

## 2020-21 Receivership School Final Report and Continuation Plan

Final Report: *January 16, 2021 to June 30, 2021*

Continuation Plan for the 2021-22 School Year

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	010100010029	City School District of Albany		<a href="#">Receivership   Giffen Memorial Elementary School</a>				
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	Remote-Only Student Enrollment	% ELL	% SWD
Kaweeda G. Adams	Jasmine Brown	Dr. Cecily Wilson-Turner, Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Instruction Michele Bridgewater, District Improvement Director	Prek-5		535	259	12.34%	20.37
	Appointment Date: 8/1/2012							

<b>Executive Summary</b>
<p>Please provide a <u><i>plain-language summary</i></u> of this combined report and continuation plans in terms of implementing key strategies, engaging the community, and enacting Receivership. 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 <i>no more than 500 words</i>.</p>
<p>ACSD continued operating in a hybrid instructional model the second half of the year. Giffen finished the school year with 259 remote students and approximately 274 onsite/in-person learners. Giffen continued to focus on our identified strategies, with reviews, adjustments and modifications being made monthly after review of our Building Leadership Team. There were some district changes that have impacted our building configuration and enrollment for the 21.22 school year: Grade 6 is no longer in our building and has officially been moved to our middle school and our Academic International Center (school for entering English as a New Language Learners) will impact our ELL enrollment. These factors have been considered in the work outlined in our 21.22 SCEP and the key strategies listed below.</p>
<p>As indicated in our 21.22 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. This continues to be a focus for Giffen as we continue work to lift the instructional practices of staff to provide a rigorous, standards based, high quality education. In the 21.22 school year, we will be able to re-implement our ELA double-dose model (increased daily minutes) of small group reading instruction and MTSS (multi tiered system of supports) small group instruction in Grades 1 - 5. This support will also be provided to our self-contained special education classes, 2/4 who have students who will be expected to sit for the NYS exams. Our K classrooms will be supported by a literacy TA for additional reading instruction. There will be an increase in Math coaching support (moving from a .5 position to a full time position, with supporting Math interventionists supporting small group Math instruction for Grades 3 - 5. There will be a new Bridges Math intervention program also implemented in the upcoming school year.</p>
<p>Assessments and data collection will continue to be a strategy to drive instructional decisions at Giffen. As indicated from our survey data, we will look to implement Academic Parent Teacher Teams in Grades 3 - 5 to further engage our parents and partners around student data and the strategies teacher teams are using to promote student growth inside and outside of the classroom. 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.</p>
<p>Walkthroughs by school and district administrators continue to inform the impact of elements within our 21.22 SCEP. For ELA. Those monitoring implementation of rigorous instructional strategies will utilize the IGP (Instructional Practice Guide - CORE ACTION 2, which focuses on scaffolding to ensure all students develop a deeper understanding of complex texts that are presented to them). For Math and engagement strategies, the district instructional</p>

continuum will be utilized to provide feedback to teachers. With the reinstatement of two building APs, learning walks will be conducted to make sure administrators are calibrated around instructional practices and further support needed throughout the building. Building coaches will begin to utilize a result based rubric to measure their work with teachers through the coaching cycle process. Walkthrough results and an analysis of data has been shared with the school's Building Leadership Team, teaching staff, and Community Engagement Team/School Advisory Team.

Chronic Absenteeism continues to be a focus of our monitoring and data review in the 21.22 school year, as it was in the second half of the 20.21 school year. With an anticipated return to a full in-person model, we will continue to focus on improving chronic absenteeism and increasing communication to the school community in an effort to remove attendance barriers. Strategies include: targeting students on the cusp of chronic absenteeism and using a 14 day rolling average to identify Tier 3 students/families. Our attendance team increases communication with those Tier III families, identifying a case manager/family ; Tier 3 attendance plans are created in an effort to remove barriers for those families. Our second home school coordinator position has also been the last quarter of the year and for next year, therefore we will be able to drill down and increase strategis support and communication for families where consistent attendance continues to be a struggle.

The Community Engagement Team met on July 26th, to review progress that the school has made on the implementation of the plan and progress towards meeting the demonstrable indicators. The team approved the plan.

