCWRP running records (4x a year) based on Teacher's College benchmarks.

SMART Goal #2:

Twenty percent of elementary students scoring within Level I on the NYS ELA test will show a 3% score increase. Student progress will be assessed using Performance Series approximately every 14 weeks (3x a year) and TCWRP running records (4x a year) based on Teacher's College benchmarks.

SMART Goal #3:

Non-verbal alternate assessment students will use the Picture Exchange Communication System. Twenty percent of the Alternate Assessment students using the Picture Exchange Communication System will increase by one Phase by June 2009. This will be measured by The Picture Exchange Communication Objectives Assessment Tool.

SMART Goal #4:

To increase the number of parents involved in home school related activities by 10% that will result in a minimum of 5% growth in parent response to the Learning Environment Survey.

SMART Goal #5:

To provide professional development to teachers in the analysis of school data and the alignment of instruction that will result in an increase in ELA scores by 5 % evidenced by Performance Series, TCWRP Assessments and the NYSAA data.

ACTION VI: ACTION PLAN

Directions: The action plan should be used as a tool to support effective implementation and to evaluate progress toward meeting goals. Use the action plan template provided below to indicate key strategies and activities to be implemented for the 2008-09 school year to support accomplishment of each annual goal identified in Section V. The action plan template should be duplicated as necessary. **Reminder:** Schools designated for improvement (SINI/SRAP/SURR 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.

Standardized Middle School ELA

Subject/Area (where relevant):

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p> | <p>By June 2009: Thirty percent of MS students scoring within Level II on the NYS ELA test will show a 3% score increase. Student progress will be assessed using Performance Series approximately every 14 weeks (3x a year) and TCWRP running records (4x a year) based on Teacher’s College benchmarks.</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> | <p>All standardized middle school students will use Literacy Navigator as a supplement to the core curriculum. Pre and post assessments will be conducted for every unit. Each unit consists of 30 forty-five minute lessons that will be taught twice a week.</p> |
| <p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p> | <p>Literacy Navigator is a District Initiative that is being piloted at our school and will be overseen by Carmen Amador, Director of Literacy. Teachers have received training by America’s Choice.</p> |
| <p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p> | <p>Progress will be verified by student test scores, portfolios, and informal and formal assessments.</p> |

Standardized Elementary ELA

Subject/Area (where relevant):

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p> | <p>By June 2009: Twenty percent of elementary students scoring within Level I on the NYS ELA test will show a 3% score increase. Student progress will be assessed using Performance Series approximately every 14 weeks (3x a year) and TCWRP running records (4x a year) based on Teacher’s College benchmarks.</p> |
| <p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p> | <p>All standardized elementary school students will use TCWRP as the literacy core curriculum. Teachers will conduct reading running records four times a year to ensure that all students are progressing. Teachers will conduct reading responses and writing on demand assessments bi-monthly.</p> |
| <p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p> | <p>Staff will continue to attend calendar days at Teacher’s College. Monies will be allocated for Calendar Days and substitute teachers in My Galaxy from our school budget.</p> |
| <p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p> | <p>Progress will be verified by student test scores, portfolios, and informal and formal assessments.</p> |

Communication Skills for Alternate Assessment Students

Subject/Area (where relevant):

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p> | <p>By June 2009: Non-verbal alternate assessment students will use the Picture Exchange Communication System. Twenty percent of the Alternate Assessment students using the Picture Exchange Communication System will increase by one Phase by June 2009. This will be measured by The Picture Exchange Communication Objectives Assessment Tool.</p> |
| <p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p> | <p>All Alternate Assessment Classes will use Picture Exchange Communication Systems for selected students. All teachers and Speech Therapists will attend District workshops and have the coach follow up in school. At P329 Inquiry Team will focus on Picture Exchange Communication Systems Data to assess student’s progress in Communication skills.</p> |
| <p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p> | <p>Monies will be allocated in My Galaxy from our school budget for staff development, materials and substitute teachers.</p> |
| <p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p> | <p>Progress will be verified by review of Picture Exchange Communication System Data every 4-6 weeks and student video-portfolios only at P329.</p> |

Parent Involvement

Subject/Area (where relevant):

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p> | <p>To increase the number of parents involved in home school related activities by 10% that will result in a minimum of 5% growth in parent response to the Learning Environment Survey.</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> | <p>Administrators and Parent Coordinator will review events conducted during the school year along with the number of parents in attendance. A school calendar of year long events will be issued by late September. Monthly calendar and Parent Coordinator’s Newsletter will highlight upcoming events. One of the monthly parent association meetings will be dedicated to the Learning Environment Survey and Parent Engagement.</p> |
| <p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</p> | <p>Tax Levy monies will provide for: presenters, materials, food and transportation.</p> |
| <p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</p> | <p>Attendance will be charted by the Parent Coordinator and reviewed by Administrators monthly. An increase of 5% of the Parental Response of the Learning Environment Survey will be cited in Spring of 2009.</p> |

Subject/Area (where relevant):

