



**P.S. 166 Manhattan
The Richard Rogers School of Arts and Technology**

**2008-09
SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PLAN
(CEP)**

**SCHOOL: 03M166
ADDRESS: 132 WEST 89TH STREET
TELEPHONE: 212-678-2829
FAX: 212-579-4542**

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: PS 166 **SCHOOL NAME:** The Richard Rodgers School of Arts and Technology

DISTRICT: 03 **SSO NAME/NETWORK #:** Empowerment Schools/
Judi Aronson's Network

SCHOOL ADDRESS: 132 West 89th Street

SCHOOL TELEPHONE: 212-678-2829 **FAX:** 212-579-4542

SCHOOL CONTACT PERSON: Debbie J Hand **EMAIL ADDRESS:** dhand@schools.nyc.gov

<u>POSITION/TITLE</u>	<u>PRINT/TYPE NAME</u>
SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM CHAIRPERSON	<u>Barbara Denham</u>
PRINCIPAL	<u>Debbie J Hand</u>
UFT CHAPTER LEADER	<u>Deborah Forschein</u>
PARENTS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT	<u>Mary Kane</u>
STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE <i>(Required for high schools)</i>	<u>Roser Salavart</u>
COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT	<u></u>

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
Debbie J Hand	*Principal or Designee	
Deborah Forschein	*UFT Chapter Chairperson or Designee	
Mary Kane	*PA/PTA President or Designated Co-President	
Jody Baer	Teacher	
Stephanie Pappas	Teacher	
Gwenneth Turner	Teacher	
Jon Huston	Teacher	
Judy Greenspan	Parent	
Nayla Della Penna	Parent	
Scott Gaynor	Parent	
Ellen Dubin	Parent	
Barbara Denham	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

P.S. 166 is a K-5 elementary school located in the heart of Manhattan's Upper West Side on 89th Street between Columbus and Amsterdam Avenues. At P.S. 166, our mission is to provide a well-rounded elementary education to our children in a safe, caring, inclusive and stimulating environment where the individual strengths of both teachers and students are recognized and supported in order to promote excellence in both teaching and learning. Our vision is that children will explore, create and be engaged in every facet of their education and teachers will stretch their imaginations in presenting standards-driven instruction in Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, Dance, Music, Studio Arts, and Computer Science.

The school building was designed by the award-winning architect C.B. Snyder in the Collegiate Gothic style and was built in 1897-98. It is one of the most impressive public school buildings in the city and received Landmark status in 1999. In 1995, a complete interior renovation was undertaken and the entire building was modernized, becoming a wheelchair accessible institution. A new million-dollar playground was built in 2001 which is open to the public after school hours. There is a separate playground for the kindergarten children. The school is currently undergoing an extensive exterior renovation that will eventually replace the curtain stonework, windows and the roof. Our facilities include a 415-seat auditorium, a large art studio, a computer laboratory, which includes 34 multimedia student workstations; a library/communications center with 6,000 volumes, ten computers and an automated on line catalogue which can be accessed throughout the school; a dance studio, a gymnasium, science room and teacher resource room with a leveled library.

There are currently 614 students enrolled in K through 5th grades, and another 31 students in the two half-day Pre-K classes. Our school has grown in line with the local population of the catchment. Our students are grouped in the following instructional units (the 2008/2009 school year): two Pre-K classes, 10 General Education Classes, 12 Gifted and Talented classes, one Collaborative Team Teaching class, and two self-contained Special Education Classes. While the process has changed from year to year, placement in the Gifted and Talented classes are based on test scores. Special Education teacher support services (SETSS) are provided to students with IEPs utilizing both the push in and pull out models. P.S. 166 has a staff of over 65 full-time employees. The pedagogical staff includes 27 grade-level teachers, a pre-k teacher, a full-time teacher dedicated to each of our "specials" or clusters: physical education, music, dance, art and computers. All full-time teachers are certified. Our other full-time staff includes a math coach, an ELA coach, a registered nurse, a guidance counselor, a science teacher/aid and our principal. We also employ a librarian and science coach on a part-time basis and part or all of their salaries are supported by the PTA, through our 501c3 organization, Friends of PS 166. Every classroom is also staffed by a classroom assistant on a full or part-time basis. The salaries of these classroom assistants are paid through Friends of PS 166. In addition, we have a student-teacher collaboration with City College.

Classroom instruction supports the teaching and learning of standards-based content. Our classrooms are enriched by leveled-classroom libraries. Children are encouraged to use our library/media center to read books and do research both from our extensive reference

collection and on the Internet. Our Teachers' Resource Center has an ever-growing complement of guided reading sets by grade level, mentor texts in conjunction with the units of study from accelerated literacy learning together and assessment tools for teachers to share. Each year, the rubrics used to determine whether children have reached the standards are revisited.

Other programs in the school include the following:

- Push in Literacy Intervention (grades K to five)
- Support services (SETSS) for students with IEPs either with a push in or pull-out program that is based on the needs of the individual child.
- AIS support throughout the school day.
- School Volunteers (Learning Leaders), serving 25 third, fourth and fifth grade students, and the B'nai Jeshurun (BJ Reads) volunteers, a neighborhood group serving 30 first and second grade students.
- Support for English language learners who score under the required percentile on the language proficiency test.
- Ballet Hispanico, which includes 20 weeks of dance instruction, impacting 150 students in grade three
- Partnership with Mannes College of Music providing small-group instruction on symphonic instruments and the teaching keyboarding to the first and second grade students.
- Salvadori Center integrating architecture with the fifth grade curriculum.
- Landmarks West, working with the second grade teachers to integrate neighborhood walks with both the social studies and art curriculum
- An After School Chess Program funded by the Friends of PS 166
- TADA! Musical theater in kindergarten and with special needs students
- Renzulli Learning, providing school-wide enrichment
- Ongoing partnerships with the Horticulture Society and the Department of Environmental Protection
- After School Programs providing after school care and instruction, including: Salvadori Center, Education Media: Robotics and Animation/Game Design, and Lincoln Center Institute

Monies raised by various fundraisers are used for the benefit of the school as a whole. These funds support such items as enhanced classroom libraries, additional funding for our arts program, supplies and personnel for our science program, technology support, and classroom assistants for kindergarten through fifth grade as well as recess assistants to help make lunchtime recess a better experience for our students. Teachers are given a \$250 discretionary fund similar to Teachers Choice, and Teacher Grants for the arts, literacy, Social Studies and field trips are available.

SECTION III – Cont'd

Part B. School Demographics and Accountability Snapshot

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY SNAPSHOT				
School Name:	PS 166 The Richard Rodgers School of The Arts and Technology			
District:	3	DBN #:	03M166	School BEDS Code #: 310300010166

DEMOGRAPHICS									
Grades Served in 2008-09:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pre-K	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> K	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 7
	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	<input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 11	<input type="checkbox"/> 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ungrad. Ele.	<input 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	26	25	31		93.7	93.5	93.5		
Kindergarten	97	105	92						
Grade 1	87	103	93	Student Mobility:					
Grade 2	103	91	102	(% of Enrollment as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Grade 3	87	113	89		96.0	96.1	97.3		
Grade 4	94	89	112						
Grade 5	75	77	78	Eligible for Free Lunch:					
Grade 6	0	0	0	(% of Enrollment as of October 31)	2005	2006	2007		
Grade 7	0	0	0		35.6	35.6	29.3		
Grade 8	0	0	0						
Grade 9	0	0	0	Students in Temporary Housing:					
Grade 10	0	0	0	(Total Number as of June 30)	2006	2007	2008		
Grade 11	0	0	0		3	6	5		
Grade 12	0	0	0						
Ungraded Elementary	1	0	1	Recent Immigrants:					
Ungraded Secondary	0	0	0	(Total Number as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008		
Total	570	603	598		0	8	0		
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	0	9	11						
No. in Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) Classes	0	0	8	Principal Suspensions	5	10	0		
Number all others	50	52	47	Superintendent Suspensions	2	4	0		
<i>These students are included in the enrollment information above.</i>									
				Special High School Programs:					
English Language Learners (ELL) Enrollment:				(Total Number)	2006	2007	2008		
(October 31)	2006	2007	2008	CTE Program Participants	0	0	0		
# in Trans. Bilingual Classes	10	0	0	Early College HS Participants	0	0	0		

DEMOGRAPHICS							
# in Dual Lang. Programs	10	0	0				
# receiving ESL services only	39	64	58	Number of Staff:			
# ELLs with IEPs	0	1	1	(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	33	35	42
				Number of Administrators and Other Professionals	12	4	14
Overage Students:							
(# entering students overage for grade as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	Number of Educational Paraprofessionals	7	TBD	4
	0	0	0				
				Teacher Qualifications:			
Ethnicity and Gender:				(As of October 31)	2006	2007	2008
(% of Enrollment as of October 31)	2006	2007	2008	% fully licensed & permanently assigned to this school	100.0	100.0	100.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.7	0.0	0.2	Percent more than two years teaching in this school	66.7	65.7	61.9
Black or African American	19.0	18.9	17.9	Percent more than five years teaching anywhere	51.5	51.4	42.9
Hispanic or Latino	30.2	27.2	28.4				
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Isl.	4.2	6.3	6.7	Percent Masters Degree or higher	91.0	86.0	88.0
White	46.0	47.6	46.8	Percent core classes taught by "highly qualified" teachers (NCLB/SED definition)	83.3	94.1	95.2
Multi-racial							
Male	49.8	47.9	49.0				
Female	50.2	52.1	51.0				