***Attention*** – This document is intended to be completed by the School Receiver and/or their designee and submitted electronically to [OISR@NYSED.gov](mailto:OISR@NYSED.gov). The reporting portion of this document is a self-assessment of the **implementation and outcomes of key strategies** related to Receivership, and as such, should not be considered a formal evaluation on the part of the New York State Education Department. This document in its entirety must be posted on the district website.

***Please note*** - All responses submitted under the “2021-22 School Year Continuation Plan” heading should directly align with or be adaptations to the previously approved intervention plans and must have input from community engagement teams.

**Directions for Parts I, II, and III** - District and school staff should respond to the sections of this document by both analyzing and summarizing the key strategies that will be addressed in the 2021-2022 Continuation Plan to include anticipated processes for implementation and measuring impact on student learning outcomes.

The 2021-2022 Continuation Plan is an opportunity for district and school staff to present their proposed actions and adaptations for the upcoming school year. This 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*, with a clear focus on supporting student well-being, equity, and engagement. The District should ensure the key strategies address the needs of all learners, particularly the needs of subgroups of students and those at risk for not meeting the challenging State academic standards. District and school staff should consider the impact of proposed key strategies on student learning, as well as the long-term sustainability and connectivity of those key strategies to diagnostic review feedback.

**Part I –Lead Strategies for Improvement**

<b>Lead Strategies for School Improvement</b> <i>Identify up to 4 lead strategies that are central to the school's improvement plan. Lead strategies are key levers for improvement that are identified based on trends in student performance data to serve as overarching approaches for implementing strategically focused action plans for achieving demonstrable improvement.</i>			
<b>Final Report and Reflection on Lead Strategies Applied during January 16, 2021 - June 30, 2021</b>		<b>Lead Strategies that will Guide the 2021-22 School Year Continuation Plan</b>	
List the lead strategies that guided the school's improvement work during the 2020-21 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 2021-22 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.
<b>1. Professional development for teachers on standards-based instruction, standards progression, high leverage routines and thinking maps.</b>	Our data (student lack of progress towards proficiency (PI) showed that there was a need to consistently implement standards based instruction for ELA and Math. Many of the professional development sessions shifted to standards based learning utilizing selected online platforms to accommodate our hybrid learning environment, after being able to provide all students with Chromebooks.  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 these areas remains a key lever for improvement during our dynamic 20.21 school year.	<b>1. Professional development</b> for teachers on standards-based instruction, standards progression, high leverage routines.	Current data shows us that even amidst modest 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 now focus on high leverage Math routines, providing rich complex texts for ELA; 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. Walkthroughs and cycles will be a strategy for monitoring and implementation of all learning.
<b>2. Bi-weekly data team meetings</b> with instructional staff, coaches, and administration to review and modify instructional practices with a tight focus on student work.	Common planning time/data team structure was a key vehicle to connect planning and data review for virtual and in-person staff. This time of collaboration focused on professional development and review of assessment data. Coaches reworked the 7 day lesson plan for teachers to dive deeper to fill gaps this school year and they were available to support	<b>2. Grade level Bi-weekly data team meetings/common planning</b> with instructional staff, coaches, and administration to review and modify instructional practices with a tight focus on student work.	Walkthroughs and lack of student progress (Tier I progress, curricular and local assessments) 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



	grade level teams.		<p>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.</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><b>3.Coaches</b> 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 <b>coaching cycles</b>.</p>	<p>At the start of the 20.21 school year, District coaches modified the Wonders pacing map whereby teachers utilized a 7 day plan vs a 5 day plan. The pacing map for Math was also modified. Coaches were expected to provide time through PD and cycles to go deeper within the curriculum and to foster mastery at each unit. Cycles continued to pose a challenge through the second half of the year, however, recorded virtual instructional videos were utilized to provide a different type of “studio” style experience to coach teachers around unit implementation. This will continue to be a research based strategy for the 21.22 school year.</p>	<p><b>3.Coaches</b> will model and plan with teachers to provide ongoing support in the implementation of strategies taught in professional development. There will be a focus on ELA Core instruction and Math instructional routines</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. This year there will be a coaching based tool used to make sure that there is not only an observable change in practice, but that it leads to improved student outcomes.</p>
<p><b>4.Administrator walkthroughs/instructional rounds</b> 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. 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 20.21 school year.</p>	<p><b>4.Chronic absenteeism</b> reduction strategies will continue to be a focus this year as we continually work to remove barriers for consistent participation in our educational program. There are also a number of ways that we will strive to utilize MTSS and parental engagement/empowerment opportunities for parent-school partnership.</p>	<p>Our chronic absenteeism rate stayed above 50% this year. While this is not an indicator for GMES, there continues to be strategies that we must employ to reduce our chronic absenteeism rate and support families toward improved attendance and thus increase consistent instructional seat time and intervention.</p>

