

2021-2022 Receivership School Final Report and 2022-23 Continuation Plan

Final Report: *April 15, 2022, to June 30, 2022*

Continuation Plan for the 2022-23 School Year

This document is to be completed by the School Receiver and/or their designee and submitted electronically to OISR@NYSED.gov. **All sections of the report must be completed by fully responding to each prompt.**

The reporting portion of this document is a self-assessment of the **implementation and outcomes of key strategies** related to Receivership, and as such, is not considered a formal evaluation via the New York State Education Department. Once finalized and accepted, this document in its entirety ***must be posted in a conspicuous place*** on the district website. All responses submitted under the “2022-2023 School Year Continuation Plan” heading should directly align with, or be adaptations to, the previously approved intervention plans and **require explicit engagement and input from community engagement teams (CET)**.

| School Name | School BEDS Code | District | Lead Partner or EPO | | Hyperlink to where this plan will be posted on the district website: | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---------------------|--|--|--------|-------|---|
| Giffen Memorial Elementary School | 010100010044 | Albany | N/A | | Receivership Giffen Memorial Elementary School | | | |
| Superintendent | School Principal (If new, please attach resume) | Additional District Staff working on Program Oversight | Grade Configuration | High School Graduation Rate (If applicable, please provide the most recent graduation rate data available.): | Total Enrollment | % ELL | % SWD | % Students designated as both ELL & SWD |
| Kaweeda G. Adams | Jasmine Brown Appointment Date: 8/1/2012 | Dr. Cecily Wilson-Turner, Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Michele Bridgewater, District Improvement Director | PreK-5 | N/A | 322 | 21.12% | 23.5% | 7.1% |

Executive Summary

Please provide a *plain-language summary* of this combined report and continuation plan to both reflect the changes and progress made since the last reporting period and to describe how actions taken to implement lead strategies, engage the community, and enact Receivership powers during the past quarter will provide a basis for developing a data-informed continuation plan for the next school year. The summary should be written in terms easily understood by the community-at-large. Please avoid terms and acronyms that are unfamiliar to the public and limit the summary to *no more than 500 words*. **Any links included must be made publicly available prior to submitting the report.**

Giffen Memorial Elementary finished the 21.22 school year working to meet the goals outlined in our School Comprehensive Education Plan. We continued providing professional development and coaching support focused on lesson rigor, and standards-based instruction for all grade levels for Math and ELA. Professional development continued, with modifications and adjustments made, after our quarter 3 data review and report. Some of the professional development and coaching we engaged in were as follows, but not limited to: accountable talk, coaching cycles with a focus on writing; core instruction (IPG Core Action 2); text based questioning; primary grade levels: foundational skills instruction and building fluency; releasing scaffolds with a focus on comprehension, launching into the “Explore” part of L.E.D in Math lesson planning, and integrating science topics into ENCORE to support the review for NYS science test. In an effort to continue to reduce our chronic absenteeism rate, we continued to provide incentives connected to Tier I and continued to implement attendance plans (barrier based) for our families that needed the most attendance support.

As indicated in our 22.23 SCEP, the focus of our continuation plan centers on providing professional development, and coaching support focused on lesson rigor, standards-based instruction and learning targets for all grade levels. Teachers will continue receiving professional development around standards based instruction, with a focus on complex texts and cognitive engagement strategies. Instructional support for teachers currently includes : grade level/individual coaching cycles based on benchmarking data, as well as bi-weekly data teaming support as dictated by grade level data and need. In the 22.23 school year, we will continue to implement our ELA double-dose model (increased daily minutes) of small group reading instruction and MTSS (multi tiered system of supports) in all grade levels, including self-contained. Our K classrooms will be supported by a literacy TA for additional reading instruction. Additional Math support will be provided for Grades 2 - 5, implementing our Bridges Math intervention program by two Math interventionists. Due to our enrollment and a reduction of sections, our interventionists will be able to provide additional minutes of instruction to more students based on the development of the master schedule. We will administer, review and modify instruction based on our NWEA assessments, Math and ELA pre and post assessment data, as well as our curricular checkpoints.

Assessments and data collection will continue to be a strategy to drive instructional decisions at Giffen. We will administer, review and modify instruction based on our NWEA assessments, Math and ELA pre and post assessment data, as well as our curricular checkpoints. As indicated from our DTSDE survey data, we will continue our Equity and Social Emotional Learning for staff to strengthen their understanding of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy in order to create more affirming environments for our Black and Brown student population.

Walkthroughs by school and district administrators continue to inform the impact of elements within our 22 - 23 SCEP. We worked on lifting CORE instruction within Math and ELA for all students for grade level material in the 21.22 school year. While we will continue to monitor this implementation in the 22.23 school year, administrators will shift their focus to small group and RtI instruction in both Math and ELA. Walk-through trends and an analysis of relevant data will be reviewed with the administrative staff to tier teacher support, and walkthrough data will be shared quarterly with the school’s Building Leadership Team, building staff, and Community Engagement Team/School Advisory Team.