2008-09 TITLE I STATUS				
<input type="checkbox"/> Title I Schoolwide Program (SWP)	<input type="checkbox"/> Title I Targeted Assistance	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>		If yes, area(s) of SURR identification:		
Overall NCLB/SED Accountability Status (2007-08):		<input checked="" 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:	IGS	ELA:	
	Math:	IGS	Math:	
	Science:	IGS	Grad. Rate:	

NCLB/SED SCHOOL-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

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

Student Groups	Elementary/Middle Level			Secondary Level		
	ELA	Math	Science	ELA	Math	Grad. Rate
All Students	Y	Y	Y			
Ethnicity						
American Indian or Alaska Native						
Black or African American	Y	Y	-			
Hispanic or Latino	Y	Y	-			
Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	-	-	-			
White	Y	Y	Y			
Multiracial						
Other Groups						
Students with Disabilities	-	-	-			
Limited English Proficient	-	-	-			
Economically Disadvantaged	Y	Y	Y			
Student groups making AYP in each subject	5	5	3			

Key: AYP Status

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

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

CHILDREN FIRST ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY

Progress Report Results – 2007-08		Quality Review Results – 2007-08	
Overall Letter Grade	B	Overall Evaluation:	W
Overall Score	54.8	Quality Statement Scores:	
Category Scores:		Quality Statement 1: Gather Data	P
School Environment (Comprises 15% of the Overall Score)	3.9	Quality Statement 2: Plan and Set Goals	W
School Performance (Comprises 30% of the Overall Score)	16.6	Quality Statement 3: Align Instructional Strategy to Goals	W
Student Progress (Comprises 55% of the Overall Score)	29.8	Quality Statement 4: Align Capacity Building to Goals	W
Additional Credit	4.5	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

The SLT conducted a comprehensive review of the PS 166 education program informed by the most current quantitative and qualitative data regarding student performance trends and other indicators of progress. This comprehensive review included an analysis of information available from the New York City Department of Education accountability tools and from the New York State Department of Education accountability resources. Included in the review were data gathered from teacher and parent NYC Learning Environment Surveys, NYC Progress Report, Quality Review, school-based assessments, nySTART reports, internal curriculum-based needs assessments as well as Inquiry Team work from the 2007-2008 school year.

What student performance trends have been identified?

NYC Progress Report

- **School Environment:** Although the overall grade of “B” was earned on the NYC Progress Report, a letter grade of “D” was earned in the School Environment category. The overall grade for school environment was 3.9 out of 15. In all sub-categories (academic expectations, communication, engagement, and safety/respect) we underperformed in relation to our Peer Horizon. In communication, we received a score of 6.1, which is 0.0% of the way from the lowest (6.1) to the highest (8.4) score relative to our Peer Horizon and 15.4% of the way relative to the City Horizon. In safety and respect, we received a score of 7.7, which is 12.5% of the way from the lowest (7.5) to the highest (9.1) score relative to our Peer Horizon and 48.3% of the way relative to the City Horizon. While our attendance rate for 2007-2008 was at 93.6%, our goal is to increase attendance to 96% by aggressively tracking attendance data and following-up with families in need of support and guidance.
- **Percentage of Students Making One-Year Progress in ELA:** 55.7% of our students made at least one-year progress in ELA, which is 44.5% of the way from the lowest (44.8%) to the highest (89.3%) score relative to our Peer Horizon and 39.4% of the way relative to our City Horizon. For students in the school’s lowest 1/3 making at least one-year of progress, 74.2% of our students made at least one-year of progress in ELA, which is 43.2% of the way from the lowest (59.9%) to the highest (93.0%) score relative to our Peer Horizon and 40.2% of the way relative to our City Horizon.
- **Average Change in Student Proficiency for Level 3 and Level 4 Students in ELA:**
- 0.05 is our average change in student proficiency, which is 40.9% of the way from the lowest (-0.14) to the highest (0.08) score relative to our Peer Horizon and 56.7% on the way relative to the City Horizon.
- **Percentage of Students in the School’s Lowest 1/3 Making One-Year Progress in Mathematics:** 61.3% of our students in the lowest 1/3 made at least one-year of progress, which is 29.3% of the way from the lowest (49.4%) to the highest (90.0%) score relative to our Peer Horizon and 35.3% of the way relative to the City Horizon.

The school received an overall score of 29.8 out of 60 in student progress. The school received extra credit for closing the achievement gap in ELA for Special education students, black students in the lowest 1/3, and other students in the lowest 1/3. In mathematics, the school received extra credit in closing the achievement gap for other students in the lowest 1/3. All other categories included less than 15 students and were ineligible for extra credit. The internal accountability scores from the NYC Progress Report confirm the data indicated in the external NYS accountability report. PS 166 is a school in Good Standing based on state

accountability formulas for making adequate yearly progress. The NYC Progress Report illustrates not only our achievements in student performance, but also includes valuable information in regard to our ability to track student progress toward at least one-year of progress as measured by student performance from year to year on the NYS ELA and Math exams. We are also using ARIS to further support our analysis of this data.

What have been the greatest accomplishments over the past few years?

As indicated in the Quality Review, PS 166's greatest accomplishments are that the school is committed to continuous improvement and has developed a climate of learning where the needs of the student are at the heart of all decision making. A particular strength is the collaborative team-working culture where everyone is involved and consulted in decision making. The School Leadership Team and the school-based Inquiry Team are two strong examples of this collaborative and reflective approach to school improvement. In addition, the school and students are well supported by a strong partnership with parents.

According to the 2007-2008 Quality Review report, the school made "some progress in addressing the issues identified" in the 2006-2007 Quality Review report. Although the overall rating for the school on the most current Quality Review was "Well Developed", there were three areas documented as "What the School Need to Improve" based on Quality Review findings:

- Extend the way the school gathers and uses data to further understand what each student can do and compare progress for English language learners and for ethnic groups and gender
- Ensure that staff make the best use of data to compare standards and progress against past performance and against similar schools
- Ensure all staff share goals more clearly with students and parents in order for them to understand exactly what needs to be improved

We have embedded these (3) designated areas in need of improvement within the five instructional goals that we have established for this school year. We plan to strengthen the use of data across all subject areas and have already put systems and structures in place to support this work. The Inquiry Team, with the support of the data specialist/math coach, has made significant progress in analyzing data from various sources, including: school-based assessments, commercially produced assessments, ACUITY predictives and ITAs, nySTART reports, and ARIS. It is the commitment of the Inquiry Team members to expand this work by sharing it with their grade level colleagues.

What are the most significant aids or barriers to the school's continuous assessment?

A significant aid to our continuous school improvement can be attributed to the high level of teacher quality and stability at PS 166. 100.0% of our teaching staff is fully licensed and permanently assigned to PS 166. While 88.0% of our staff have earned a Masters Degree or higher, it is important to note that 57.1% of our teachers have less than five years of teaching experience. As teachers new to the profession, it is our responsibility to create appropriate contexts to foster collaborative inquiry across all core curriculum areas. In order to accomplish this, we must adequately address the barrier of time. We will use common planning time and grade level meetings as well as faculty conferences to focus on curriculum development and improving instructional practice. In addition, we recognize the need to plan inter-visitations with similar schools and to take advantage of professional learning opportunities that are in direct alignment with our stated instructional goals. Throughout the school, we aspire to make instructional decisions based on information gained from student data – and to reflect and revise instructional practices as necessary to meet the needs of ALL students in our school.

SECTION V: ANNUAL SCHOOL GOALS

Based on the findings and implications from the comprehensive needs assessment (Section IV), the School Leadership Team, in consultation with the larger school community, has developed five instructional goals for the current school year (2008-2009).

Goal #1: Strengthening the School Environment

- To increase the School Environment letter grade earned on the 2008-2009 New York City Progress Report to a “B” from a letter grade of “D”, which was earned on the 2007-2008 New York City Progress Report
 - Use teacher and parent survey results to evaluate strengths and challenges of our current school environment
 - Increase communication and engagement for teachers and parents
 - Recognize social and emotional responsive support as part of our daily responsibilities as educators of young children to ensure a safe and respect learning environment
 - Track student attendance and tardiness (offer support as necessary)

Goal #2: Mathematics Differentiation

- To increase by 8.7% the number of students in the lowest 1/3 who achieve a minimum of one-year progress in Math as measured by the NYS Math exam on the 2008-2009 New York City Progress Report. Our goal is to increase from 61.3% students in the school’s lowest 1/3 making one-year progress to 70% making one-year progress.
 - Expand the work of the Inquiry Team to improve instructional practices and increase student achievement across all grade levels
 - Involve teachers in a collaborative approach to examining their teaching and in evaluating curriculum decisions so that ALL students are being supported and challenged appropriately
 - Determine supplemental resources and instructional materials that are needed to fully support differentiation in mathematics

Goal #3: Increase Student Progress in ELA

- To increase by 9.3% students who achieve a minimum of one-year progress in ELA as measured by the NYS ELA exam on the 2008-2009 New York City Progress Report. Our goal is to increase from 55.7% making one year progress to 65% making one year progress. This goal includes students in all subgroups and at all performance levels.
 - Use data more efficiently and effectively to track the progress of individual students in ELA (as well as across all subgroups)
 - Evaluate our balanced literacy program, set professional goals, and provide professional learning opportunities to improve “best practices”
 - Continue to develop and further refine standards-based grade level expectations in reading, writing, speaking and listening

Goal #4: Social Studies Curriculum Mapping

- A Social Studies Curriculum Map will be created in each grade level K through 5. This will be a long-term multi-year project. By June 2009, our goal is to have at least (1) Unit of Social Studies/Literacy planned per grade level. During the 2009-2010 school year, we will continue our Curriculum Mapping initiative with the expectation that all grade levels will have Curriculum Maps that will be used consistently to plan and implement standards-based instruction while fully integrating Social Studies with Literacy.
 - Dedicate Professional Development Days, common planning time, grade level meetings and faculty conferences to further collaboration and professional learning
 - Use Curriculum Mapping as a practical means of integrating social studies and literacy teaching and learning
 - Support teachers in the preparation, planning and implementation of the NYC K-8 Social Studies Scope and Sequence
 - Align instructional materials and resources to support social studies teaching and learning (including collaborations with/visits to cultural institutions)

Goal #5: Supporting an Inquiry-based Approach to Science Teaching and Learning

- To increase by 5% the number of students in the 4th grade who achieve a minimum of a Level 3 as measured on the New York State Science exam during the current school year (2008-2009). Our goal is to increase from 88% to 93% the students reaching grade level proficiency in science by fourth grade.
 - Support teachers in the preparation, planning and implementation of the NYC K-8 Science Scope and Sequence
 - Establish a Science Laboratory program following a “by module” approach to support teachers in implementing a hands-on, inquiry-based science curriculum
 - Continue to develop a collaborative professional approach to strengthening a standards-based science program across all grade levels

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

Directions: The action plan should be used as a tool to support effective implementation and to evaluate progress toward meeting goals. Use the action plan template provided below to indicate key strategies and activities to be implemented for the 2008-09 school year to support accomplishment of each annual goal identified in Section V.