Differentiated Instruction

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Annual Goal <i>Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</i></p> | <p>To provide professional development to teachers in the analysis of school data and the alignment of instruction that will result in an increase in ELA scores by 5 % evidenced by Performance Series, TCWRP Assessments and the NYSAA data.</p> |
| <p>Action Plan <i>Include: actions/strategies/activities the school will implement to accomplish the goal; target population(s); responsible staff members; and implementation timelines.</i></p> | <p>All Students will be grouped appropriately in their classes. Teachers and Paraprofessionals will instruct according to each student’s Individual Education Plan goals and objectives, based on assessments.</p> |
| <p>Aligning Resources: Implications for Budget, Staffing/Training, and Schedule <i>Include reference to the use of Contracts for Excellence (C4E) allocations, where applicable.</i></p> | <p>Teachers and Paraprofessionals will be trained in small group instruction. Senior staff members will provide ongoing support and modeling by becoming mentor teachers.</p> |
| <p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p> | <p>Students’ progress will be measured by TCWRP running record, Performance Series, Applied Behavior Analysis Assessments and NYSAA. Focus walks will be conducted and documented twice a year to ensure small group instruction is taking place (as noted in teacher lesson plans and observations)</p> |

REQUIRED APPENDICES TO THE CEP FOR 2008-2009

Directions: All schools must complete Appendices 1, 2, 3, 7 & 8. All Title I schools must complete Appendix 4. All schools identified under NCLB or SED for School Improvement, including Title I Schools in Need of Improvement (SINI) – Year 1 and Year 2, Title I Corrective Action (CA) Schools, NCLB Planning for Restructuring Schools, NCLB Restructured Schools, and Schools Requiring Academic Progress (SRAP), must complete Appendix 5. All Schools Under Registration Review (SURR) must complete Appendix 6. **Note: Please refer to the accompanying CEP Guide for specific CEP submission instructions and timelines.**

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

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

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

APPENDIX 4: NCLB REQUIREMENT FOR ALL TITLE I SCHOOLS

APPENDIX 5: NCLB/SED REQUIREMENTS FOR SINI AND SRAP SCHOOLS

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

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

APPENDIX 8: CONTRACT FOR EXCELLENCE (CFE) SCHOOL-BASED EXPENDITURES FOR 2008-09 – SED REQUIREMENT FOR ALL SCHOOLS

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

- Students in Grades K – 2 who do not meet reading and writing benchmarks on Teachers College Assessments.
- Students in Grades 3 – 8 who are performing at Level 1 or Level 2 on New York State English Language Arts (ELA), Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies Assessments, or failed major subjects on report cards.
- Students in Grades 9 – 12 who scored below the passing grade on Regents examinations, and/or failed a major subject.

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: | Students, who have scored Level 1 and Level 2, will be targeted for Academic Intervention Services in reading during the school day. Staff will provide support services/remedial services/test taking strategies to target areas of weakness. Both individual and small group instruction is provided. Wilson, Great Leaps, Word Study, Power Up, and New York State Coach books. The students receive services during the school day. |
| Mathematics: | Students, who have scored Level 1 and Level 2, will be targeted for Academic Intervention Services in reading during the school day. Staff will provide support services/remedial services/test taking strategies to target areas of weakness. Both individual and small group instruction is provided by using Math Steps, Math Games, and New York State Coach books. The students receive services during the school day. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Science:</p> | <p>Students, who have scored Level 1 and Level 2, will be targeted for Academic Intervention Services in reading during the school day. Staff will provide support services/remedial services/test taking strategies to target areas of weakness. Both individual and small group instruction is provided using Smart Science labs, FOSS kits, and New York State Coach books. The students receive services during the school day.</p> |
| <p>Social Studies:</p> | <p>Students, who have scored Level 1 and Level 2, will be targeted for Academic Intervention Services in reading during the school day. Staff will provide support services/remedial services/test taking strategies to target areas of weakness. Both individual and small group instruction is provided by using New York State Coach Books. The students receive services during the school day.</p> |
| <p>At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:</p> | <p>Small groups and 1:1 sessions using Life Space Crisis Intervention, Therapeutic Crisis Intervention and social skills curriculum are used as needed, and during no clubs on Friday afternoons to help students function appropriately in their school environment.</p> |
| <p>At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:</p> | <p>Small groups and 1:1 sessions using Life Space Crisis Intervention, Therapeutic Crisis Intervention and social skills curriculum are used as needed, and during no clubs on Friday afternoons to help students function appropriately in their school environment.</p> |
| <p>At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:</p> | <p>Small groups and 1:1 sessions using Life Space Crisis Intervention, Therapeutic Crisis Intervention and social skills curriculum are used as needed, and during no clubs on Friday afternoons to help students function appropriately in their school environment. them to re-focus and return to the classroom.</p> |
| <p>At-risk Health-related Services:</p> | <p>Done on an as needed basis for individual students.</p> |

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

NCLB/SED requirement for all schools

Part A: CR Part 154 (A-4) Bilingual/ESL Program Description

**CR Part 154 (A-6)
Program Description
2008-2009**

**District: 75
School Building: P771K@225
No. LEP/ELLs Served in 2007-2008: 43
Type of Program: ESL
Name of Principal: Sharon Meyers Izzo**