Although chronic absenteeism is not an indicator, it remains a focus of our monitoring and data review. Our SCEP calls for utilizing a tiered model for response to intervention and increasing communication to the school community in an effort to remove attendance barriers. In January, our chronic absenteeism rate was 45%. In June, our chronic absenteeism rate was 39%. While not the goal we strived for, we achieved this goal by implementing the following strategies: placing daily phone calls to Tier 2 and Tier 3 students, creating attendance plans for students on the cusp of chronic absenteeism, identifying Tier 3 students/families with increased focus and communication with our home school coordinators and assistant principals, conducting weekly home visits. We also shifted and began implementing positive incentives for students/families who consistently met attendance benchmarks. The incentives included positive phone calls, distributing rewards to the homerooms with perfect attendance, and recognizing the grade level with the highest monthly attendance. We will plan to make connections with not only our chronically absent families this summer, but also work with all of our newly enrolled families to not only welcome them and communicate expectations, but also identify if there are any barriers that may contribute to attendance concerns in the future and assist in removing them. We will continue this work in the 22.23 school year.



The Community Engagement Team met on July 18th, to review the Continuation plan and had an opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback.

Directions for Parts I, II, and III - District and school staff should respond to these sections of the document by both analyzing and summarizing the steps taken to implement lead strategies since the third quarter and to identify the key strategies that will be addressed in the 2022-2023 Continuation Plan.

- When responding to prompts pertaining to the *Final Report and Reflection*, include processes that were used in Quarter 4 **to assess the impact** of strategies implemented on student learning outcomes.
- When responding to prompts pertaining to the *2022-23 School Year Continuation Plan*, include processes for **assessing impact** on student learning outcomes that will be implemented during the new school year.

The 2022-2023 Continuation Plan is an opportunity for district and school staff to present their proposed actions and adaptations for the upcoming school year and is intended to create a *framework* by which the school transitions from the current year to the upcoming school year in a manner that represents *continuous and comprehensive planning*. This should include a clear **focus on how evidence** guides decisions and an articulation of explicit supports for student social-emotional well-being, diversity, equity, inclusion, and active engagement in learning.

- The District should ensure that the implementation of lead strategies addresses the needs of *all learners*, particularly the needs of subgroups of students and those at risk for not meeting State academic standards.
- District and school staff should **assess the impact** of identified lead strategies on student learning, as connected and aligned to diagnostic review feedback, to ensure strategy implementation can achieve *long-term sustainable growth*.

Part I –Lead Strategies for Improvement

Lead Strategies for School Improvement

Include 3-4 core lead strategies that are central to the school’s improvement plan. The lead strategies included should be a continuation or extension of lead strategies implemented in the prior school year and serve as key levers for improvement based on trends in student performance data to serve as overarching approaches for implementing strategically focused action plans for achieving demonstrable improvement.

| Final Report and Reflection on Lead Strategies Applied during April 15, 2021 - June 30, 2022 | | Lead Strategies that will Guide the 2022-23 School Year Continuation Plan | |
|--|---|---|---|
| List the lead strategies that guided the school’s improvement work during the 2021-22 school year, including any that were discontinued. | For each lead strategy, provide context for why the strategy was selected as a key lever for improvement based on data trends, as well as whether or not the lead strategy will be maintained during the next school year. | List the lead strategies that will guide the school’s improvement plan during the 2022-23 school year. | Explain why the lead strategy listed was selected based on current data trends, and how the lead strategy will help to achieve progress toward this year’s demonstrable improvement targets. |
| 1. Professional development for teachers on standards-based instruction, standards progression, high leverage routines. | <p>Our data this year exhibited significant student growth, especially in our intermediate grade levels for both Math and ELA. While we saw student growth, there was still a lack of progress towards proficiency (PI). We will continue to implement and monitor standards based instruction for ELA and Math. Many of the professional development sessions focused on lesson planning around standards based learning and engagement strategies for students.</p> <p>We realize at GMES that increases in student outcomes will only occur with growth in teachers’ abilities to provide standards based instruction that enables students to demonstrate performance at or above their grade level. Professional development around this, as well as strong development of response to intervention strategies, remains a key lever for improvement for the 22.23 school year.</p> | 1. Professional development for teachers on standards-based instruction, standards progression, intervention strategies, high leverage routines and student engagement strategies (student voice). | Current data shows us that even amidst student growth, students are not reaching grade level proficiency in all content areas. Teacher learning and implementation continues to be the highest leverage strategy to change teacher practice and provide high quality instruction for our students. Some of these PDs will continue to focus on high leverage Math routines, providing rich complex texts for ELA, planning for text-dependent questions and culminating writing tasks; all around state based grade level standards. Many of the online platforms will continue to be a part of teacher learning for integration into lesson planning and delivery. We have also included teaching assistants in our instructional coaching cycles and professional developments for implementation in the 22.23 school year. |



| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | | | Walkthroughs and cycles will be a strategy for monitoring and implementation of all teacher learning. |
| <p>2. <u>Weekly common planning meetings</u> with instructional staff, coaches, and administration to review and modify instructional practices with a tight focus on student work.</p> | <p>Common planning time/data team structure was a key vehicle to connect planning and data review for all teachers. This time of collaboration focused on professional development and review of assessment data (including review of student work). Coaches worked closely with staff during this carved out time to support grade level teams.</p> <p>In October we added an additional bi-weekly hour for grade levels to meet, review student data and rework our Tier I plans to strategically plan for individual student needs and move students through groups as they mastered concepts. This also assisted with what students may have needed to be seen by our MTSS team for further review of support needed. This is a practice that will continue into the 22.23 school year.</p> | <p>2. <u>Weekly common planning meetings</u> with instructional staff, coaches, and administration to review and modify instructional practices with a tight focus on student work.</p> | <p>Walkthroughs and lack of student progress toward PI show that there is still inconsistency in the effective planning and instructional delivery of ELA and Math standards based instruction across all instructional staff (across all Tiers). While there are professional development hours built into our yearly calendar to develop competency, utilizing the common planning time/data team structure has been the most effective way to do this work and allow teacher collaboration time to focus on assessment data and rework the best instructional routine to continue to push student growth. Administration and coaches are present during this time to be able to support proper implementation. With the growth demonstrated on the intermediate level, this is a model we will continue to use to lift our practice and provide the most effective instruction in all classes that we can for students.</p> <p>This year common planning time will focus on the planning of instruction that includes the necessary scaffolds for students to remain engaged with grade level instruction. In addition, time will be dedicated to allow for classroom teachers, interventionists and instructional supervisors to review student data to monitor the progress of students who have specific gaps in their learning.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| <p>3. Coaches will model and plan with teachers to provide ongoing support in the implementation of strategies taught in professional development. Teachers will share classroom instruction methodologies and student artifacts throughout the coaching cycles.</p> | <p>At the start of the 21.22 school year, Coaches provided time through PD and coaching cycles to go deeper within the curriculum and to foster mastery at each unit. This PD continued through the year, as well as an opportunity to model and discuss the strategies in practice. The district increased coaching support for GMES at the start of the 21.22 school year. This will continue to be a research based strategy for the 22.23 school year.</p> | <p>3.Coaches will model and plan with teachers to provide ongoing support in the implementation of strategies taught in professional development. There will be continued work on ELA Core instruction and Math instructional routines. This upcoming school year we will also focus on high leverage Math routines, providing rich complex texts for ELA, planning for text-dependent questions and culminating writing tasks; all around state based grade level standards. The instructional coaches are instrumental for this work.</p> | <p>The instructional coaches are critical in assisting teachers and administration in understanding the best practices to lift teacher classroom practices and provide rich equitable student opportunities. While we have been engaging in coaching cycles for the past few years, we have begun to shift to outcome based cycles, looking at the impact on not only student practice, but also student outcomes.</p> <p>Coaches will focus on a few teachers at a time for coaching cycles to provide ample time for them to support changes in teaching practice and demonstrate increased student growth as a result of the coaching cycle.</p> |
| <p>4.Administrator walkthroughs/instructional rounds will allow for consistent monitoring and feedback on the standards based instruction and tasks provided and understood through professional development and coaching support</p> | <p>Accountability and consistency to implement practices was a need as evidenced through walkthrough collection data in the 21.22 school year. Feedback and follow up with teachers has slightly shifted teachers on the district learning continuum rubric. This was a continued strategy identified and used through the second half of the 21.22school year. As an administrative team, we were able to not only conduct walkthroughs but also class visits which helped us keep an instructional pulse on the building and make adjustments. This also assisted with the time administrators spent in classrooms. Building trends were shared monthly with clear expectations about what practices were expected to be implemented and what would be monitored and to which feedback would be provided.</p> | <p>4.Administrator walkthroughs/instructional rounds will continue to be a strategy used in the 22.23 school year, allowing for consistent monitoring and feedback on the standards based instruction and tasks provided and understood through professional development and coaching support.</p> | <p>Accountability and consistency to implement practices was a need as evidenced through walkthrough collection data. Walkthroughs and classroom visits will be strategically implemented based on a school tiering system which identifies the level of visits and support needed for classrooms. While we have worked to increase the amount of time administrators are in the classroom, we have also worked to strengthen the quality and mode of feedback to impact teacher practice. We also began to share teacher data with emailed feedback, as a way to connect the practices with student outcomes. This will be a continued strategy in the 22.23 school year. We will also continue to share building trends monthly with clear expectations about what practices are expected to be</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | | implemented, what will be monitored and to which feedback will be provided. |
|--|--|--|---|