Subject/Area (where relevant): Strengthening the School Environment

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>To increase the School Environment letter grade earned on the 2008-2009 New York City Progress Report to a “B” from a letter grade of “D”, which was earned on the 2007-2008 New York City Progress Report</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>Use of Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyze the results of the teacher and parent Learning Environment Surveys from 2007-2008 focusing on responses to questions group by the four main categories: academic expectations, communication, engagement, safety and respect • Analyze the Occurrence Reports from the 2007-2008 school year including any principal and superintendent suspensions (OORS) • According to the NYC Progress Report, attendance for the 2007-2008 school year was 93.6%. Our goal is to increase attendance by 2.4% in the 2008-2009 school year to 96%. <p>Actions and Strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal will foster an “Open Door” policy for students, teachers and parents • Principal will attend monthly PTA meetings to provide updates as well as to gain feedback from parents and teachers in attendance • Continuous tracking of student progress and setting goals for performance in alignment with standards will lead to higher academic expectations for all students • Each class will create and distribute monthly newsletters in addition to a weekly school-wide newsletter • An updated website with a message board will be developed to provide information about PS 166 to current as well as prospective parents • Connect with Kids will be utilized to promote the “Respect for All” policy in alignment with creating a supportive environment for socio-emotional

	<p>learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety Meetings will be held monthly to review the Safety Plan and to address any concerns or areas in need of improvement • Special attention will be targeted to morning entry/breakfast, lunch/recess, and dismissal; the principal as well as out-of-classroom teachers will be visible during these transitional periods • Advisory groups will be established for students considered to be “at risk” academically and/or socially and emotionally in need of extra support • Attendance tracking procedures will be strengthened through the weekly meetings and planned follow-up of the Attendance Committee <p>Development of Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through inter-visitations to “peer” schools, we will evaluate at least two programs to help support positive behavior interventions and socio-emotional learning (i.e., Responsive Classroom, PBIS, and/or Ramapo for Children)
<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>Alignment of Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance at DOE offered PD sessions focusing on Managing Student Behavior and Minimizing Misbehavior from Ramapo for Children (Tax Levy) and Socio-Emotional Learning Workshops (Tax Levy) for Teachers and Paraprofessionals of self-contained Special Education students • Violence Prevention Grant – Salvadori Architecture (grades 2-4) and Robotics (grades 4 and 5) after school programs (January – June) • Community Building Committee (PTA) – plan community building activities to engage the entire school community • Parent Coordinator (Fair Student Funding) • School Secretary (Fair Student Funding) • SBST (TL Fair Student Funding and IDEA) • Family Worker (TL Fair Student Funding) • Recess Aide (Friends of PS 166/Fundraising)
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Feedback from parents received at monthly PTA meetings ➤ Informal daily feedback received from students, parents, and teachers ➤ Tracking ATS attendance reports ➤ Tracking Incidents entered into the OORS system and targeting any patterns ➤ Results of 2008-2009 Learning Environment Survey (teachers and parents) ➤ Earned letter grade of “B” on the 2008-2009 for School Environment on 2008-2009 NYC Progress Report

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

Directions: The action plan should be used as a tool to support effective implementation and to evaluate progress toward meeting goals. Use the action plan template provided below to indicate key strategies and activities to be implemented for the 2008-09 school year to support accomplishment of each annual goal identified in Section V.

Subject/Area (where relevant): Mathematics/Differentiation

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>To increase by 8.7% the number of students in the lowest 1/3 who achieve a minimum of one-year progress in Math as measured by the NYS Math exam on the 2008-2009 New York City Progress Report. Our goal is to increase from 61.3% students in the school’s lowest 1/3 making one-year progress to 70% making one-year progress.</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>Use of Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher developed baseline assessments will be administered in all grade levels K through 5 at the beginning of the school year • Track student progress through the ACUITY Periodic Assessment Reports for individual students in grades 3 through 5 • Track individual student as well as class and grade level progress through the use of the ACUITY Periodic Assessment Item Analysis Reports in grades 3 through 5 • Assign students instructional resource activities to reinforce sub-skills and standards for which students fall below Tier 4 on the ACUITY system • Long term and interim goals will be established for individual students • Unit exams and performance checklists from Every Day Math will also be used to track student progress in grades K through 5 • Information from ARIS will be used to track longitudinal data on NYS assessments <p>Curriculum and Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-Teaching and support will be provided by the math coach in individual classes as needed • AIS will be provided in math for struggling students in the form of flexible small group instruction (two – 45 minute periods per week) • Ongoing professional development will be provided so that we may build our capacity to differentiate the curriculum to meet the individual needs of students in the classroom • Establish research-based strategies to differentiate the math curriculum

	<p>which include the implementation of EDM games for reinforcement and the purposeful selection of computer software</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compacting the curriculum to meet the needs of our most accelerated learners • Focus grade level Inquiry Teams on differentiating our curriculum in mathematics
<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>Development of Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Math coach and grade leaders provide staff with ongoing support/training • After school training sessions to ensure effective implementation of data tracking as well as use of data to inform instruction • Training on the use of ACUITY and ARIS for all teachers • Our Inquiry Team focus is directly aligned to this goal; the Inquiry Team will share their work with the staff at grade level meetings and monthly faculty conferences • Classroom and “peer” school inter-visitations will be scheduled to share (and learn from) best practices based on identified needs • Principal blocks time to interact with students and informally observe teaching and learning during math instruction <p>Alignment of Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Math Coach (Fair Student Funding and C4E Funds) • Two AIS Teachers (Fair Student Funding) • Attendance at DOE offered PD sessions focusing on Math Differentiation and Data Tracking (Fair Student Funding) • Weekly common planning time across all grade levels • Professional Development Days, monthly Faculty Conferences, and Grade Level Meetings will be dedicated to professional learning • Computer software and games will be purchased to support student needs in differentiating and reinforcing math competencies (NYSTL) • Per session (Tax Levy) for Inquiry Team and Curriculum Development
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Establish assessment binders and student work folders that provide meaningful information, which informs instruction (Binders will include, but are not limited to: ACUITY data (Predictive and ITAs), Baseline results, Unit, Mid-Year and End of Year Assessments and nySTART reports. ➤ Agendas and sign-in sheets as evidence of professional learning ➤ Monthly grade level planning time embedded into the program ➤ Appropriate use of differentiated strategies as evidenced by informal and formal classroom observations of teaching and learning.

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

Directions: The action plan should be used as a tool to support effective implementation and to evaluate progress toward meeting goals. Use the action plan template provided below to indicate key strategies and activities to be implemented for the 2008-09 school year to support accomplishment of each annual goal identified in Section V.

Subject/Area (where relevant): ELA/Students Making Progress

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>To increase by 9.3% students who achieve a minimum of one-year progress in ELA as measured by the NYS ELA exam on the 2008-2009 New York City Progress Report. Our goal is to increase from 55.7% making one year progress to 65% making one year progress. This goal includes students in all subgroups and at all performance levels.</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>Use of Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish assessment binders and student work folders that provide meaningful information, which informs instruction (Binders will include, but are not limited to: ACUITY (predictives and ITAs, Fountas and Pinnell Assessment results, running records, conference notes, rubrics for written assignments, and nySTART reports). • Track individual student as well as class and grade level progress through the use of the ACUITY Item Analysis Reports in grades 3 through 5 • Assign students instructional resource activities to reinforce sub-skills and standards for which students fall below Tier 4 on the ACUITY system • Analyze student work (reading, writing, speaking, and listening) to come to agreement on uniform criteria of standards-based performance levels and to determine adjustments that need to be made to instructional practices to meet the learning needs of our students (September and ongoing) <p>Curriculum and Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organized classroom libraries with appropriate leveled reading materials • Establish and ensure the use of standards-based rubrics for student writing, reading levels and listening/speaking development • Utilize grade level curriculum maps to guide instruction with an interdisciplinary focus (aligning social studies and literacy) • Use the Units of Study to provide structure to our writing program • Focus on the application of strategies for reading texts during shared and guided reading • Refine the implementation of mini-lessons to support the transfer of strategies to independent work • The development, ongoing refinement and consistent use of a standards-