**Part II – Demonstrable Improvement Indicators-Level 1**

**Level 1 Indicators**

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.

Identify Indicator	Final Report and Reflection on Activities Completed during January 16, 2021 - June 30, 2021	2021-22 School Year Continuation Plan for Meeting this Indicator
# 33 ELA All Students MGP	<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"> <li>• Provide the specific data/evidence used to determine progress and impact on instruction, student learning, and achievement.</li> <li>• Describe how the data trends that emerged during this period will inform future action steps.</li> </ul> <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. Tier I plans were reviewed in February and March, and professional development on the above were provided during common planning time.</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"> <li>• Grade 3 - 44%</li> <li>• Grade 4 - 47%</li> <li>• Grade 5 -53%</li> </ul> <p>We also compared the conditional growth percentile in the Spring of 2019 and Spring 2021 (Assessment wasn't given in Spring 2020 due to COVID Pandemic)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 3 - 6 %ile points lower than 2019</li> <li>• Grade 4 - 7%ile points lower than 2019</li> <li>• Grade 5 - 8%ile points lower than 2019</li> </ul> <p>Based on the NWEA Spring performance, using NWEA as a predictor of State performance, overall growth was 45.7 which is 2.9 points below the target of 48.6 for 2020-2021 school year.</p> <p>This data indicated for us that there is still a great need for teacher development to provide rigorous standards based instruction for students. While half 44 - 53% of our students met their growth target, there was a steady decrease of percentile points as grade level standard expectations increased. This will 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 CORE ELA planning for classrooms.</p>	<p>Drawing from the information provided in the <b>Final Report and Reflection on Activities</b>, what specific strategies, and action steps will be implemented during the 2021-22 school year to support progress for this Demonstrable Improvement Indicator?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a data-informed rationale for the strategies and action steps indicated.</li> <li>• Include a description of any adjustments made since the last reporting period along with the corresponding data used to inform the adjustment.</li> </ul> <p>Our review of our end of the year ELA data has indicated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walkthroughs and lack of student progress (Tier I progress, curricular and local assessments) show that there is an inconsistency to properly plan for and implement ELA standards based congruent instruction across all ELA teachers and providers (across all Tiers).</li> <li>• Walkthroughs indicate that teachers must develop competency around text dependent questions to further support all student access of grade level complex texts.</li> <li>• Survey data shows that parents request additional opportunities to be included in the review of student ELA progress and ELA instructional strategies used to support student growth</li> </ul> <p>The following ELA strategies will be utilized to support progress for student ELA growth and performance index progress in the 21.22 school year based on the above trends and observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 3 will be departmentalized to increase the content area focus for teachers and strategically schedule support for the ELA teacher and Reading interventions and supports.</li> <li>• Teachers will participate in Standards Based Instruction PD, with a focus on developing text-dependent questions, for K-5 teachers around the Priority standards as outlined in the current ELA pacing map.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• GMES intermediate staff (3 - 5) will engage in professional development around the Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) model for Fall implementation.</li> <li>• Teachers will engage in outcome based coaching cycles with ELA coaches, who will provide targeted support to classrooms/teachers around development of CORE Action 2.</li> </ul>