Part II – Demonstrable Improvement Indicators-Level 1

| Level 1 Indicators <i>Please list the school’s Level 1 indicators and complete all columns below. This information should provide details about how lead strategies will inform the implementation of specific strategies and action steps that will support progress toward the Demonstrable Improvement Indicators.</i> | | |
|---|---|---|
| Identify Indicator | Final Report and Reflection on Activities Completed during April 15, 2021- June 30, 2022 What specific strategies and action steps were implemented to support progress for each of the Demonstrable Improvement Indicators? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the specific data/evidence used to determine progress and impact on instruction, student learning, and achievement. • Describe how the data trends that emerged during this period will inform future action steps. | 2022-2023 School Year Continuation Plan for Meeting this Indicator Drawing from the information provided in the Final Report and Reflection on Activities , what specific strategies, and action steps will be implemented during the 2022-2023 school year to support progress for this Demonstrable Improvement Indicator? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a data-informed rationale for the strategies and action steps indicated. • Include a description of any adjustments made since the last reporting period along with the corresponding data used to inform the adjustment. |
| #33 3-8 ELA All Students MGP #100 ELA All Students | EasyCBM Data | Our review of our end of the year ELA data has indicated that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walkthroughs and student data indicate that there are some strategies working (Tier I review, departmentalizing, common planning focuses) and others that need to be reviewed and modified (curricular assessments, alignment of tier I support and instruction)to continue to develop competency around implementing ELA standards based congruent instruction across all ELA teachers and providers (across all Tiers). • Walkthroughs indicate that teachers are developing competency around text dependent questions to further support all student access of grade level complex texts. There remains |

**Core Subject
 PI**

| Grade Level | easyCBM Probe | Grade level Avg. October Mid-Point | Grade level Avg. Spring '22 Benchmark | | MidPoint Gap to the target | Spring '22 Gap to Target |
|-------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| K | Letter Sounds (LS) | 6.67 | 26 | | -5.33 | -9 |
| 1 | Word Reading Fluency (WRF) | 9.66 | 24 | | -5.34 | -19 |
| 2 | Passage Reading Fluency (PRF) | 36 | 60 | | -26 | -38 |
| 3 | Passage Reading Fluency (PRF) | 64 | 98 | | -28 | -12 |
| 4 | Passage Reading Fluency (PRF) | 89.5 | 120 | | -28.5 | -12 |
| 5 | Passage Reading Fluency (PRF) | 107 | 150 | | -38 | -13 |

After review of the ELA Winter benchmarks, there was an increased focus on phonological awareness strategies in K-1, fluency support at Grade 2, and additional comprehension strategies in Grades 3 - 5. The gap to the target, while we did not meet it across all grade levels, decreased more significantly in our departmentalized grades 3 - 5). Tier I plans were continuously reviewed, and professional development on the above were provided during common planning time. We also spent some time working through engagement strategies and providing student scaffolds to those that still required them, and beginning to release those students on the verge or at mastery.

A review of the NWEA benchmark data from Winter to Spring indicates that in grades 3-5, the following percentage of students met their growth target from Winter to Spring:

- Grade 3 - 56% (44% Winter to Spring 20.21)
- Grade 4 - 54% (47% Winter to Spring 20.21)
- Grade 5 -48% (53% Winter to Spring 20.21)

We also compared the conditional growth percentile in the Spring of 2021 and Spring 2022

- Grade 3 - 52 (7 %ile points higher than 2021)
- Grade 4 - 54 (10%ile points higher than 2021)
- Grade 5 - 55 (7%ile points higher than 2021)

Lastly, the average proficiency rate on the curriculum aligned assessments are:

- Grade 3 - 7%(incl. self-contained classes)
- Grade 4 - 34%
- Grade 5 - 23%

Based on the NWEA Spring performance, using NWEA as a predictor of State performance, the overall growth was 53.4, which is 4.8 points above our indicator target of 48.6 for 2021 - 2022 school year.

a need for release to students and further opportunities for students to engage in their learning (IGP - CORE 3)

- Survey data shows that students are looking for greater affirming opportunities in school by staff and our school environment.
- Opportunities for teachers to plan together and be included in the review of student ELA progress and ELA instructional strategies used to support student growth has proved to be beneficial.