SCHOOL BUILDING ESL PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

(Not to exceed two pages)

- I. **Instructional Program for ELLs:** The school has a Freestanding ESL program that serves a total of 46 LEP/ELLs during the 2008-2009 school year. This total number includes 16 students whose IEP's indicate ESL Only, 16 students in Alternate Placement and 13 x-coded students and 1 transitional ELL who passed the NYSESLAT and is supported with ESL/AIS services for up to two years. All ELLs are in Alternative Assessment with 37 students in Elementary grades and 8 students in Middle School grades with 13 students in 12:1:4 ratio, 5 students in 12:1:1, 18 students in 6:1:1, 10 students in 8:1:1 ratios. The number of students within each language group spoken by ELLs is as follows: 18 Spanish, 10 Chinese, 8 Russian, 3 Arabic, 2 Yiddish, 1 Urdu, 1 Italian, 1 Korean and 1 Malayalam. According to the NYSESLAT scores we have 2 students at the Advanced level of English language proficiency, 4 ELL students at the Intermediate level and the rest of ELLs are at their Beginning level. LAB-R is administered to new entrants to determine eligibility for ESL services. As a part of Native Language Assessment, the Spanish LAB is administered to those students whose home language is Spanish.

Freestanding ESL Program Description: Our ESL program is provided by a certified ESL teacher through a combination of self-contained ESL and “push-in” teaching models of instruction. The instructional language is English. Students in Alternative Placement received additional support in their native language and English from 13 paraprofessionals who speak the students’ native language, and English and 3 bilingual speech therapists who provided direct services to ELLs in students’ native languages. All ELLs receive the number of units of ESL instruction as required by CR Part 154. To ensure that students meet the standards and pass the required state and local assessments, ESL instruction follows the NYS ESL Standards and incorporates ESL strategies such as: Total Physical Response (TPR), Language Experience, Whole Language, Scaffolding Techniques, and graphic organizers, and Cooperative Learning. The use of technology and augmentative communication was incorporated to give students additional instructional support. Intervention strategies that have been used with ESL students were: The Cognitive Academic Language Experience and Whole Language Approach. The use of technology was incorporated to give the students additional instructional support. Multisensory and multicultural ESL materials were infused throughout all aspects of instruction. The classroom library has also been used to give the students a variety of books of all levels that reflect the background, needs, and strength and languages of ELLs. Additionally, the teachers use informal methods to assess the students’ progress.

A. Curricular: For all students content area instruction is provided as follows: all subjects are taught in English through ESL methodologies by Special Education teachers who have completed the mandated 10 hours of Jose P. ESL training. The ESL methodologies used in the classrooms include: TPR, Language Experience, the Natural Approach, Whole Language, the use of graphic organizers, multisensory approaches were used in conjunction with augmentative communication devices and Mayer Johnson Symbols. Content Area Instruction follows the NYC Scope and Sequence for Content Area teaching and uniform curriculum for Math. The use of technology is incorporated into ESL and Content Area Instruction to give students additional support through Balanced Literacy; children develop listening comprehension and an overall language acquisition. Through student observations and conversations with parents of ELLs, our ESL teacher has noted that Literacy practices in ELL students’ home language have showed positive influence on students’ literacy acquisition. Reading in ELL students’ native language is positively associated with students’ emergent literacy skills, such as vocabulary, letter-name knowledge, phonological awareness and conventional literacy skills, as word reading and spelling. Native language literacy for ELLs is supported by multicultural library books, as well as books in the Spanish and Russian languages and the adaptation of literacy materials to meet the needs of students with severe disabilities. Content area teachers put more emphasis on team teaching along with our ESL teacher to help to identify students’ need for extra language support. Cooperative planning during common prep periods with an ESL teacher and service providers ensures that the class program takes

into account children's language needs; suggesting additional communicative language activities related to the classroom program; and alerting staff to resources available to support the language development of bilingual students.

B. Extracurricular:

Students have monthly trips to the Aviator Sports and Recreation Center where they participate in a wide variety of activities and sports. Middle School ELL students receive additional support in Literacy, Science, Art and Technology during after-school program.

All ELL students are actively involved in holiday parties and shows held every month at each site:

October 31, 2008 – Wonder Walk/neighborhood Walk with Costumes

November 25, 2008 – Thanksgiving Feast

December 16, 2008 – Winter Holiday Show

January 20, 2009 – President's inauguration

January 22, 2009 – Winter Wonderland Show

II. **Parent Community Involvement:** Options for special education ELLs are discussed with parents during the Educational Planning Conference at the CSE level. The parent coordinator at P771K offers parents of ELL's on-going information in their home languages and training on different aspects of their children's education, such as home activities to support learning, outside supports in their local community, and parent interest needs survey. Our Parent Orientation Meeting was held on 09/10/08 informing the parents about the programs available in our school and other schools in the district. Interviews with the parents of newly enrolled ELLs are conducted by our ESL teacher during their first enrollment to the school system. During our parent-teacher conferences, meetings and workshops our ESL teacher discuss different ELL issues, such the instructional methods used in teaching each unit, addressing the students' individual differences in the classroom, the types of homework assigned to the students, and how parents could best respond to the homework. Parents, who are engaged in oral presentations, are provided with interpreters' services. ELLs and their families have an access to the valuable educational resources in different languages, technological tools and software. Parents also have an access to the informational brochures in 13 different languages about NYSESLAT and how it measures the progress of English language learners. From this brochure, parents learn what they can do to help their students meet the challenges of NYSESLAT.