<p><b>#100 3-8 ELA All Students Core subject Performance Index</b></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. Tier I plans were reviewed in February and March, and professional development on the above were provided during common planning time.</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"> <li>• Grade 3 - 44%</li> <li>• Grade 4 - 47%</li> <li>• Grade 5 -53%</li> </ul> <p>We also compared the conditional growth percentile in the Spring of 2019 and Spring 2021 (Assessment wasn't given in Spring 2020 due to COVID Pandemic)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 3 - 6 %ile points lower than 2019</li> <li>• Grade 4 - 7%ile points lower than 2019</li> <li>• Grade 5 - 8%ile points lower than 2019</li> </ul> <p>Lastly, the average proficiency rate on the curriculum aligned assessments are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 3 - 13%</li> <li>• Grade 4 - 42%</li> <li>• Grade 5 - 37%</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Based on the NWEA Spring performance, using NWEA as a predictor of State performance, the overall PI was 61.6, which is .9% below our indicator target of 62.5 for 2020-2021 school year.</i></b></p> <p>This data indicated for us that there is still a great need for teacher development to provide rigorous standards based instruction for students. The curriculum assessment ELA data for Grade 3 has indicated a need for a deeper dive and the need to make some additional changes to this Grade level. While half 44 - 53% of our students met their growth target, there was a steady decrease of percentile points as grade level standard expectations increased. This will 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 CORE ELA planning for classrooms.</p>	<p>Our review of our end of the year ELA data has indicated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walkthroughs and lack of student progress (Tier I progress, curricular and local assessments) show that there is an inconsistency to properly plan for and implement ELA standards based congruent instruction across all ELA teachers and providers (across all Tiers).</li> <li>• Walkthroughs indicate that teachers must develop competency around text dependent questions to further support all student access of grade level complex texts.</li> <li>• Survey data shows that parents request additional opportunities to be included in the review of student ELA progress and ELA instructional strategies used to support student growth</li> </ul> <p>The following ELA strategies will be utilized to support progress for student ELA growth and performance index progress in the 21.22 school year based on the above trends and observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 3 will be departmentalized to increase the content area focus for teachers and strategically schedule support for the ELA teacher and Reading interventions and supports.</li> <li>• Teachers will participate in Standards Based Instruction PD, with a focus on developing text-dependent questions, for K-5 teachers around the Priority standards as outlined in the current ELA pacing map.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• GMES intermediate staff (3 - 5) will engage in professional development around the Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) model for Fall implementation.</li> <li>• Teachers will engage in outcome based coaching cycles with ELA coaches, who will provide targeted support to classrooms/teachers around development of CORE Action 2.</li> </ul>
<p><b>#39 3-8 Math All Students MGP</b></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 Math instructional routines that promoted rigorous tasks (number talks, the 3-read routine, connecting representation) and further development of students' Math conceptual reasoning.</p>	<p>Our review of our end of the year Math data has indicated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walkthroughs and lack of student progress (Tier I progress, curricular and local assessments) show that there is an inconsistency to properly plan for and implement Math standards based congruent instruction across all Math teachers and providers (across all Tiers).</li> </ul>