The following ELA strategies will be utilized to support progress for student ELA growth and performance index progress in the 22.23 school year based on the above trends and observations:

- Teachers will continue to participate in Standards Based Instruction PD, with a focus on developing text-dependent questions and writing tasks, for K-5 teachers around the Priority standards as outlined in the current ELA pacing map.
- Teachers, with the guidance of the instructional coaches, will engage in a CPT Structure of *Plan, Implement, Evaluate, Reflect* focused on planning for text dependent questioning. CPT structure will embed discussion of equity and bias in our beliefs about students' abilities to achieve with complex grade level texts based on their ability, ENL, SPED status and racial/culture backgrounds.
- ELA Coaches will work with grade level teams monthly to review the end of week outcomes, review the progression of the weekly standard and determine strategies to foster grade level understanding and update Tier 1 plans based on all data points.
- Teachers will engage in outcome based coaching cycles with ELA coaches, who will provide targeted support to classrooms/teachers around further development of CORE Action 2 and introduction to CORE Action 3.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p><i>With regards to the performance index, we are not on target for this indicator at this time. Based on the NWEA Spring performance, using NWEA as a predictor of the State assessment, the projected performance level is 56.2 and the target for this year was 62.5 which is 6.3 points below our target.</i></p> <p>While we hit our benchmark with regards to growth, we are still striving to improve teacher development to provide rigorous standards based instruction for students so that they perform at grade level.. The curriculum assessment ELA data for Grade 3 has indicated a need for a deeper dive and the need to further support the students with disabilities at this grade level. While most students hit their growth targets (slight decrease from Winter to Spring for Grade 5 through the students who met their goals over the course of the year in Grade 5 increased this year by 2 percentage points), and all percentile points increased, they are not at the accelerated levels we hope to achieve. This will assist in informing what classrooms begin 22.23 coaching cycles at the start of the school year, and provide information for identifying Tier I strategies and CORE ELA planning for classrooms.</p> | |
| <p>#39 3-8 Math All Students MGP</p> <p>#110 Math All Students Core Subject PI</p> | <p>After review of the Math Winter benchmarks, there was an increased focus to utilize our bi-weekly data team meetings to review standards based grade level Math assessments and review student work to shift practice. We continued the development of CORE Math instructional routines that promoted rigorous tasks (number talks, which one doesn't belong, connecting representation) and further development of students' Math conceptual reasoning.</p> <p>A review of the NWEA benchmark data from Winter to Spring indicates that in grades 3-5, the following percentage of students met their growth target from Winter to Spring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 3 - 63% (61% Winter to Spring 2021) • Grade 4 - 53% (37% Winter to Spring 2021) • Grade 5 - 78% (54% Winter to Spring 2021) <p>We also compared the conditional growth percentile in the Spring of 2021 and Spring 2022</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 3 - 58 (3 %ile points lower than 2021) • Grade 4 - 57 (17%ile points higher than 2021) • Grade 5 - 72 (22%ile points higher than 2021) <p>Lastly, the average proficiency rate on the curriculum aligned assessment are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 3 - 43% (with self contained; 64% without) • Grade 4 - 56% | <p>Our review of our end of the year Math data has indicated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walkthroughs and student progress show that the instructional work around implementation of Math standards based congruent instruction across all Math teachers and providers is beginning to show impact in the intermediate grades. • Walkthroughs indicate that teachers continue to develop their competency around high leverage tasks to develop student conceptual understanding and allow opportunities for students to show and explain their thinking, while capitalizing off the use of strategies that are allowing students to excel in their Math conceptual understanding. <p>The following Math strategies will be utilized to support progress for student Math growth and performance index progress in the 22.23 school year based on the above trends and observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Math interventionists will continue to aid support, with the intervention program, Bridges, to address unfinished learning in Grades 2 - 5, an increased grade level from last year. • Teachers will participate in Standards Based Instruction PD, with a focus on the math teaching practices, student math practices, and instructional routines surrounding high leverage explore routines (reviewing launch routines in Sept.). • Teachers, with the guidance of the Math coach, will engage in a CPT Structure of <i>Plan, Implement, Evaluate, Reflect</i> focused on components of an effective math routine.. CPT structure will embed discussion of equity and bias in our beliefs about students' abilities to |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grade 5 - 84% <p><i>Based on the NWEA Spring performance, using NWEA as a predictor of State performance, overall growth was 62.8 which is 18.5 points above our target of 44.3 for the 2021 - 2022 school year.</i></p> <p><i>With regards to the performance index, we are on target for this indicator at this time. Based on the NWEA Spring performance, using NWEA as a predictor of the State assessment, the projected performance level is 49.2 and the target for this year was 43.5 which is 5.7 points above our target.</i></p> <p>This data indicated for us that there was growth in the intermediate grades as it relates to student growth, a substantial increase at Grade 5. We will utilize the strategies that have assisted in this growth for Grade 5 and not only spotlight this Grade level and its work, but begin to translate those practices to the other grade levels. Additional support will also continue to be provided to our self-contained classes, approximately 30 students who also must be prepared for the state exams. We will continue teacher development to provide rigorous standards based instruction for students. While CORE instruction remains a focus for our standards based equitable instruction, we will also start to use our Tier I planning strategy for Math in Grades 2 - 5 (use of Bridges intervention) This data will also assist in informing what classrooms begin the 21.22 coaching cycles at the start of the school year, and provide information for identifying Tier I strategies and Math planning for classrooms.</p> | <p>problem solve rigorous math tasks based on their ability, ENL, SPED status and racial/culture backgrounds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Math Coaches will work with grade level teams monthly to review the end of week outcomes, review the progression of the weekly standard and determine strategies to foster grade level understanding and update Tier 1 plans based on all data points. Teachers will engage in outcome based coaching cycles with the Math coach, who will provide targeted support to classrooms/teachers around Math launch routines to promote re-engagement around pre-requisite standards, problem solving routines and accountable talk |
| <p>#150 Grades 4 Science All Students Core Subject PI</p> | <p>Based on our mid-year Science data, we continued our professional development around the FOSS curriculum resource, implemented our quarterly Science assessments, and modified Science instruction based on the item analysis review of those assessments.</p> <p><i>Based on the pre and post Grade 4 Science Assessment, level 3s and 4s increased from 0% to 25% (an increase of 25%). In 18-19 a 64% proficiency rate (levels 3 & 4) equated to 151.6 on this ESSA indicator, which is well below our target of 161.3.</i></p> <p>This data indicated for us that there is a need for teacher development around the FOSS Science curriculum. There will be a continued focus for all teachers to modify the curriculum as it applies to FOSS and the Engineering and Science Standards.</p> | <p>Our review of our end of the year Science data has indicated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a need to increase the amount of walkthroughs and class visits devoted to Science to make sure schedule time is not being dominated by Math and ELA. The instructional coach and administration must devote and schedule adequate professional development, assessment review, and instructional modification for Science. <p>The following Science strategies will be utilized to support progress for student Science core subject performance index progress in the 21.22 school year based on the above trends and observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administration will schedule and embed dedicated instructional Science time for each classroom teacher. Grade 4 and Grade 5 students will take a modified written and performance assessment, for the purposes of establishing a baseline for the New York State Science Test. The instructional coach will work with the intermediate Science/Math teachers quarterly to review the results of the written and performance baseline assessment and offer strategies for implementing the strategies during instruction. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional development via Teacher PD sessions to all grade teams unpacking investigations with a focus on how to enhance student engagement with the targeted Science and Engineering Practices (1,3,4,5) Building leaders and instructional supervisors will conduct class visits on all Science teachers with a focus on effective implementation of labs, and the embedding of Science and Engineering Practices 1,3,4,5 (during their scheduled Science blocks) followed-up by written and/or face to face feedback in order to develop vertically aligned student Science competencies. |
|--|--|--|