III. **Project Jump Start:** N/A

IV. **Professional Development:** Our school ensures the attendance of bilingual, ESL, and monolingual teachers and paraprofessionals at district, city and state wide conferences focusing on the education of ELLs. The tentative schedule for the PDs planned for the staff and turn keyed by our ESL teacher is as follows:

Compliance: the 3rd week of October;
Integrating Multiple Intelligences into the Curriculum for ELLs with Severe Disabilities: the 3rd week of November;
Second Language Learning through the Content Areas for ELLs with Disabilities in both Standardized and Alternate Assessment: mid-December;
L-1 and Culture as Vehicles for promoting Language and Social Development through intercultural Communicative Competence in ELLs diagnosed with Developmental Disabilities: the last week of February;
Administration of the NYSESLAT: mid-April;
Team-Teaching and Integrated Lesson Planning via the push-in model of instructing ELLs in both Standardized and Alternate Assessment: the first week of June;
P771K's teachers and paraprofessionals serving ELLs are also supported by the district's instructional Coaches.

V. **Support Services provided to LEP students:**

Newcomers: We have 6 Newcomers this year who receive tutoring, differentiated instruction, alternate placement paraprofessionals, development of initial literacy in native language, and a nurturing environment to facilitate language production.

SIFE: Presently we have no SIFE students. At such time that we do we will provide with a buddy student, tutoring and support in native language.

Transition Plan: Students who passed the NYSESLAT are supported for a period of up to two years with ESL and other support services.

Extension of Services: For those students with an extension of services individual prescriptive and diagnostic plans have been implemented to facilitate tutoring or differentiated instruction. Students participated in all after school programs designed to improve test prep and literacy skills.

Long Term ELL students are supported through: extended day programs, AIS, Instructional Technology, visual arts enrichment.

VI. **Name/type of native language assessments administered** (bilingual programs only): N/A

Language Allocation Policy (LAP)

School: P771K

District: 75
Principal: Sharon Meyers Izzo

LAP Committee: Sharon Meyers Izzo, Principal; Annette Beale, Assistant Principal; Heather Leykam, Assistant Principal; Gouzalia Olson, ESL Teacher; and Denise Ramos, Parent Coordinator.

P771K has 6 sites located in different sections of Brooklyn. In 2008-2009 school year the school population consisted of 394 students from culturally diverse backgrounds; approximately 46% of the students are Black; 33% are White, 14% are Hispanic and 5% are other.

The school has a Freestanding ESL program that serves a total of 46 LEP/ELLs during the 2008-2009 school year. This total number includes 16 students whose IEP's indicate ESL Only, 16 students in Alternate Placement and 13 x-coded students and 1 transitional ELL who passed the NYSESLAT and is supported with ESL/AIS services for up to two years. All ELLs are in Alternative Assessment with 37 students in Elementary grades and 8 students in Middle School grades with 13 students in 12:1:4 ratio, 5 students in 12:1:1, 18 students in 6:1:1, 10 students in 8:1:1 ratios. The number of students within each language group spoken by ELLs is as follows: 18 Spanish, 10 Chinese, 8 Russian, 1 Urdu, 3 Arabic, 2 Yiddish, 1 Korean and 1 Malayalam. According to the NYSESLAT scores we have 2 students at the Advanced level of English language proficiency, 4 ELL students at the Intermediate level and the rest of ELLs are at their Beginning level. LAB-R is administered to new entrants to determine eligibility for ESL services. As a part of Native Language Assessment, the Spanish LAB is administered to those students whose home language is Spanish.

Parent Community Involvement: 100% of our school population is special education students with multiple disabilities. Parents of students in special education do not have the same opportunities for parent involvement activities as parents of students in general education. Options for special education ELLs are discussed with parents during the Educational Planning Conferences at the CSE level. The parent coordinator at P771K offers parents of Ell's on-going information in their home languages and training on different aspects of their children's education, such as home activities to support learning, outside supports in their local community, and parent interest needs survey. The Parent Orientation Meeting was held on 09/10/08 informing the parents about the programs available in our school and other schools in the district. Interviews with the parents of newly enrolled ELLs are conducted by our ESL teacher during their first enrollment to the school system. During our parent-teacher conferences, meetings and workshops our ESL teacher discuss different ELL issues, such the instructional methods used in teaching each unit, addressing the students' individual differences in the classroom, the types of homework assigned to the students, and how parents could best respond to the homework. Parents, who are engaged in oral presentations, are provided with interpreters' services.

Patterns in proficiency: LAB-R is administered to new entrants to determine eligibility for ESL services. As a part of Native Language Assessment, the Spanish LAB is administered to those students whose home language is Spanish. In the beginning of each academic year ELLs are assessed via Brigance.