	<p>based curriculum maps to guide instruction school-wide as evidenced by classroom visits, student work and lesson plans</p> <p>Development of Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literacy Coach and lead teachers provide staff with ongoing training • Create data informed professional development plan by teacher, grade and whole school level – including targeted support for the use of the Fountas and Pinnell Assessment System (administration and use of results) • After school training sessions to ensure effective implementation of data tracking as well as use of data to inform instruction; including the use of ACUITY and ARIS for all teachers • Classroom and “peer” school inter-visitations will be used to share (and learn from) best practices based on identified needs • Principal blocks time on a weekly basis to interact with students and informally observe teaching and learning during ELA instruction • Professional Development Days (Nov. and June), monthly Faculty Conferences, and monthly Grade Level Meetings will be dedicated to professional learning
<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>Alignment of Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literacy Coach and Two AIS Teachers (Fair Student Funding) • Attendance at DOE offered PD sessions focusing on Using Data to Inform Literacy Teaching and Learning (Tax Levy) • Weekly common planning time across all grade levels • Per session (Tax Levy) for Curriculum Development w/ Literacy Coach • NYSTL and NYSLIB funds used to support academic as well as socio-cultural needs of our students
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Collect, record, analyze and document independent reading level on a 4-6 week basis for each student, class and grade level using Fountas and Pinnell levels (grades K through 5) ➤ Use running records to ensure appropriate placement in guided reading groups (ECLAS results from 2007-2008 will be used as appropriate) ➤ Track student progress through the ACUITY Periodic Assessment Reports for individual students in grades 3 through 5 ➤ Long term and interim goals will be established for individual students ➤ Use standards-based rubrics and provide meaningful and purposeful feedback to students aligned with grade level standards ➤ Agendas and sign-in sheets as evidence of professional learning ➤ Monthly grade level planning time embedded into the program

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

Directions: The action plan should be used as a tool to support effective implementation and to evaluate progress toward meeting goals. Use the action plan template provided below to indicate key strategies and activities to be implemented for the 2008-09 school year to support accomplishment of each annual goal identified in Section V.

Subject/Area (where relevant): Social Studies/Curriculum Mapping

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>A Social Studies Curriculum Map will be created in each grade level K through 5. This will be a long-term multi-year project. By June 2009, our goal is to have <i>at least</i> (1) Unit of Social Studies/Literacy planned per grade level. During the 2009-2010 school year, we will continue our Curriculum Mapping initiative with the expectation that all grade levels will have Curriculum Maps that will be used consistently to plan and implement standards-based instruction while fully integrating Social Studies with Literacy.</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>Use of Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SLT administered Parent and Teacher surveys at the end of the 2007-2008 school year to evaluate our existing Social Studies program • Survey results indicate a need to strengthen our Social Studies curriculum and illustrate a need to support teachers with appropriate resources and instructional materials • Analyze New York State Social Studies exam results from the 2007-2008 school year to determine areas of strength and weakness in our existing program • Implement the use of an Information Fluency Continuum to monitor individual student as well as class progress in gaining the necessary skills to be actively engaged in social studies learning • Formal and informal feedback received at PTA meetings regarding social studies in the classrooms <p>Curriculum and Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literacy Coach and grade level leaders will support classroom teachers in selecting a unit of study in Social Studies for comprehensive development • All teachers will be provided a copy of the New York City K-8 Social Studies Scope and Sequence to use as a planning guide • The Curriculum Maps will include: Essential Questions, standards based instructional plans, options for assessment, suggested resource materials, field trip opportunities and desired student outcomes • Develop partnerships with cultural organizations • Plan field trips to enhance the learning experience of our students

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A rigorous arts education program will support this Literacy and Social Studies initiative by integrating Visual Arts, Music, and Dance as resources and extensions of learning <p>Development of Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A collaborative approach to social studies curriculum development and lesson planning will be supported by embedding weekly common planning time across all grade levels (beginning in January and continuing through June) • Professional Development provided by internal DOE tailored to the new curriculum options and the NYC Social Studies Scope and Sequence (Tax Levy) • Support provided through our ESO Network targeting Social Studies teaching and learning (monthly meetings/ongoing) • A fourth grade teacher (our designated Social Studies liaison) will participate in a Teaching American History grant program and will have an opportunity to turnkey her work at one of the monthly Faculty Conferences (spring 2009) • Classroom and “peer” school inter-visitations will be used to share (and learn from) best practices based on identified needs (i.e., PS 49Q) • Professional Development Days (Nov. and June), monthly Faculty Conferences, and monthly Grade Level Meetings will be dedicated to professional learning
<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>Alignment of Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ordering the Core Curriculum/Trade Book Option for Grade 4 (NYSTL funds) • Per session for Curriculum Development and Mapping with the Literacy Coach (Tax Levy) • Resource materials for circulation in the school library (NYSLIB) • Instructional Technology for Interactive Learning (NYSTL Hardware Funds) • Professional Learning Opportunities (Tax Levy)
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The Information Fluency Continuum will be used to monitor individual student as well as class progress in gaining the necessary skills to be actively engaged in social studies learning ➤ Interim and long-term goals will be established for individual students ➤ The development, ongoing refinement and consistent use of a standards-based curriculum maps to guide instruction school-wide as evidenced by classroom visits, student work and lesson plans; Curriculum Map illustrating evidence of a (1) Unit completed by June 2009 for each grade level ➤ Agendas and sign-in sheets as evidence of professional learning ➤ Monthly grade level planning time embedded into the program ➤ Appropriate integration of social studies and literacy as evidenced by informal and formal classroom observations of teaching and learning.

SECTION VI: ACTION PLAN

Directions: The action plan should be used as a tool to support effective implementation and to evaluate progress toward meeting goals. Use the action plan template provided below to indicate key strategies and activities to be implemented for the 2008-09 school year to support accomplishment of each annual goal identified in Section V.

Subject/Area (where relevant): Science/Inquiry-based Approach

<p>Annual Goal Goals should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound.</p>	<p>To increase by 5% the number of students in the 4th grade who achieve a minimum of a Level 3 as measured on the New York State Science exam during the 2008-2009 school year. Our goal is to increase from 88% to 93% the students reaching grade level proficiency in science by fourth grade.</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>Use of Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SLT administered a Parent and Teacher Needs Assessment at the end of the 2007-2008 school year to evaluate our existing Science program and to determine greatest accomplishments as well as significant barriers to school continuous improvement • Survey results indicate a need to strengthen our science curriculum and illustrate a need to support teachers with implementation of a hands-on, inquiry-based science program as well as the need for “a full-time dedicated Science teacher” and the need for “more professional development” • Analyze New York State Science exam results from the 2007-2008 school year to determine areas of strength and weakness in our existing program • Formal and informal feedback received at PTA meetings regarding science in the classrooms <p>Curriculum and Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish a Science Laboratory which emphasizes a hands-on, inquiry-based approach to learning • All teachers will be provided a copy of the New York City K-8 Science Scope and Sequence to use as a planning guide • Maintain Instructional Time Guidelines as mandated by the New York State Department of Education (two – 45 minute periods per week in all kindergarten through second grade classes and three – 45 minute periods per week in all third through fifth grade classes) • Provide support to teachers in managing an inquiry-based lab program via the Learning Leaders Volunteer Program • Science journal notebooks will be used to track student progress and rubrics will be establish to evaluate student performance based on grade level standards

	<p>Development of Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A collaborative approach to science curriculum development and lesson planning will be supported by embedding weekly common planning time across all grade levels (beginning in September and continuing through June) • Co-teaching and support will be provided to all classroom teachers by our Science Consultant • Professional Development provided by internal DOE tailored to science teaching and learning and the NYC Science Scope and Sequence (Tax Levy) • Support provided through our ESO Network targeting Science teaching and learning (monthly meetings/ongoing) • A full-time teacher will be designated as our Science liaison and will work in consultation with our Science Consultant to facilitate and sustain a collaborative approach to science teaching and learning (Sept. 2008 - June 2009) • Classroom and “peer” school inter-visitations will be used to share (and learn from) best practices based on identified needs (i.e., PS 163M) • Professional Development Days (Nov. and June), monthly Faculty Conferences, and monthly Grade Level Meetings will be dedicated to professional learning
<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>Use of Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ordering of Core Curriculum Option C: Combination of Kits and Text-based Modules (NYSTL Funds) • Learning Leaders Volunteers • Full-time teacher offering partial day support to Science Lab for planning, preparation, and implementation of inquiry-based labs (TL Fair Student Funding) • Additional science kits and consumable materials (Friends of PS 166) • .2 Science Consultant position (Friends of PS 166 Funding) • Collaboration with Horticultural Society for third grade (Grant) • Fourth grade trip to Ashokan Watershed (Grant)
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishment <i>Include: interval of periodic review; instrument(s) of measure; projected gains</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Evidence of learning and hands-on, inquiry-based investigations and explorations in science as documented in student work folders and science journal notebooks ➤ Interim and long term goals will be established for individual students ➤ Informal and formal classroom/lab observations of teaching and learning ➤ Increase in performance by 5% the number of students in the 4th grade who achieve a minimum of a Level 3 as measured on the New York State Science exam during the 2008-2009 school year.