Part III – Demonstrable Improvement Indicators-Level 2

| <p>Level 2 Indicators Please list the school’s Level 2 indicators and complete all columns below. This information should provide details about how lead strategies will inform the implementation of specific strategies and actions that will support progress toward the Demonstrable Improvement Indicators.</p> | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Identify Indicator</p> | <p>Final Report and Reflection on Activities Completed during April 15, 2021 - June 30, 2022</p> <p>What specific strategies and action steps were implemented to support progress for each of the Demonstrable Improvement Indicators?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide the specific data/evidence used to determine progress and impact on instruction, student learning, and achievement. Describe how the data trends that emerged during this period will inform future action steps. | <p>2022-23 School Year Continuation Plan for Meeting this Indicator</p> <p>Drawing from the information provided in the Final Report and Reflection on Activities, what specific strategies, and action steps will be implemented during the 2022-2023 school year to support progress for this Demonstrable Improvement Indicator?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a data-informed rationale for the strategies and action steps indicated. Include a description of any adjustments made since the last reporting period along with the corresponding data used to inform the adjustment. |
| <p>ELA</p> <p>#35 3-8 ELA Black Students MGP</p> <p>#103</p> | <p>After review of the ELA Winter benchmarks, there was an increased focus on phonological awareness strategies in K-1, fluency support at Grade 2, and additional comprehension strategies in Grades 3 - 5. The gap to the target , while we did not meet it across all grade levels, decreased more significantly in our departmentalized grades 3 - 5). Tier I plans were continuously reviewed, and professional development on the above were provided during common planning time. We also spent some time working through engagement strategies and providing student scaffolds to those that still required them, and beginning to release those students on the verge or at mastery.</p> | <p>Our review of our end of the year ELA data has indicated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Walkthroughs and student data indicate that there are some strategies working (Tier I review, departmentalizing, common planning focuses) and others that need to be reviewed and modified (curricular assessments, alignment of tier I support and instruction)to continue to develop competency around implementing ELA standards based congruent instruction across all ELA teachers and providers (across all Tiers). Walkthroughs indicate that teachers are developing competency around text dependent questions to further support all student access of grade level complex texts. There remains a need for release to students and further opportunities for students to engage in their learning (IGP - CORE 3) |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>3-8 ELA Hispanic Core Subject PI</p> <p>NWEA Reading Growth SWD</p> | <p><i>Based on the NWEA Spring performance, using NWEA as a predictor of State performance, overall growth for Black students was 54.4 which is 6.5 points above the target of 47.9 for 2020-2021 school year.</i></p> <p><i>Based on the NWEA Spring performance, using NWEA as a predictor of State performance, the overall PI for Hispanic students was 38.6 which is 29.1 points below the target of 67.7 for the 2021 - 2022 school year.</i></p> <p><i>Based on the NWEA Spring performance, using NWEA as a predictor of State performance, overall growth for SWDs was 37.3 which is 18.4 points above the target of 55.7 for the 2021 - 2022 school year.</i></p> <p>This data has indicated for us that our ELA focused work is beginning to show impact on student outcomes for our Black Students. We will continue our work around teacher development to provide rigorous standards based instruction for students. This will assist in informing what classrooms begin the 22.23 coaching cycles at the start of the school year and provide information for identifying Tier I strategies and CORE ELA planning for classrooms. This data will also be utilized to identify which students may benefit from additional before and after school programs that will supplement classroom learning in the upcoming school year.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey data shows that students are looking for greater affirming opportunities in school by staff and our school environment. • Opportunities for teachers to plan together and be included in the review of student ELA progress and ELA instructional strategies used to support student growth has proved to be beneficial. <p>The following ELA strategies will be utilized to support progress for student ELA growth and performance index progress in the 22.23 school year based on the above trends and observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers will continue to participate in Standards Based Instruction PD, with a focus on developing text-dependent questions and writing tasks, for K-5 teachers around the Priority standards as outlined in the current ELA pacing map. • Teachers, with the guidance of the instructional coaches, will engage in a CPT Structure of <i>Plan, Implement, Evaluate, Reflect</i> focused on planning for text dependent questioning. CPT structure will embed discussion of equity and bias in our beliefs about students' abilities to achieve with complex grade level texts based on their ability, ENL, SPED status and racial/culture backgrounds. • ELA Coaches will work with grade level teams monthly to review the end of week outcomes, review the progression of the weekly standard and determine strategies to foster grade level understanding and update Tier 1 plans based on all data points. • Teachers will engage in outcome based coaching cycles with ELA coaches, who will provide targeted support to classrooms/teachers around further development of CORE Action 2 and introduction to CORE Action 3. |