	<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"> <li>• Grade 3 - 61%</li> <li>• Grade 4 - 37%</li> <li>• Grade 5 -54%</li> </ul> <p>We also compared the conditional growth percentile in the Spring of 2019 and Spring 2021 (Assessment wasn't given in Spring 2020 due to COVID Pandemic)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 3 - 6 %ile points higher than 2019</li> <li>• Grade 4 - 20%ile points lower than 2019</li> <li>• Grade 5 - 6%ile points lower than 2019</li> </ul> <p>Lastly, the average proficiency rate on the curriculum aligned assessment are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 3 - 13%</li> <li>• Grade 4 - 42%</li> <li>• Grade 5 - 37%</li> </ul> <p><b>Based on the NWEA Spring performance, using NWEA as a predictor of State performance, overall growth was 49.9 which is 5.6 points above our target of 48.6 for 2020-2021 school year.</b></p> <p>This data indicated for us that there is still a great need for teacher development to provide rigorous standards based instruction for students. The curriculum assessment data for Grade 3 has indicated a need for a deeper dive and the need to make some additional changes to this Grade level. While half 37 - 61% of our students met their growth target in Math, there was a decrease of percentile points in Grades 4 and 5, as grade level standard expectations increased. An additional strategy must be considered to address this unfinished learning. 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walkthroughs indicate that teachers must develop their competency around high leverage tasks to develop student conceptual understanding and allow opportunities for students to show and explain their thinking.</li> <li>• Survey data shows that parents request additional opportunities to be included in the review of student Math progress and Math instructional strategies used to support student growth.</li> </ul> <p>The following Math strategies will be utilized to support progress for student Math growth and performance index progress in the 21.22 school year based on the above trends and observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 3 will be departmentalized to increase the content area focus for teachers and strategically schedule support for the Math interventionists and supports.</li> <li>• Math interventionists will be an added support, with a new intervention program, Bridges, to address unfinished learning in Grades 3 - 5.</li> <li>• 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 <b>launch</b> routines (Sept. through January).</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• GMES intermediate staff (3 - 5) will engage in professional development around the Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) model for Fall implementation.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
<p><b>#110 3-8 Math All Students Core Subject Performance Index</b></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 Math instructional routines that promoted rigorous tasks (number talks, the 3-read routine, 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>	<p>Our review of our end of the year Math data has indicated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walkthroughs and lack of student progress (Tier I progress, curricular and local assessments) show that there is an inconsistency to properly plan for and implement Math standards based congruent instruction across all Math teachers and providers (across all Tiers).</li> <li>• Walkthroughs indicate that teachers must develop their competency around high leverage tasks to develop student conceptual understanding and allow opportunities for students to show and explain their thinking.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Grade 3 - 44%</li> <li>● Grade 4 - 47%</li> <li>● Grade 5 -53%</li> </ul> <p>We also compared the conditional growth percentile in the Spring of 2019 and Spring 2021 (Assessment wasn't given in Spring 2020 due to COVID Pandemic)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Grade 3 - 6 %ile points lower than 2019</li> <li>● Grade 4 - 7%ile points lower than 2019</li> <li>● Grade 5 - 8%ile points lower than 2019</li> </ul> <p>Lastly, the average proficiency rate on the curriculum aligned assessment are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Grade 3 - 13%</li> <li>● Grade 4 - 42%</li> <li>● Grade 5 - 37%</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Based on the NWEA Spring performance, using NWEA as a predictor of State performance, the overall PI was 29.3, which is 14% below our indicator target of 43.5 for 2020-2021 school year.</i></b></p> <p>This data indicated for us that there is still a great need for teacher development to provide rigorous standards based instruction for students. The curriculum assessment data for Grade 3 has indicated a need for a deeper dive and the need to make some additional changes to this Grade level. While half 37 - 61% of our students met their growth target in Math, there was a decrease of percentile points in Grades 4 and 5, as grade level standard expectations increased. An additional strategy must be considered to address this unfinished learning. 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Survey data shows that parents request additional opportunities to be included in the review of student Math progress and Math instructional strategies used to support student growth.</li> </ul> <p>The following Math strategies will be utilized to support progress for student Math growth and performance index progress in the 21.22 school year based on the above trends and observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Grade 3 will be departmentalized to increase the content area focus for teachers and strategically schedule support for the Math interventionists and supports.</li> <li>● Math interventionists will be an added support, with a new intervention program, Bridges, to address unfinished learning in Grades 3 - 5.</li> <li>● 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 <b>launch</b> routines (Sept. through January).</li> <li>● 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.</li> <li>● 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.</li> <li>● GMES intermediate staff (3 - 5) will engage in professional development around the Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) model for Fall implementation.</li> <li>● 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.</li> </ul>
<p><b>#150 Grade 4 Science All Students Core Subject Performance Index</b></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 (remote and in-person), based on the item analysis review of those assessments.</p> <p><b><i>Based on the pre and post Science Assessment, level 3s and 4s increased from 20% to 43% (an increase of 23%). In 18-19 a 64% proficiency rate (levels 3 &amp; 4) equated to 151.6 on this ESSA indicator, which is well below our target of 161.3.</i></b></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 Grade 4 teachers to modify the curriculum as it applies to FOSS and the Grade 4 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"> <li>● There is a need to increase the amount of walkthroughs devoted to Science to make sure schedule time is not being dominated by Math and ELA.</li> <li>● The instructional coach and administration must devote and schedule adequate professional development, assessment review, and instructional modification for Science.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>● Administration will schedule and embed dedicated instructional Science time for each classroom teacher.</li> <li>● Grade 4 students will take a modified written and performance assessment, for the purposes of establishing a baseline for the New York State Science Test.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The instructional coach will work with grade 4 Science/Math teachers quarterly to review the results of the written and performance baseline assessment and offer strategies for implementing the strategies during instruction.</li> <li>• professional development via Teacher PD sessions to 2nd-5th grade teams unpacking investigations with a focus on how to enhance student engagement with the targeted Science and Engineering Practices (1,3,4,5)</li> <li>• Building leaders and instructional supervisors will conduct walkthroughs on a core group of 2nd-5th grade 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.</li> </ul>
--	--	--