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

APPENDIX 1: ACADEMIC INTERVENTION SERVICES (AIS) SUMMARY FORM

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

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

Grade	ELA	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	At-risk Services: Guidance Counselor	At-risk Services: School Psychologist	At-risk Services: Social Worker	At-risk Health-related Services
	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS	# of Students Receiving AIS
K	1	0	N/A	N/A	0	8	2	as need basis
1	11	0	N/A	N/A	3	14	4	as need basis
2	8	5	N/A	N/A	1	5	4	as need basis
3	6	9	N/A	N/A	6	4	8	as need basis
4	6	9	8	0	2	4	6	as need basis
5	9	8	0	0	4	4	6	as need basis
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								

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

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

Part B. 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:	Small group instruction and one-on-one tutoring as needed three times per week during the school day. Materials used include: Best Practices in Reading program, trade books selection based on elements being taught and class library books. The Wilson Reading System, Wilson Fluency Program and Foundations are used for small group instruction as well as Explode the Code and various scaffolding and guided reading techniques.
Mathematics:	During the day small group instruction as well as one-on-one tutoring when needed two times per week. The program is adapted to meet the needs of individual students and is supported by various instructional materials, including: Strategies for Success in Math, Comprehensive Mathematics Assessment, Everyday Math Games, differentiated instruction and manipulatives. Student progress is tracked via baseline assessments, unit exams, and Math Achievement Predictors.
Science:	Extended day small group instruction integrating Science and Literacy; including Reading and Writing. Instructional materials include: Science in Your World, Growing Things, and the New York State Science Coach.
Social Studies:	N/A
At-risk Services Provided by the Guidance Counselor:	During the day small group advisories, conflict resolution, anti-bullying “Respect for All” support, play therapy. Whole class intervention lessons are also planned on an as needed basis to support community building and social skills.
At-risk Services Provided by the School Psychologist:	During the day at risk counseling, suicide ideation, child abuse, crisis intervention, conflict resolution, anti-bullying “Respect for All”, bereavement, behavior management, social skills development, teacher consultations, desperation/anxiety, race/gender conflicts, and character development (i.e., Connect with Kids)
At-risk Services Provided by the Social Worker:	During the day small group advisories focusing on conflict resolution and fostering responsible behavior. Support is also offered during recess to reinforce appropriate social skills and to build leadership capacity and efficacy.
At-risk Health-related Services:	On an as needed basis the school nurse provides support to students with the following: playground safety, asthma, healthy eating, nutrition, lice education, immunizations, personal hygiene, annual physical/follow-ups on health-related problems, vision/hearing, anti-bullying “Respect for All” support, and referrals for medical attention.

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

NCLB/SED requirement for all schools

Part A: Language Allocation Policy (LAP) – Attach a copy of your school's current year (2008-2009) LAP narrative to this CEP.

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

Type of Program: ___ Bilingual X ESL ___ Both **Number of LEP (ELL) Students Served in 2007-08:** 58
(No more than 2 pages)

- I. Instructional Program for ELLs (including brief description of program, # of classes per program, language(s) of instruction, instructional strategies, etc). Program planning and management description to include identification and placement of ESL/Bilingual certified teachers, utilization of appropriate instructional materials (English and other languages) and technology, school-based supervisory support, use of external organizations, compliance with ELL-related mandates, and use of data to improve instruction:

P.S. 166 Richard Rodgers School of the Arts and Technology is located in a Collegiate Gothic landmarked building in the heart of Manhattan's Upper West Side. The staff and student body comprises a microcosm of the demographics of the city including representatives from the Americas, Africa, Europe and Asia. P.S 166 is a Pre-K to Grade 5 School grouped in the following instruction units: 10 General Education classes, 12 Gifted and Talented classes, 1 Collaborative Team Teaching Class and 2 12:1:1 Self Contained Special Education Classes.

P.S. 166 has a population of 614 Pre-K to Grade 5 Students, 48 of whom are English Language Learners. All students are served in a freestanding ESL program. The students are a microcosm of the multi-ethnic, multi-lingual makeup of the surrounding community. Our Kindergarten has 1 Russian, 1 Chinese, 1 Bengali, 1 Polish, 1 Arabic, 1 French, and 2 Spanish speakers. In Grade 1 we have 1 Icelandic, 1 Japanese, 5 Spanish, 1 German, 1 Arabic, and 2 French speakers. In Grade 2 we have 1 Haitian Creole, 7 Spanish, 1 Hungarian, and 2 Arabic speakers. In 3rd grade we have 6 Spanish speakers, 1 Haitian Creole. In Grade 4 we have 5 Spanish speakers and 1 French. In 5th grade we have 3 Spanish speakers, 1 Arabic speaker and 1 Japanese speaker.

In our free-standing ESL program, 14 classes in grades K-5 are served with English as the language of instruction. In Kindergarten, 3 students are served in 1 general education class, 3 students in another general education class, 1 student is served in a Gifted and Talented class and 1 student in a self contained special education class. In Grade one, 6 students are served in one general education class and 3 students are served in another general education class and 1 child is served in a Gifted and Talented class. In grade 2, 6 students are served in one general education class and 4 students are served from another general education class and 2 students are in a self contained special education class. In grade 3, five students are served in one general education class and three students are served from another general education class. In grade 4, six students are served in one general education class. In grade 5, five students are served in one general education class. One certified ESL teacher serves our ESL population. This teacher participates in ongoing school-based as well as Professional development provided by ELL compliance specialists and Protraxx.

In the free-standing ESL instructional program, the certified teacher works using both push-in and pull-out models, planning with classroom teachers to ensure curricular alignment. The instruction is in alignment with the Language Allocation Policy. In the push in model, the ESL teacher works with these

target students during ELA instruction in collaboration with the regular classroom teacher. Teachers use a balanced literacy approach using the workshop model, combining mini-lessons with group, paired and independent work. Explicit ESL is delivered as the teacher provides support and can scaffold instruction to make the subject area information more comprehensible while the ELLs retain content instruction time. Language acquisition, grammar and vocabulary support are provided to these target children. The pull-out model is also utilized to homogeneously group for target area of instruction according to NYSESLAT and LAB-R scores and depending on the proficiency level and heterogeneous make-up of classes. Needs within individual modalities are analyzed in order to target instruction and form groups based on needs. In compliance with all ELL related mandates, all beginning and intermediate students receive 360 minutes of instruction per week. Advanced learners receive 180 minutes per week.

Appropriate materials are chosen for the class unit of study calendar for each grade. These materials are chosen when possible to reflect the target culture and are chosen because students can make a connection from the books to their lives. Native language materials are integrated as part of the balanced literacy instruction and content area instruction as children are given the opportunity to read books in their native language as a genre choice during independent reading.

The ESL teacher includes the following components in instruction: oral language development, comprehension, literacy skills, content area objectives, language learning strategies and writing skills. Planning and instruction continues to be aligned with ESL/ELA learning standards and aligned with classroom literacy units of study.

Students demonstrate learning standards through ongoing formative and summative assessments utilizing rubrics and class projects. Students are assessed with the following formal and informal assessments throughout the year and instruction is guided and improved based on this data: Fountas/Pinnell running records, student conferences, ELA and Math Acuity Periodic Assessments, ELL Interim Assessments, City and State ELA and Math Exams and student portfolios. Differentiation of instruction is incorporated into classroom teaching practices based on the data which results from the above assessments. In analysis of our data to improve instruction this past year we observed that listening and speaking skills in productive and receptive modalities are significantly higher than reading and writing skills on the NYSESLAT. Oracy skills are more developed than literacy skills, but all areas need development. Therefore our emphasis will be on integrating the 4 skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing into all instruction. For example, the excellent use of music, poetry, shared reading, guided reading, read-alouds, and phonemic awareness starting in Kindergarten with continuous reinforcement of skills throughout the grades. Discussion in partnerships and hands-on activities using a multisensory approach will improve productive skills and integrate the modalities. Teacher modeling and think-alouds will help activate prior knowledge and support metacognition. BICs and CALP will be integrated. Writing will be supported with immersion in various literacy genres, mentor texts and use of graphic organizers and interactive writing. Continuous vocabulary development is aided with visual and realia support.

Patterns across the board in analysis of P.S. 166 ELA and Math Test show weakness in the area of reading comprehension and inferencing and in math reasoning and modeling. In order to improve instruction, attention will be given to teacher modeling of metacognitive strategies in literacy and math as well as creating visuals and using manipulatives to support academic vocabulary used for mathematic reasoning and modeling.

When an assistant principal is appointed, he/she will be given the responsibility of overseeing the instructional program for ELLs including compliance issues as well as PD for the teachers. Technology is infused into the curriculum. Each of our classes visits the computer lab once a week with a certified technology teacher. This teacher incorporates strategies with the ELL population under the guidance of our ELL coordinator. The Renzulli Learning Program provides differentiated instruction based on the individual student interest and readiness level on the computer. In addition, the students also take part in the School-wide enrichment module where they are broken up into learning clusters based on student surveys. All of our ELLs in our classrooms

participate in external organization programs with Ballet Hispanico, Mannes School of Music and The New York City Ballet, Nutcracker Project and The Horticultural Society.

A. Curricular: Briefly describe the school's literacy, mathematics and other content area programs and explain ELLs' participation in those programs. Briefly describe supplemental programs for ELLs (i.e., AIS, Saturday Academies).

All students, including ELLs at P.S. 166, participate in the following curricular program: All classes are taught using the Workshop Model, combining mini-lessons with group, paired and independent work. In Literacy, teachers use a balanced literacy approach in teaching reading, writing and word study. P.S. 166 uses the cognitive based Everyday Mathematics program. It provides a differentiated instructive approach where students are grouped based on readiness level. The groups are flexible and change based on the current unit of study. In addition, the Math Steps program is utilized to supplement Everyday Mathematics for those students who would benefit from a more structured method of instruction. Our classes implement the FOSS/Delta program of science discovery and investigation. Social Studies is incorporated into the literacy curriculum in each of our classes. We follow the New York State curriculum in this area.

P.S. 166 provides the following supplemental services to ELLs: In order to help students in need of extra help based on requests for CR Part 154 extension of services, children work with Learning Leaders and B'nai Jeshurun volunteers as a TIER 2 intervention 2 days a week. In addition AIS services are available to ELL students in need of academic intervention. These students are provided with Foundations and Wilson small group instruction. The program supports both phonemic awareness as well as reading fluency. All ELLs in grades 1-5 are invited to attend our after school Title III ELL academy to work on guided reading, writing and math academic vocabulary.