| <p>MATH</p> <p>#41 3-8 Math Black Students MGP</p> <p>#112 3-8 Math Black Core Subject PI</p> <p>#113</p> | <p>After review of the Math Winter benchmarks, there was an increased focus to utilize our bi-weekly data team meetings to review standards based grade level Math assessments and review student work to shift practice. We continued the development of CORE Math instructional routines that promoted rigorous tasks (number talks, which one doesn't belong, connecting representation) and further development of students' Math conceptual reasoning.</p> <p><i>Based on the NWEA Spring performance, using NWEA as a predictor of State performance, overall growth for Black students was 60.9 which is 17.8 points above the target of 43.1 for 2021 - 2022 school year.</i></p> <p><i>Based on the NWEA Spring performance, using NWEA as a predictor of State performance, the projected PI for Black students was 60.9 which is 17.8 points above the target of 43.1 for 2021 - 2022 school year.</i></p> <p><i>Based on the NWEA Spring performance, using NWEA as a predictor of State performance, the projected PI for Hispanic students was 38.6 which is 29.1 points below the target of 67.7 for 2021 - 2022 school year.</i></p> | <p>Our review of our end of the year Math data has indicated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walkthroughs and student progress show that the instructional work around implementation of Math standards based congruent instruction across all Math teachers and providers is beginning to show impact in the intermediate grades. • Walkthroughs indicate that teachers continue to develop their competency around high leverage tasks to develop student conceptual understanding and allow opportunities for students to show and explain their thinking, while capitalizing off the use of strategies that are allowing students to excel in their Math conceptual understanding. <p>The following Math strategies will be utilized to support progress for student Math growth and performance index progress in the 22.23 school year based on the above trends and observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Math interventionists will continue to aid support, with the intervention program, Bridges, to address unfinished learning in Grades 2 - 5, an increased grade level from last year. • Teachers will participate in Standards Based Instruction PD, with a focus on the math teaching practices, student math practices, and instructional routines surrounding high leverage <i>explore</i> routines (reviewing <i>launch</i> routines in Sept.). |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>3-8 Math Hispanic Core Subject PI</p> <p>NWEA Math Growth CGP - SWD</p> | <p><i>Based on the NWEA Spring performance, using NWEA as a predictor of State performance, overall growth for SWDs was 48.3 which is 16.3 points above the target of 32 for the 2021 - 2022 school year.</i></p> <p>This data indicated for us that there was growth in the intermediate grades as it relates to student growth. Additional support will also continue to be provided to our self-contained classes, approximately 30 students who also must be prepared for the state exams. We will continue teacher development to provide rigorous standards based instruction for students. While CORE instruction remains a focus for our standards based equitable instruction, we will also start to use our Tier I planning strategy for Math in Grades 2 - 5 (use of Bridges intervention) This data will also assist in informing what classrooms begin the 21.22 coaching cycles at the start of the school year, and provide information for identifying Tier I strategies and Math planning for classrooms. This data will also be utilized to identify which students may benefit from additional before and after school programs that will supplement/enrich classroom learning.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers, with the guidance of the Math coach, will engage in a CPT Structure of <i>Plan, Implement, Evaluate, Reflect</i> focused on components of an effective math routine.. CPT structure will embed discussion of equity and bias in our beliefs about students’ abilities to problem solve rigorous math tasks based on their ability, ENL, SPED status and racial/culture backgrounds. • Math Coaches will work with grade level teams monthly to review the end of week outcomes, review the progression of the weekly standard and determine strategies to foster grade level understanding and update Tier 1 plans based on all data points. • Teachers will engage in outcome based coaching cycles with the Math coach, who will provide targeted support to classrooms/teachers around Math launch routines to promote re-engagement around pre-requisite standards, problem solving routines and accountable talk. |
|--|--|--|