ESL students from 3rd through 8th grades also participated in the Alternative Assessment 2007-2008 NYSAA. 4 students in the 5th grade scored at level 4 in Math, and 4 in Reading; 1 student scored 4, and 1 student scored 1 in Science. In the 6th grade, 2 students scored 4 in Math, and 2 students scored 4 in Reading; 1 student scored 2 in Science, and 1 student scored 4 in Social Studies. In the 7th grade, 2 students scored 4 in Math, 3 students scored 4 in Reading, 1 student scored 3 in Math, 1 student scored 4 in Social Studies. Their participation was ensured through the use of augmentative devices and adaptations. The LAB Team has observed that the ELL students succeeded in NYSAA with higher scores than in the NYSESLAT, mostly, because the NYSAA test materials are adapted according to the special needs of our students.

All ELLs participated in the NYSESLAT in spring 2008. In grades K-1, students at the beginner proficiency level scored higher in speaking and listening than in reading and writing. In grades 2-3, 2 ESL students at the Beginning proficiency level scored sufficiently in all four modalities and moved to the Intermediate level. The scores for 12 Elementary ELLs were invalid due to the students' severe disabilities. In grades 4-5, students at the Beginning proficiency level improved their reading skills with higher scores in reading comparing to the test scores in the past. 1 student scored at the Intermediate level of proficiency. The scores for 2 Middle School ELLs were invalid. In the 6th grade, 1 ELL student passed the NYSESLAT and will be supported with transitional ESL services for a period of up to two years. In grades 7-8, students at the beginner proficiency level scored higher in speaking and listening than in reading and writing. 13 X-coded ELLs also showed progress in all four modalities with significant improvement in reading, speaking, listening skills, 2 students scored at the intermediate proficiency level, and 2 students - at the advanced level.

Implications for LAP: During the LAP process we have evaluated our program needs to ensure that staffing, materials, and program requirements meet the needs of our ELLs.

Implications for Instruction: The SMART Board technology was implemented into all subject areas to increase English language proficiency and academic achievement for ELL students with special needs and different learning styles. In 2008-2009 school year, we use an instructional program to develop writing and reading skills through the integration of academic content. The program will implement English language skills development and content area instruction through the use of ESL methodologies to ensure that ELL students meet the standards and pass the required State assessments, LAB-R and/or NYSESLAT. Some of the ESL strategies to be used in our program are guided reading, shared reading, silent reading, reading aloud; writing process, hands on projects, cooperative learning, charts, graphic organizers, visual aids and technology. The use of computers will provide students with the opportunity to practice listening, writing, reading skills, and language development.

Freestanding ESL Program Description: Our ESL program is composed of 46 ELL students in 2008-2009 school year. ESL classes are provided by a certified ESL teacher through a combination of self-contained ESL classes and “push-in” teaching models of instruction. The language of instruction is English. Students in Alternative Placement receive additional support in their native language and English from 13 paraprofessionals in the students’ native language and English, and 3 bilingual speech therapists that provide direct services to ELLs in students’ native languages.

All ELLs receive the number of units of ESL instruction as required by CR Part 154. To ensure that students meet the standards and pass the required state and local assessments, ESL instruction follows the NYS ESL Standards and incorporates ESL strategies such as: Total Physical Response (TPR), Language Experience, Whole Language, Scaffolding Techniques, graphic organizers, and Cooperative Learning. The use of technology and augmentative communication devices are incorporated to give students additional instructional support.

Intervention strategies used with ESL students are: The Cognitive Academic Language Experience and Whole Language Approach. The use of technology is incorporated to give the students additional instructional support. Multi-sensory and multicultural ESL materials are infused throughout all aspects of instruction. The classroom library is also used to give the students a variety of books of all levels that reflect the background, needs, and strength and languages of ELLs. Additionally, the teacher uses informal methods to assess the students’ progress.

Content Area Instruction: For all students content area is provided as follows: all subjects are taught in English through ESL methodologies by Special Education teachers who have completed the mandated 10 hours of Jose P. ESL training. The ESL methodologies used include: TPR, Language Experience, the Natural Approach, Whole Language, the use of graphic organizers, multisensory approaches used in conjunction with augmentative communication devices and Mayer Johnson Symbols. Content Area Instruction follows the NYC Scope and Sequence for Content Area teaching and uniform curriculum for Math. The use of technology is incorporated into ESL and Content Area Instruction to give students additional support.

Through Balanced Literacy, children will develop listening comprehension and an overall language acquisition. Through student observations and conversations with parents of ELLs, our ESL teacher has noted that Literacy practices in ELL students’ home language have showed positive influence on students’ literacy acquisition. Reading in ELL students’ native language is positively associated with students’ emergent literacy skills, such as vocabulary, letter-name knowledge, phonological awareness and conventional literacy skills, as word reading and spelling.

Native language literacy for ELLs is supported by multicultural library books, as well as books in the Spanish and Russian languages and the adaptation of literacy materials to meet the needs of students with severe disabilities. Content area teachers put more emphasis on team teaching along with our ESL teacher to help to identify students’ need for extra language support. Cooperative planning during common prep periods with an ESL teacher and service providers ensures that the class program

takes into account children's language needs; suggesting additional communicative language activities related to the classroom program; and alerting staff to resources available to support the language development of bilingual students.