**Part III – Demonstrable Improvement Indicators-Level 2**

<p><b>Level 2 Indicators</b></p>		
<p><i>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.</i></p>		
<p><b>Identify Indicator</b></p>	<p><b>Final Report and Reflection on Activities Completed during January 16, 2021 - June 30, 2021</b></p>	<p><b>2021-22 School Year Continuation Plan for Meeting this Indicator</b></p>
<p>3-8 ELA Black Students MGP</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"> <li>• Provide the specific data/evidence used to determine progress and impact on instruction, student learning, and achievement.</li> <li>• Describe how the data trends that emerged during this period will inform future action steps.</li> </ul> <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. Tier I plans were reviewed in February and March, and professional development on the above were provided during common planning time.</p> <p><b>Based on the NWEA Spring performance, using NWEA as a predictor of State performance, overall growth was 47.8 which is .1 points above the target of 47.9 for 2020-2021 school year.</b></p> <p>This data has indicated for us that there is still a great need for teacher development to provide rigorous standards based instruction for students. While half 44 - 53% of our students</p>	<p>Drawing from the information provided in the <b>Final Report and Reflection on Activities</b>, what specific strategies, and action steps will be implemented during the 2021-22 school year to support progress for this Demonstrable Improvement Indicator?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a data-informed rationale for the strategies and action steps indicated.</li> <li>• Include a description of any adjustments made since the last reporting period along with the corresponding data used to inform the adjustment.</li> </ul> <p>Our review of our end of the year ELA data has indicated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walkthroughs and lack of student progress (Tier I progress, curricular and local assessments) show that there is an inconsistency to properly plan for and implement ELA standards based instruction across all ELA teachers and providers (across all Tiers).</li> <li>• Walkthroughs indicate that teachers must develop competency around text dependent questions to further support all student access of grade level complex texts.</li> <li>• Survey data shows that parents request additional opportunities to be included in the review of student ELA progress and ELA instructional strategies used to support student growth</li> </ul> <p>The following ELA strategies will be utilized to support progress for student ELA growth and performance index progress in the 21.22 school year based on the above trends and observations:</p>