Part IV – Community Engagement Team (CET)

| <p>Community Engagement Team (CET) <i>The role of the Community Engagement Team is to develop recommendations for school improvement by soliciting input through public engagement.</i></p> <p><i>Recommendations made by the CET, including how the school community and community at-large were engaged to (1) provide input into the school’s Continuation Plan and (2) review and update, if necessary, its 2022-2023 Community Engagement Team plan and membership, should be addressed in response to the prompts below.</i></p> | |
|--|--|
| <p>Report Out of 2021-2022 CET Plan Implementation</p> | <p>Plan for Use of CET Recommendations in 2022-2023</p> |
| <p>Describe how recommendations made by the CET during 2021-2022 were used to inform implementation of the school’s improvement plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List the categories of stakeholders that have participated as members over the past school year. Note any changes made to the CET’s membership since the last reporting period. • Include links, or embed, real time artifacts such as meeting agendas, membership lists, signed attendance lists, etc. | <p>Describe how recommendations made by the CET during 2022-23 will be used to inform implementation of the school’s improvement plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include any changes that will be made to CET membership for the 2022-23 school year. Include the role/title of any new members. |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Administrators Teachers Parents Community School Site Coordinator Home School Coordinator Community Members School Program Provider</p> <p>21.22 Continuation Plan (SCEP 22.23) CET Review</p> | <p>While the categories of stakeholders on the CET have not changed since submission of the Q3 report.</p> <p>The CET has been informed and has approved of the plan set forth in our School Improvement Plan for the 22.23 school year.</p> |
|---|--|

Part V - Receivership Powers

| <p>Powers of the Receiver <i>Provide a summary of the use of the School Receiver’s powers during 2021-2022 school year.</i></p> | <p><i>Describe the anticipated use of the School Receiver’s powers during the 2022-2023 school year (pursuant to those identified in Commissioners Regulation §100.19).</i></p> |
|---|---|
| <p>The School Receiver negotiated with the Teachers’ Union, and an MOA was passed which added an additional two hours of professional development for instructional staff. Each of these professional development hours have been directly connected to the SCEP strategies identified above to lift practices of instructors as it applies to CORE ELA and MATH instruction.</p> | <p>The current agreement will remain in effect for the 2022-2023 school year.</p> |

Part VI – Assurance and Attestation

By signing below, I attest to the fact that the information in this continuation plan is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and that all requirements with regard to public hearings and the Community Engagement Teams, as per Commissioners Regulation § 100.19 have been met.

Name of Receiver (Print): _____

Signature of Receiver: _____

Date: _____

By signing below, I attest to the fact that the Community Engagement Team has had the opportunity to provide input into this continuation plan and to review and update, if necessary, its 2022-2023 Community Engagement Team plan and membership.*

Name of CET Representative (Print): _____

Signature of CET Representative: _____

Title of CET Representative: _____

Date: _____

****The CET Attestation must be signed by a CET member other than a school administrator.***

Revised June 1, 2022