B. Extracurricular: Briefly describe extracurricular activities available in your school, and the extent to which ELLs participate.

All students including ELLs receive instruction in computers, physical education, dance, music and art as cluster periods. All of our arts programs follow the Blueprint for the Arts manual from the Department of Education. In addition all of our ELLs have the opportunity to participate in the above stated external organizations as part of their classes.

II. Parent/community: Describe parent/community involvement activities planned to meaningfully involve parents in their children's education and to inform them about the state standards and assessments.

In order to recognize the importance of family and community involvement in the education of ELLs and strengthen communication with parents, all parents of newly enrolled ELLs are provided with an orientation session on the State standards, assessments, school expectations and a general program description. The meeting will take place tentatively on **September 18, 2008** and the parents will be provided with an orientation DVD and materials in their native language to explain and clarify information about services for ELLs. There will also be two additional meetings for parents during the school year. One to present information on helping their children at home, **November 19, 2008** and the second on questions concerning curriculum and methodology used with the students and getting ready for ELA and NYSESLAT, **March 18, 2009**. Translators will be provided during the meetings for parents and all written materials will be in both English and Spanish. Parents of ELL students are invited to meet with their child's teachers regularly. Parent-Teacher conferences are held both during the fall and spring terms. Translators will be available on an "as needed" basis.

III. Project Jump Start: Describe the programs and activities to assist newly enrolled ELL/LEP students prior to the first day of school.

All incoming students to the school including ELLs are invited to attend an informational session as well as a walking tour of the school. In addition, upon arrival in to their classroom new arrivals are paired up with a more proficient buddy to help them acculturate to their new environment.

IV. Staff Development (2008-2009 activities—tentative dates and ELL-related topics): Describe how staff will participate in ongoing, long-term staff development with a strong emphasis on the State learning standards and high impact differentiated and academic language development strategies.

As part of the school's professional development, eight sessions will be given during monthly grade conferences/staff meetings. These sessions will give teachers the opportunity to explore ESL strategies and methodology. Tentative date and topics are as follows:

October 3, 2008 – How the NYSESLAT and other assessments help us plan instruction
November 7, 2008 – Interactive/Expository Writing with ELL
December 10, 2008 – Aligning ELA/ESL standards and bridging the gap for our students
January 7, 2009 – Math and the ELL Student
February 4, 2009 – Thematic units and center activities to meet the needs of ELLs
March 11, 2009 – Technology and the ELL Student
April 22, 2009 – ELLs and Gifted Education
May 20, 2009 - Differentiation and the IEP Student

In addition, staff members attending hours of Professional Development for Title III will receive credit towards Jose P.

V. Support services provided to LEP students: Describe other support structures that are in place in your school which are available to ELLs.

There are a variety of services available to all of our ELLs if needed to achieve and maintain a satisfactory level of academic performance. These include: guidance, psychology, occupational therapy, physical therapy as well as speech and language services and small group instruction provided by a special education teacher. ESL students receiving special education services in accordance with his/her IEP are also eligible for ESL services as recommended in the IEP.

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

School Building: 03M166 District 03

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			
0	2	0	0	0	0	2

* 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

Include schedules for students on three different levels in the ESL program (one each for Beginning, Intermediate and Advanced English Proficiency levels based on NYSESLAT/LAB-R). The schedules must account for all periods. Use attached Freestanding ESL Schedule Template. If your school has a Bilingual/Dual Language program, also provide three sample schedules – one each for Beginning, Intermediate and Advanced English Proficiency levels based on the NYSESLAT/LAB-R). The schedules must reflect ESL, Native Language Arts and content area instruction through use of both languages. Use attached Bilingual Schedule Template.

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (ESL)

ESL Program Type: Free-Standing Push-in Pull-out
 Indicate Proficiency Level: Beginning Intermediate Advanced

School District: 03

School Building: 03M166

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From: 8:30 To: 9:15	Subject (Specify) <i>Unpack and morning meeting</i> <i>*ESL</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Unpack and morning meeting</i> <i>*ESL</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Unpack and morning meeting</i> <i>*ESL</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Unpack and morning meeting</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Unpack and morning meeting</i> <i>*ESL</i>
2	From: 9:15 To: 10:00	Subject (Specify) <i>Literacy Block</i> <i>*ESL</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Literacy Block</i> <i>*ESL</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Literacy Block</i> <i>*ESL</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Literacy Block</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Literacy Block</i> <i>*ESL</i>
3	From: 10:00 To: 10:45	Subject (Specify) <i>Literacy Block</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Literacy Block</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Literacy Block</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Literacy Block</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Literacy Block</i>
4	From: 10:50 To: 11:40	Subject (Specify) <i>L</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>U</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>N</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>C</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>H</i>
5	From: 11:45 To: 12:35	Subject (Specify) <i>Math</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Math</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Math</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Math</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Math</i>
6	From: 12:35 To: 1:20	Subject (Specify) <i>Computer</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>PE</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Art</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Dance</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Music</i>
7	From: 1:20 To: 2:05	Subject (Specify) <i>Science</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Social Studies</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Science</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Science</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Social Studies</i>
8	From: 2:05 To: 2:40	Subject (Specify) <i>Snack/Read Aloud</i> <i>/Dismissal</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Snack/ Read</i> <i>Aloud/Dismissal</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Snack/ Read</i> <i>Aloud/Dismissal</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Snack/ Read</i> <i>Aloud/Dismissal</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Snack/ Read</i> <i>Aloud/Dismissal</i>

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (ESL)

ESL Program Type: Free-Standing Push-in Pull-out
 Indicate Proficiency Level: ___ Beginning Intermediate ___ Advanced

School District: 03

School Building: 03M166

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From: 8:30 To: 9:15	Subject (Specify) <i>Unpack and morning work</i> <i>*ESL</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Unpack and morning work</i> <i>*ESL</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Unpack and morning work</i> <i>*ESL</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Unpack and morning work</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Unpack and morning work</i> <i>*ESL</i>
2	From: 9:15 To: 10:00	Subject (Specify) <i>Literacy Block</i> <i>*ESL</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Literacy Block</i> <i>*ESL</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Literacy Block</i> <i>*ESL</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Literacy Block</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Literacy Block</i> <i>*ESL</i>
3	From: 10:00 To: 10:45	Subject (Specify) <i>Literacy Block</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Literacy Block</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Literacy Block</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Literacy Block</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Literacy Block</i>
4	From: 10:50 To: 11:40	Subject (Specify) <i>L</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>U</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>N</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>C</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>H</i>
5	From: 11:45 To: 12:35	Subject (Specify) <i>Math</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Math</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Math</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Math</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Math</i>
6	From: 12:35 To: 1:20	Subject (Specify) <i>Dance</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Art</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>PE</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Music</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Computer</i>
7	From: 1:20 To: 2:05	Subject (Specify) <i>Science</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Social Studies</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Science</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Science</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Social Studies</i>
8	From: 2:05 To: 2:40	Subject (Specify) <i>Snack/Read Aloud/Dismissal</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Snack/Read Aloud/Dismissal</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Snack/Read Aloud/Dismissal</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Snack/Read Aloud/Dismissal</i>	Subject (Specify) <i>Snack/Read Aloud/Dismissal</i>

SAMPLE STUDENT SCHEDULE 2008-09 (ESL)

ESL Program Type: Free-Standing Push-in Pull-out
 Indicate Proficiency Level: ___ Beginning ___ Intermediate Advanced

School District: 03

School Building: 03M166

Period	Time	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1	From: 8:30 To: 9:15	Subject (Specify) Morning Work/H.W. Check	Subject (Specify) Morning Work/H.W. Check	Subject (Specify) Morning Work/H.W. Check	Subject (Specify) Morning Work/H.W. Check	Subject (Specify) Morning Work/H.W. Check
2	From: 9:15 To: 10:00	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math	Subject (Specify) Math
3	From:10:00 To: 10:45	Subject (Specify) Reading Workshop	Subject (Specify) Reading Workshop	Subject (Specify) Reading Workshop	Subject (Specify) Reading Workshop	Subject (Specify) Reading Workshop
4	From:10:50 To: 11:40	Subject (Specify) Writing Workshop *ESL	Subject (Specify) Writing Workshop *ESL	Subject (Specify) Writing Workshop *ESL	Subject (Specify) Writing Workshop *ESL	Subject (Specify) Writing Workshop
5	From:11:45 To: 12:35	Subject (Specify) L	Subject (Specify) U	Subject (Specify) N	Subject (Specify) C	Subject (Specify) H
6	From:12:35 To: 1:20	Subject (Specify) Science	Subject (Specify) Social Studies	Subject (Specify) Science	Subject (Specify) Social Studies	Subject (Specify) Science
7	From: 1:20 To: 2:05	Subject (Specify) Music	Subject (Specify) Dance	Subject (Specify) Computer	Subject (Specify) PE	Subject (Specify) Art
8	From: 2:05 To: 2:40	Subject (Specify) Science cont. Copy H.W./Dismiss	Subject (Specify) Social Studies cont. Copy H.W./Dismiss	Subject (Specify) Science cont. Copy H.W./Dismiss	Subject (Specify) Social Studies cont. Copy H.W./Dismiss	Subject (Specify) <i>Science cont.</i> Copy H.W./Dismiss

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

Form TIII – A (1)(a)

Grade Level(s) K-5 Number of Students to be Served: 48 LEP 530 Non-LEP

Number of Teachers 1 Other Staff (Specify) _____

School Building Instructional Program/Professional Development Overview

Title III, Part A LEP Program

Language Instruction Program

Rationale: The students' language proficiency levels according to the NYSESLAT range from Beginner to Intermediate to Advanced. The goal is to work on student's integration of four skills of listening, reading, writing and speaking in literacy and math in English in order to scaffold learning to the next level. Early intervention guided reading strategies as well as metacognitive strategies to increase reading comprehension will be emphasized. Group time emphasis will also be on scaffolding math academic language needed to solve word problems. Students will be given continuous opportunity to integrate modalities and work toward meeting standards.