	<p>met their growth target, there was a steady decrease of percentile points as grade level standard expectations increased. This will 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 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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Grade 3 will be departmentalized to increase the content area focus for teachers and strategically schedule support for the ELA teacher and Reading interventions and supports.</li> <li>● Teachers will participate in Standards Based Instruction PD, with a focus on developing text-dependent questions, for K-5 teachers around the Priority standards as outlined in the current ELA pacing map.</li> <li>● 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.</li> <li>● 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.</li> <li>● GMES intermediate staff (3 - 5) will engage in professional development around the Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) model for Fall implementation.</li> <li>● Teachers will engage in outcome based coaching cycles with ELA coaches, who will provide targeted support to classrooms/teachers around development of CORE Action 2.</li> </ul>
<p>3-8 ELA Hispanic Core Subject MGP</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. Tier I plans were reviewed in February and March, and professional development on the above were provided during common planning time.</p> <p><b><i>Based on the NWEA Spring performance, using NWEA as a predictor of State performance, overall growth was 67.7 which is 14.9 points below the target of 52.8 for 2020-2021 school year.</i></b></p> <p>This data has indicated for us that there is still a great need for teacher development to provide rigorous standards based instruction for students. This will 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 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.</p>	<p>Our review of our end of the year ELA data has indicated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Walkthroughs and lack of student progress (Tier I progress, curricular and local assessments) show that there is an inconsistency to properly plan for and implement ELA standards based congruent instruction across all ELA teachers and providers (across all Tiers).</li> <li>● Walkthroughs indicate that teachers must develop competency around text dependent questions to further support all student access of grade level complex texts.</li> <li>● Survey data shows that parents request additional opportunities to be included in the review of student ELA progress and ELA instructional strategies used to support student growth</li> </ul> <p>The following ELA strategies will be utilized to support progress for student ELA growth and performance index progress in the 21.22 school year based on the above trends and observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Grade 3 will be departmentalized to increase the content area focus for teachers and strategically schedule support for the ELA teacher and Reading interventions and supports.</li> <li>● Teachers will participate in Standards Based Instruction PD, with a focus on developing text-dependent questions, for K-5 teachers around the Priority standards as outlined in the current ELA pacing map.</li> <li>● 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.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 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.</li> <li>● GMES intermediate staff (3 - 5) will engage in professional development around the Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) model for Fall implementation.</li> <li>● Teachers will engage in outcome based coaching cycles with ELA coaches, who will provide targeted support to classrooms/teachers around development of CORE Action 2.</li> </ul>
<p>3-8 Math Black Students MGP</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 Math instructional routines that promoted rigorous tasks (number talks, the 3-read routine, connecting representation) and further development of students' Math conceptual reasoning.</p> <p><b>Based on the NWEA Spring performance, using NWEA as a predictor of State performance, overall growth was 47.4 which is 4.3 points above the target of 43.1 for 2020-2021 school year.</b></p> <p>While this indicator of growth was above the target for this school year, other data points still indicate that there is a need for teacher development to provide rigorous standards based instruction for students. Our data will 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 CORE 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>	<p>Our review of our end of the year Math data has indicated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Walkthroughs and lack of student progress (Tier I progress, curricular and local assessments) show that there is an inconsistency to properly plan for and implement Math standards based congruent instruction across all Math teachers and providers (across all Tiers).</li> <li>● Walkthroughs indicate that teachers must develop their competency around high leverage tasks to develop student conceptual understanding and allow opportunities for students to show and explain their thinking.</li> <li>● Survey data shows that parents request additional opportunities to be included in the review of student Math progress and Math instructional strategies used to support student growth.</li> </ul> <p>The following Math strategies will be utilized to support progress for student Math growth and performance index progress in the 21.22 school year based on the above trends and observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Grade 3 will be departmentalized to increase the content area focus for teachers and strategically schedule support for the Math interventionists and supports.</li> <li>● Math interventionists will be an added support, with a new intervention program, Bridges, to address unfinished learning in Grades 3 - 5.</li> <li>● 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 <b>launch</b> routines (Sept. through January).</li> <li>● 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.</li> <li>● 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.</li> <li>● GMES intermediate staff (3 - 5) will engage in professional development around the Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) model for Fall implementation.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>
<p>3-8 Math          Hispanic 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 Math instructional routines that promoted rigorous tasks (number talks, the 3-read routine, connecting representation) and further development of students' Math conceptual reasoning.</p> <p><b>Based on the NWEA Spring performance, using NWEA as a predictor of State performance, the overall PI was 22.2, which is 33.9% below the indicator target of 56.1 for 2020-2021 school year.</b></p> <p>This indicates that there is a need for teacher development to provide rigorous standards based instruction for students, as this indicator was well below our target. Our data will 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 CORE 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>	<p>Our review of our end of the year Math data has indicated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Walkthroughs and lack of student progress (Tier I progress, curricular and local assessments) show that there is an inconsistency to properly plan for and implement Math standards based congruent instruction across all Math teachers and providers (across all Tiers).</li> <li>Walkthroughs indicate that teachers must develop their competency around high leverage tasks to develop student conceptual understanding and allow opportunities for students to show and explain their thinking.</li> <li>Survey data shows that parents request additional opportunities to be included in the review of student Math progress and Math instructional strategies used to support student growth.</li> </ul> <p>The following Math strategies will be utilized to support progress for student Math growth and performance index progress in the 21.22 school year based on the above trends and observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grade 3 will be departmentalized to increase the content area focus for teachers and strategically schedule support for the Math interventionists and supports.</li> <li>Math interventionists will be an added support, with a new intervention program, Bridges, to address unfinished learning in Grades 3 - 5.</li> <li>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 <b>launch</b> routines (Sept. through January).</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>GMES intermediate staff (3 - 5) will engage in professional development around the Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) model for Fall implementation.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>