Support Services provided to LEP students:

Newcomers: We have 6 Newcomers this year who receive tutoring, differentiated instruction, alternate placement paraprofessionals, development of initial literacy in native language, and a nurturing environment to facilitate language production.

SIFE: Presently we have no SIFE students. At such time that we do we will provide with a buddy student, tutoring and support in native language.

Transition Plan: Students who passed the NYSESLAT are supported for a period of up to two years with ESL and other support services.

Extension of Services: For those students with an extension of services individual prescriptive and diagnostic plans have been implemented to facilitate tutoring or differentiated instruction. Students participated in all after school programs designed to improve test prep and literacy skills.

Long Term ELL students are supported through: extended day programs, AIS, Instructional Technology, visual arts enrichment.

Professional Development:

Professional development topics for teachers of ELLs include:

Compliance: the 3rd week of October;

Integrating Multiple Intelligences into the Curriculum for ELLs with Severe Disabilities: the 3rd week of November; Second Language Learning through the Content Areas for ELLs with Disabilities in both Standardized and Alternate Assessment: mid-December;

L-1 and Culture as Vehicles for promoting Language and Social Development through intercultural Communicative Competence in ELLs diagnosed with Developmental Disabilities: the last week of February;

Administration of the NYSESLAT: mid-April;

Team-Teaching and Integrated Lesson Planning via the push-in model of instructing ELLs in both Standardized and Alternate Assessment: the first week of June.

P771K's teachers and paraprofessionals will also be supported by the district's instructional Coaches. In addition, the school will ensure the attendance of bilingual, ESL, and monolingual teachers and paraprofessionals at district, city and state wide conferences focusing on the education of ELLs.

P771K is dedicated to serving the needs of all ELL students. Our goal is to create a rigorous learning environment that focuses on academic achievement, language and social development, and cross-cultural support. We will continue to provide ELLs and their families with equity and access to an excellent education by strengthening instructional staff, promoting parental involvement, and improving material resources.

Part C: CR Part 154 – Number of Teachers and Support Personnel for 2007-08

School Building: _____P771K_____ **District** __75_____

List the FTEs in your school in the Bilingual Education and ESL programs in the appropriate column.

| Number of Teachers 2007-2008 | | | | Number of Teaching Assistants or Paraprofessionals*** | | Total |
|---------------------------------|----------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|-------|
| Appropriately Certified* | | Inappropriately Certified or Uncertified Teachers** | | Bilingual Program | ESL Program | |
| Bilingual Program | ESL Program | Bilingual Program | ESL Program | | | |
| NA | 1 | NA | NA | NA | 13 | 14 |

* The number of teachers reported must represent the number of teachers holding an appropriate license for the subject area being taught (i.e., language arts and content area.) Note: The Office of Bilingual Education and Foreign Language Studies will conduct a random review of the 2006-2007 teacher reported data. Districts randomly selected

will be asked to electronically submit to the Department, the name of the teacher(s), social security number and type of license or certificate issued by the NYSED.

** Examples of this may include: teachers without an appropriate New York State teaching certificate or New York City license for the subject area(s) being taught or without a valid NYS teaching certificate or NYC license.

*** Teaching Assistants and Paraprofessionals must be working under the direct supervision of a licensed teacher. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Part D: CR Part 154 – Sample Student Schedules

SAMPLE STUDENT CLASSROOM SCHEDULE 2008-09 ESL

Not Required

P771K

A-2(a)

Number of LEP Students Identified and Served in Each School Building by Type of Program in 2008-09

School District: 75

School Building P771K@225, 236, 329, 98

(Complete this form for each school building with LEP students in grades 7-12 and Special Education during 2008-09)

| | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | Grade 9 | Grade 10 | Grade 11 | Grade 12 | Special Education(K-12) |
|----------|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------|----------|-------------------------|
| Language | | | | | | | |

| | Identified | Served | | Identified | Served | | Identified | Served | | Identified | Served | | Identified | Served | | Identified | Served | |
|------------------|------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|------------|--------|-----|
| | | Bil | ESL | | Bil | ESL | | Bil | ESL | | Bil | ESL | | Bil | ESL | | Bil | ESL |
| Arabic (ARB) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | | 3 |
| Chinese (CMN) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 10 | | 10 |
| French (FRA) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| H. Creole (HAT) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hindi (HIN) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Japanese (JPN) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Korean (KOR) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| Polish (POL) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Portuguese (POR) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Russian (RUS) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 8 | | 8 |
| Spanish (SPA) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 19 | | 19 |
| Vietnamese (VIE) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Urdu | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 |

Part E: Title III: Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students – School Year 2008-2009

N/A for 2008-2009 School Year

Form TIII – A (1)(a)

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

Number of Teachers _____ Other Staff (Specify) _____

School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview

Title III, Part A LEP Program

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

N/A

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.