Approach: Small Group Instruction

Frequency/Duration: after school 2:50 pm to 4:50 pm, 2 hours, one day per week. Mondays, November 2008-March 2009.

Number of Students: 48 K – 5th grade students grouped by proficiency level, grade and teacher informal assessments and judgment

Number of Teachers: 7 certified ESL/Bilingual teachers/ESL trained

Measurement and Assessment Indicators: Fountas/Pinnell Assessments, State tests such as ELA and NYSESLAT, ELL interim assessments, City/State Math Exams as well as teacher made assessments.

The assessment and accountability will be shown in the following ways:

We will look for academic growth and achievement to be evidenced by ESL standards. Several formal assessments will be administered throughout the year to help guide instruction. There are LAB-R and NYSESLAT where applicable, ELA and Math Acuity Assessments, ELL Interim assessments and NYS and Citywide exams. We will develop student language skills in the areas of listening, speaking, reading and writing. Fountas/Pinnell assessments, NYSTART reports, teacher made assessments, anecdotal records, writing samples, student

accountable talk, and portfolios will be used to help guide instruction and scaffold student learning as well. The accountability of the students will be measured by ensuring that teachers who are working with the ELL population are trained and knowledgeable on providing support for these students. Student progress will be discussed during grade meetings and program meetings.

Professional Development Program

To continue the focus of our LAP of developing the four modalities and help increase knowledge of supporting our ELL students, we will hold an ongoing study group using Freeman and Freeman's book *English Language Learners, the Essential Guide*. In addition, current articles from the International Reading Association and TESOL journals on differentiating instruction for ELLs will be used for study and discussion. The seven Title III teachers will be invited to participate for per session rate. A copy of the book will be supplied to each teacher as well. Projected dates will be 12/5, 12/12, 12/19, 1/9, 1/16, 1/23, 2/6, 2/27, 3/13, 3/27. The group will meet for one hour at a time. The Professional Development and Instruction will be facilitated by a certified ESL teacher. As a culmination activity participants will create an information booklet highlighting strategies and activities aligning ESL/ELA/Math Standards to support Title III instruction and learning. Study Group teachers will turn key information during common prep meetings and staff meetings. This new learning will enhance our existing Professional Development.

The Professional development will be measured by the following: State ELL standards being met as evidenced by student work on ongoing assessments. A pre and post survey will be given to measure teacher increased awareness of scaffolding strategies and increased knowledge of working with students. Teachers will be given the opportunity to collaborate and work in groups to differentiate their knowledge levels and learn from each other. An ongoing journal will be created to reflect upon and improve instruction.

Parental Involvement/Engagement:

In order to recognize the importance of family and community involvement and reach out to parents, we will be holding 2 two-hour workshops to help parents with strategies to support their children at home as well as familiarize them with alignment of ESL and ELA standards. The workshops will be led by one certified teacher. Proposed dates will be 12/8, 2008 and 3/16, 2009. Parents of all ELLs will be invited to participate. Their increased knowledge base from these workshops will lead to increased student performance in school. Translators will be available on an "as needed" basis.

Form TIII – A (1)(b)

**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)	\$12,533	Teacher Per Session of a total of 252 hours at an hourly rate of \$49.73 (including fringe).
Purchased services such as curriculum and staff development contracts	n/a	
Textbooks	\$1,885	Supplies and instructional materials for the extended time programs for ELL learners. For example: Rigby On Our Way to English leveled fiction and content-based readers, Fairy Tales/Lakeshore Vocabulary Builders, Theme Kits, Community Puppets, notebooks, folders, markers, copy paper and copies for use of teachers, students, and parents, <u>English Language Learners- The Essential Guide</u> by Freeman for participating teachers
Supplies and Materials	\$215	Paper and supplies for students
Parent Involvement	\$367	Refreshments for parent meetings
TOTAL	\$15,000	

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.

Written Translation and Oral Translation Needs assessments were conducted at registration from information obtained from the Home Language Identification Surveys and from parent interviews.

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.

Findings reveal that most parents of our Spanish speaking second language learner population are American born and/or fluent readers, writers, and speakers of English. Findings reveal that ten parents of our Spanish home language population need written and oral translation/interpretation into Spanish. Families coming from homes other than Spanish speaking are fluent in English and therefore not in need of these services. Findings were reported to the school community by the Parent Coordinator and ELL Coordinator during initial parent meetings. In addition, information is available regarding access to translation and interpretation services in the Parent Coordinator's office.

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.

Written translation communicated in letters and memos will be provided by in-house Spanish bilingual staff members. In addition, parent volunteers will be called upon for written translation of school correspondence on an as needed basis to insure timely provision of translation documents. This service will meet our identified needs by providing Spanish written correspondence to those Spanish home language families.

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 interpretation of school meetings will be provided by in-house Spanish bilingual staff members. In addition, after school parent workshops will be interpreted by bilingual staff member using Title III monies. These services will meet our identified needs by providing native language interpretation to Spanish speaking families.

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>.

Our school will fulfill Section VII of Chancellor's Regulations A-663 by providing families with oral/written translation/interpretation in their home language. Thus, these Limited English Speaking families will be provided with a meaningful opportunity to participate in and have access to programs and services critical to their child's education. In addition, information about the services the Department of Education offers will be available in the Parent Coordinator's office. They will also be given access to the following Department of Education website: www.nycenet.edu/Offices/Translation/ContactUs/Default.htm.

**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, these 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: 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 also 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 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.

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.

– **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.

A collaborative approach to professional learning will be implemented for researching these findings and determining if they are applicable to our school. An ELA curriculum subcommittee will be formed to research and gather data on this key finding. Learning Walks, faculty meetings, grade level conferences, and common planning time will be implemented to support our efforts. We will dedicate time at our School Leadership Team meetings to share, discuss and reflect our findings at the school level.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

We anticipate that, through our self-assessments, we will find evidence in support of this finding. In advance of our inquiry, we recognize that there are areas of the written and taught curriculum that will present misalignments. In addition, we need to further develop our work in curriculum mapping so that we are addressing not only content topics, but skills to be mastered, strategies to be utilized, and student outcomes to be attained. Finally, as we allocate funds to purchase additional instructional materials, we must select materials to meet the needs of all of our learners, including ELLs, students with disabilities, and struggling learners.

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.

As an elementary school, we are committed to strengthening the rigor and alignment of our written, tested and taught curriculum in ELA. We plan to address any misalignments by continuing to act on the data gathered. In alignment with our CEP goals, we will strengthen our approach to curriculum mapping so that skills and strategies are included as well as content topics. These curriculum

maps will be aligned to state standards and these standards will be used in planning to help us guide instruction. We will continue the use of formative assessment data (running records, conference notes, student writing samples, etc.) to inform instruction and meet individual student needs. We will take a collaborative, reflective practitioner approach to professional development. As we discover some of our “gaps” in curriculum and instructional materials, we will order culturally relevant reading materials at various levels to meet student academic needs as well as interests. Currently, we have a resource room with leveled texts for students and professional materials for teachers. This resource bookroom needs to be updated and more accessible to teachers.

All stakeholders on the Language Allocation Policy team will take part in program planning for ELLs. In addition, the ESL teacher shares alignment of ELA/ESL learning standards during common planning time, inquiry team meetings and ongoing professional development with staff. Within the framework of the school’s Balanced Literacy Program, we will continue to plan and implement instruction in alignment with ESL/ELA standards and literacy units of study.

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.

A collaborative approach to professional learning will be implemented for researching these findings and determining if they are applicable to our school. Through a data informed inquiry process, the Core Inquiry Team (as well as grade level teams) will research and gather data on this key finding in consultation with SLT members. Learning Walks, faculty meetings, grade level conferences, and common planning time will be established in support of our efforts. We will dedicate time at our School Leadership Team meetings and Inquiry Team meetings to share, discuss and reflect our findings at the school level.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

Based on the findings of the Written, Tested and Enacted curriculum, we recognize that the *Every Day Math Program* instructional materials are aligned with the NYS content strands; however, there is a very weak alignment with the NYS process strands in all grade levels. There is also an apparent lack of depth in what is being taught in the classroom as compared to what is being required in the state standards. We anticipate that, through our self-assessments, we will find additional evidence in support of this finding. A review of our 2007-2008 NYC Progress Report illustrates that there is a lack of depth in what is being taught as compared to what is being tested on state standardized assessments in Mathematics. This is evidenced by the percentage of students recognized as making one year's progress.

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

Through the work of our Inquiry Team(s), we will examine our current instructional practices and we will design ways to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students. The Math Coach will assist teachers in planning and aligning content and process strands to instruction. Another relevant issue is the need for supplementing the *Every Day Math* curriculum with additional teacher-made and commercially produced instructional materials. In order to strengthen mathematics teaching and learning, we will reach out to peer schools to schedule inter-visitations to explore other programs that are in greater alignment with the state standards. We will also rely on the support of our ESO Network to further our professional learning.

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.