N/A

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

N/A

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

| Allocation: | | |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Budget Category | Budgeted Amount | Explanation of Proposed Expenditure |
| Professional staff, per session, per diem (Note: schools must account for fringe benefits) | | |
| Purchased services such as curriculum and staff development contracts | | |
| Supplies and materials | | |
| Travel | | |
| Other | | |
| TOTAL | | |

APPENDIX 3: LANGUAGE TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

Requirement under Chancellor's Regulations – for all schools

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

Part A: Needs Assessment Findings

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

Each parent meets with the school staff when their child is placed in our school. An intake form is completed where the student's home language is noted. The appropriate language service for students is determined at CSE/SBST level based on the HLIS responses and follow-up interviews with the parents. The district sends letters in all languages to send home with the children that need different language translation.

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.

The parent coordinator keeps a record of all students that are in need of translation and interpretation. If it is necessary, the district supports us in this process.

Part B: Strategies and Activities

1. Describe the written translation services the school will provide, and how they will meet identified needs indicated in Part A. Include procedures to ensure timely provision of translated documents to parents determined to be in need of language assistance services. Indicate

whether written translation services will be provided by an outside vendor, or in-house by school staff or parent volunteers.

The parent coordinator is supported by the district and the Office of Translation Services. Written translations in Spanish are provided by in-house school staff. The parent coordinator forwards requests for written translation in other languages to the Office of Translation services. Outside vendors are contacted in the event that the translation request cannot be accommodated by this office.

2. Describe the oral interpretation services the school will provide, and how they will meet identified needs indicated in Part A. Indicate whether oral interpretation services will be provided by an outside contractor, or in-house by school staff or parent volunteers.

Oral translations in Spanish are conducted through the Parent Coordinator, as well as through two other staff members, one of them a receptionist of main school line. The Office of Translation is called and translation is done via telephone in the event that in-house staff cannot accommodate.

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>.

Notices are posted throughout building that advise parents regarding their right to request translation services. Letters are backpacked with students at the beginning of school year and before Parent-Teacher Conferences, advising parents as to this right. All letters are delivered to the students and families in their home language. Information sent from the district comes in 8 different languages to accommodate every family

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

All schools must complete this appendix.

Background

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

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

CURRICULUM AUDIT FINDINGS

KEY FINDING 1: CURRICULUM

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

1A. English Language Arts

Background

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

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

ELA Alignment Issues:

- **Gaps in the Written Curriculum.** Data show that the written curriculum in use by many schools is not aligned with the state standards in terms of the range of topics covered and the depth of understanding required. All reviewed curricula had gaps relative to the New York State ELA standards. The fewest gaps were found at Grade 2, but the gaps increased as the grade levels increased. Interviewed staff in a number of the schools that were audited reported less consistent and effective curriculum and instruction at the secondary level. These data further indicated that curricula were not adequately articulated—less articulated in secondary than elementary schools.
- **Curriculum Maps.** The curriculum alignment analyses noted that although a number of curriculum maps had been developed, the mapping has been done at a topical level only and does not drill down to an expected level of cognitive demand that will indicate to teachers what students should know and be able to do at each grade level. These curriculum maps addressed only content topics—not skills to be mastered, strategies to be utilized, or student outcomes to be attained.
- **Taught Curriculum.** The *Surveys of Enacted Curriculum* (SEC)¹ data also show that the taught curriculum is not aligned to the state standards. For example, in the reviewed high school-level ELA classes, auditors observed a great disparity between what is taught and the depth to which it should be taught. A similar lack of depth can be seen in elementary and middle grades as well (specifically Grades 2, 4, 5, and 6) and Grade 8. As one might look at it, the taught ELA curriculum is quite broad but lacks depth in any one area. Although standards indicate that instruction should be focused on having students create written products and spoken presentations, SEC data show quite the opposite. There is very little emphasis on speaking and listening and only a moderately higher level of emphasis on writing. Critical reading also is supposed to have a much greater depth than is currently occurring in high school English classes.
- **ELA Materials.** In a number of the audited schools, teachers interviewed indicate that they have sufficient amounts of curriculum materials available to them; however, the materials they have are not adequate to meet the needs of all learners, particularly English language learners, students with disabilities, and struggling readers. Further, the materials in use are

¹ To examine whether instruction was aligned to the New York state standards and assessments, teachers in the district completed the *Surveys of Enacted Curriculum* (SEC). Based on two decades of research funded by the National Science Foundation, the SEC are designed to facilitate the comparison of enacted (taught) curriculum to standards (intended) and assessed curriculum (state tests), using teachers' self-assessments. The data for each teacher consist of more than 500 responses. The disciplinary topic by cognitive-level matrix is presented in graphic form, which creates a common language for comparison and a common metric to maintain comparison objectivity.

reportedly often not relevant to the students' background knowledge, suggesting a need for more age appropriate and culturally relevant books and articles for student use.

– **English Language Learners**

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

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

1A.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.

Teachers attend Monthly Calendar Days at Columbia University and are given Curriculum Maps. Teachers K-2, 3-5, and 6-8 meet every month to do unit planning. Monthly on-demand reading responses and writing pieces are reviewed each month to determine mini-lessons and guided groups.

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

Applicable x Not Applicable

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

Improvements on NYS ELA test scores grades 3-12

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

1B. Mathematics

Background

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

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

Specific Math Alignment Issues:

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

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

1B.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.

Teachers use Scantron Data to align Standards with Instruction. Weekly grade conference meetings are held with the Assistant Principal and SBC. We follow a mandated core curriculum and augment it with another program, Classroom, Inc. Teachers attend staff development to help meet the NYS Standards. Coaches come into our school to help support the teachers in meeting the NYS Standards

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

Applicable x Not Applicable

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

Improvements on the NYS Math Test

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

KEY FINDING 2: INSTRUCTION

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

2A – ELA Instruction

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

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

2A.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school’s educational program.

TC – staff development (calendar days – wherein the teachers follow the Reader’s and Writer’s Workshop Model), SBC- models in assigned classrooms, teacher intervisitations with other colleagues and grade conference meetings that are held each week.

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

Applicable x Not Applicable

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

Classroom observations - formal/informal

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

2B – Mathematics Instruction

Auditors noted that although high academically focused class time was observed either frequently or extensively in 80 percent of K–8 mathematics classes, it was observed at this level only in 45 percent of the high school mathematics classes. Further, a high level of student engagement was observed either frequently or extensively in 52 percent of Grades K–8 and 35 percent of Grades 9–12 mathematics classrooms. *School Observation Protocol (SOM²)* and SEC results also shed light on some of the instructional practices in the mathematics classroom. The SOM noted that direct instruction in K-8 mathematics classes was frequently or extensively seen 75 percent of the time in Grades K–8 (and 65 percent of the time in Grades 9–12). Student activities other than independent seatwork and hands-on learning in the elementary grades were rarely if ever observed. Technology use in mathematics classes also was very low.

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

2B.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.

Teachers are assigned to specific Professional Development workshops. Grade Conference meetings are held each week.

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

Applicable x Not Applicable

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

Classroom observations – formal/informal

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

KEY FINDING 3: TEACHER EXPERIENCE AND STABILITY

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 3:

3.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.

Payroll secretary gives the Principal information each year. Much of the turnover is from hiring teaching fellows who leave after their two year commitment is fulfilled. Also, many of the turnover staff are young, uncommitted staff who eventually move on to other obligations, locations and employment opportunities.

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

x Applicable Not Applicable

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

The number of new teachers actually hired each year as reported by payroll secretary

3.4: If the finding is applicable, how will your school address the relevant issue(s)? Indicate whether your school will need additional support from central to address this issue. **We do not need help from central, just need to hire teachers that will stay and grow with the organization and not leave soon after hiring.**

KEY FINDING 4: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 4:

4.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.

Professional development opportunities are offered to the teachers on a district level. The school ensures the attendance of bilingual, ESL and monolingual teachers and paraprofessionals at district, city and state wide conferences focusing on the education of ELLs.

P771K's teachers and paraprofessionals are also supported by the district ELL Coaches.

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

x Applicable Not Applicable

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

A number of teachers haven't completed the mandated 10 hours of Jose P. ESL Training.

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

Our school will need additional support in providing content area teachers with the mandated Jose P. ESL Training hours.

KEY FINDING 5: DATA USE AND MONITORING—ELL INSTRUCTION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 5:

5.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.

All Standardized Assessment ELLs were administered NYSESLAT. The test scores showed improvement in writing and listening skills and sufficiently progress in reading and speaking skills with the state designed levels of English proficiency as Intermediate, Advanced and Proficient.

Because of their severe disabilities, the majority of ELL students were exempt from Standardized Testing in the past. However, in 2007-2008 school year all Alternate Assessment students participated in NYSESLAT showing progress in listening and speaking skills. The students were assessed via Brigance in the beginning of this academic year. According to NYS Alternate Assessment standards our students showed improvement with the test scores on Levels 3 and 4. Teachers used informal methods to assess the students' progress. Students' participation was ensured through the use of augmentative devices and adaptations.

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

Applicable x Not Applicable

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

Data and Test Results, Teacher Assessments

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

KEY FINDING 6: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT—SPECIAL EDUCATION

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 6:

6.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.

We are a D75 school. All teachers and teams affiliated with each student's IEP meet to discuss each student individually. Teachers are attending Professional Development workshops geared toward the population of their students. Differentiated Instruction is ongoing.

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

Applicable x Not Applicable

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

Classroom observations –formal/informal, weekly grade conferences meetings with the Assistant Principal and School Based Coach to turn key all information learned and as a team decide next steps for implementation.

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

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

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 7:

7.1: Describe the process your school has or will engage in to assess whether this finding is relevant to your school's educational program.

We have an IEP Review team with all pertinent personnel for each student. Each student is assessed individually as to their educational, behavioral and socio/emotional needs. Teachers do assessments of students and from these assessments, they create goals. Teachers take these goals and implement them in their everyday teaching. Due to the severity of most of our students' disabilities, their IEPs include behavioral goals and a Behavior Treatment Plan.

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

Applicable x Not Applicable

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

Data Collection (i.e. FBAs, Scantron results, Running Records, Teacher Assessments, Curriculum Assessments)

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