A collaborative approach to professional learning will be used to research and gather data on this key finding. Focused Learning Walks, faculty meetings, grade level conferences, and common planning time will be implemented to support our efforts. We will dedicate time at our School Leadership Team meetings to share, discuss and reflect our findings at the school level. Our teachers are encouraged to share best practices and to engage in research-based teaching, including differentiated instruction.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

Teachers in our school use the Workshop Model where there is a balance between group, shared and independent work. Students are given opportunity to practice strategies based on a teaching point that the teachers explicitly teach in a mini-lesson. A balanced literacy workshop approach is designed to meet the needs of all learners through differentiation of instruction. Common planning time and ongoing reflection continuously support the refinement of instructional practices.

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.

Although this finding is not applicable, we consider our work as professionals to be in need of constant assessment and collaborative inquiry into "best practices".

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. Observations 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.

A collaborative approach to professional learning will be implemented for researching these findings and determining if they are applicable to our school. Through a data informed inquiry process, the Core Inquiry Team (as well as grade level teams) is involved in researching and gathering data on this key finding in consultation with SLT members. Learning Walks, faculty meetings, grade level conferences, and common planning time will be established in support of our efforts. We will dedicate time at our School Leadership Team meetings and Inquiry Team meetings to share, discuss and reflect our findings at the school level.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

We anticipate that our findings will illustrate a need to deepen our understanding of a more student-centered, constructivist approach to teaching mathematics. We also recognize the need to increase the use of technology during math periods.

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.

In consultation with the SLT and Inquiry Teams, PS 166 teachers are continuing to work on ways to differentiate mathematics instruction and utilize technology during math classes. Currently, teachers and students use Renzulli Learning to differentiate for learning styles across all subject areas. Computers are used in every classroom to differentiate activities. Through a PTA grant one of our fifth grade teachers is using a laptop tablet to engage students in learning. We are also exploring the use of SmartBoards as well as other interactive technologies to enhance the educational experience of our students. In addition, our Technology specialist is committed to deepening our ability to integrate technology into our classroom instruction. As we move forward, we will seek out professional learning opportunities in alignment with our goal to strengthen the teaching and learning of mathematics across all grade levels.

KEY FINDING 3: TEACHER EXPERIENCE AND STABILITY

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

Please respond to the following questions for Key Finding 3:

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

We will conduct a review of teacher turnover rates on a yearly basis by assessing the organizational structure and its staff members.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

The teacher turnover rate is low at PS 166 as per a review of the organizational structure and its staff members. Over the past few years, very few teachers have self-selected to leave PS 166 except for the reason of retirement or family leave.

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.

N/A

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.

The School Leadership Team will consult with the ELL teacher/coordinator to discuss how we can support our teachers in continuing to differentiate for ELLs. Grade level meetings and informal conferences will be used to elicit feedback from classroom teachers to assess their professional learning needs in regard to differentiating for ELLs in the classroom.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

The ESL teacher attends ongoing professional development offered through the Protrax system such as QTEL Building the Base I, QTEL Math and QTEL for Beginning ELLS. Although the QTEL training is geared to the high school level, the ESL

teacher/coordinator turnkeys this information at ongoing professional development with staff, Inquiry Team meetings, grade level meetings, as well as during the Title III study group time. These scaffolds and strategies are used to differentiate instruction for ELLs in the mainstream classroom.

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.

Although this finding is not applicable, we consider our work as professionals to be in need of constant assessment and collaborative inquiry into “best practices”.

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.

The School Leadership Team will consult with the ELL teacher/coordinator to discuss how we can support our teachers in using data to monitor the academic progress of ELLs or their English language development. Grade level meetings and informal conferences will be used to support teachers in the use, monitoring and understanding of ELL data.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

The ESL teacher/coordinator shares NYSESLAT data with classroom teachers and service providers. In addition to the RLAT report we disaggregate our testing data into combined Listening/Speaking and Reading/Writing modalities to inform instruction for each child. The ESL teacher sets learning targets for students and shares these goals with teachers as well as parents during conference times.

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.

Although this finding is not applicable, we consider our work as professionals to be in need of constant assessment and collaborative inquiry into "best practices".

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.

A collaborative approach to professional learning will be implemented for researching these findings and determining if they are applicable to our school. The IEP teacher, school psychologist, guidance counselor, social worker, special/general education teachers and paraprofessionals will conduct a self-assessment of their strengths and challenges in meeting the needs of our special needs learners.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

We anticipate that our findings will illustrate that teachers engage in ongoing professional development for Wilson and Foundations programs in our school. They meet regularly to articulate with service providers and review IEPs. Our special education/IEP teacher acts as a liaison for professional development for teachers. Our guidance counselor and school psychologist work with teachers regarding behavioral plans, and our school social worker supports with crisis prevention and intervention. However, we recognize the fact that self-contained special education is "new" to us - as PS 166 currently supports two 12:1:1 classes and a CTT class in first grade. We are aware that a self-evaluation of our strengths and challenges will provide evidence of need for further development and professional growth in this area.

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.

Continued professional learning opportunities for special and general education teachers as well as paraprofessionals to gain familiarity with accommodations and modifications that would help to support students with disabilities in their classrooms; including knowledge of behavioral support plans for students. We will depend on the support of our peer schools and ESO Network to facilitate our growth in this area.

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.

The IEP teacher along with the school-based support team, classroom teachers, and related-service providers will review student IEPs to evaluate the accommodations and/or modifications for classroom instruction. They will also assess the alignment between goals, objectives, and modified promotional criteria that are included in student IEPs and the content on which these students are assessed on grade-level state tests. Finally, the team will engage in an assessment of behavioral intervention plans to determine the quality and appropriateness of stated behavioral goals and objectives.

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

Applicable Not Applicable

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

We anticipate that our self-assessment findings will be illustrative of a collaborative approach to strengthening the individualized educational programs for all students with disabilities on an ongoing basis. In addition, we value the input of parents in the IEP process and are constantly looking for ways to build stronger relationships with families. A review of our IEPs will provide evidence of a concerted effort made by all team members to establish goals and objectives that are aligned with grade level standards. In addition, behavioral intervention plans are designed and implemented for students with documented behavioral issues and concerns as well as for students exhibiting "at risk" behaviors.

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.

Although this finding is not applicable, we consider our work as professionals to be in need of constant assessment and collaborative inquiry into "best practices".

CEP Appendix 8: Contracts for Excellence

This electronic version of the CEP Appendix 8 allows you to submit details about your proposed 2008-09 Contracts spending within the six eligible program areas.

1. This form must describe your preliminary plans to use the total amount of funds allocated to your school in the Excellence allocation category in Galaxy. If you do not know this amount, please refer to Galaxy.
2. The sum of the allocations you list in each program area must match the total amount allocated to you in Galaxy.
3. Please provide all of the information requested for each of the program strategies to which you've allocated fund requirements.

This survey must be completed by Tuesday July 15 at 6pm.
Thank you!

Submit date: **Jul 15, 2008**

Please provide the following information about your school. You must complete all of the fields on this page in order for your survey to be valid.

School DBN	03M166
School Name	The Richard Rodgers School of Arts and Technology
Total Amount of "Contracts for Excellence" Allocation in Galaxy	\$ 43,718
Principal Name	Debbie J. Hand
Principal Email	dhand@schools.nyc.gov
Principal Phone	2126782829

Does your school plan to use FY09 C4E funding to reduce class size?

- Yes
 No

Does your school plan to use FY09 C4E funding to increase student time on task?

- Yes
 No

Does your school plan to use FY09 C4E funding for teacher and principal quality initiatives?

- Yes
 No

How much do you plan to allocate for each of the following program strategies?

Programs to recruit/retain Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT)

Professional mentoring for beginning teachers and principals

Instructional coaches for teachers

\$ 43,718

School leadership coaches for principals

Does your school plan to use FY09 C4E funding to support new or expanded programs or strategies to recruit or retain Qualified Teachers (HQT) (e.g., Lead Teacher program)?

- Yes
- No

Does your school plan to use FY09 C4E funding to support new or expanded professional mentoring for beginning teachers and/or principals (consistent with SED mentor-teacher certification requirements and limited to 1st and 2nd years teacher/principal assignment)?

- Yes
- No

Does your school plan to use FY09 C4E funding for new or expanded programs offering instructional coaching for appropriately certified coaches or highly qualified teachers providing support in content areas needed to attain learning standards)?

- Yes
- No

Please describe the program.

The C4E funds will be used to partially fund a Literacy Coach position. The position will support professional learning and strengthen instruction of teachers in our CTT and self-contained special education classes. In the 2008-2009 school year we will be expanding our special education adding a CTT/Kindergarten and another 12:1:1. These two classes are in addition to our existing CTT that is moving up to first grade and a CTT that presently includes first and second graders. Allocating the funds in this matter, will support student achievement gains in alignment with our goals and performance targets. The Literacy Coach position will also support teachers with mapping curriculum across each grade level to effect literacy and social studies. In this way, the Literacy Coach will influence and impact the capacity of classroom teachers to enhance teaching.

Please indicate the student population(s) you intend to target via this initiative.

- English Language Learners
- Students with Disabilities
- Students in Poverty
- Students with Low Academic Achievement / at Risk of Not Graduating

Is the program described above a first-time implementation of the program/strategy, or an expansion of an existing program/strategy?

- New implementation
- Program Expansion

Does your school plan to use FY09 C4E funding for new or expanded programs offering coaching for principals (e.g., appropriately certified school leadership coaches, with records of demonstrated success, providing instructional development across all curriculum areas)?

- Yes
- No

Does your school plan to use FY09 C4E funding for middle and high school restructuring efforts?

- Yes
- No

Does your school plan to allocate FY09 funding to implement a new full-day pre-kindergarten program, or to expand a pre-kindergarten program at the school?

- Yes
- No

Does your school plan to allocate FY09 funding to expand and/or replicate a model instructional program for English Learners (ELLs)?

- Yes
 - No
-