<p>3-8 Math ELL          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 Math instructional routines that promoted rigorous tasks (number talks, the 3-read routine, connecting representation) and further development of students' Math conceptual reasoning.</p> <p><b><i>Based on the NWEA Spring performance, using NWEA as a predictor of State performance, the overall PI was 22.6, which is 6.9% below the indicator target of 29.5 for 2020-2021 school year.</i></b></p> <p>This indicates that there is a need for teacher development to provide rigorous standards based instruction for students, as this indicator was below our target. Our data will 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 CORE 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>	<p>Our review of our end of the year Math data has indicated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walkthroughs and lack of student progress (Tier I progress, curricular and local assessments) show that there is an inconsistency to properly plan for and implement Math standards based congruent instruction across all Math teachers and providers (across all Tiers).</li> <li>• Walkthroughs indicate that teachers must develop their competency around high leverage tasks to develop student conceptual understanding and allow opportunities for students to show and explain their thinking.</li> <li>• Survey data shows that parents request additional opportunities to be included in the review of student Math progress and Math instructional strategies used to support student growth.</li> </ul> <p>The following Math strategies will be utilized to support progress for student Math growth and performance index progress in the 21.22 school year based on the above trends and observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 3 will be departmentalized to increase the content area focus for teachers and strategically schedule support for the Math interventionists and supports.</li> <li>• Math interventionists will be an added support, with a new intervention program, Bridges, to address unfinished learning in Grades 3 - 5.</li> <li>• 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 <b>launch</b> routines (Sept. through January).</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• GMES intermediate staff (3 - 5) will engage in professional development around the Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) model for Fall implementation.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
<p>3-8 Math Black          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 Math instructional routines that promoted rigorous tasks (number talks, the 3-read routine, connecting representation) and further development of students' Math conceptual reasoning.</p>	<p>Our review of our end of the year Math data has indicated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walkthroughs and lack of student progress (Tier I progress, curricular and local assessments) show that there is an inconsistency to properly plan for and implement Math standards based congruent instruction across all Math teachers and providers (across all Tiers).</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Based on the NWEA Spring performance, using NWEA as a predictor of State performance, the overall PI was 22.6, which is 6.9% below the indicator target of 29.5 for 2020-2021 school year.</b></p> <p>This indicates that there is a need for teacher development to provide rigorous standards based instruction for students, as this indicator was below our target. Our data will 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 CORE 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"> <li>● Walkthroughs indicate that teachers must develop their competency around high leverage tasks to develop student conceptual understanding and allow opportunities for students to show and explain their thinking.</li> <li>● Survey data shows that parents request additional opportunities to be included in the review of student Math progress and Math instructional strategies used to support student growth.</li> </ul> <p>The following Math strategies will be utilized to support progress for student Math growth and performance index progress in the 21.22 school year based on the above trends and observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Grade 3 will be departmentalized to increase the content area focus for teachers and strategically schedule support for the Math interventionists and supports.</li> <li>● Math interventionists will be an added support, with a new intervention program, Bridges, to address unfinished learning in Grades 3 - 5.</li> <li>● 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 <b>launch</b> routines (Sept. through January).</li> <li>● 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.</li> <li>● 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.</li> <li>● GMES intermediate staff (3 - 5) will engage in professional development around the Academic Parent Teacher Teams (APTT) model for Fall implementation.</li> <li>● 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.</li> </ul>
--	--	---

**Part IV – Community Engagement Team (CET)**

<p><b>Community Engagement Team (CET)</b></p>	
<p><i>The role of the Community Engagement Team is to develop recommendations for school improvement by soliciting input through public engagement. Recommendations made by the CET, including how the school community was engaged to seek input/feedback to guide development of the school's improvement plan, should be addressed in response to the prompts below.</i></p>	
<p><b>Report Out of 2020-21 CET Plan Implementation</b></p>	<p><b>Plan for Use of CET Recommendations in 2021-22</b></p>

<p>Describe how recommendations made by the CET during 2020-21 were used to inform implementation of the school’s improvement plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<p>Describe how recommendations made by the CET during 2021-22 will be used to inform implementation of the school’s improvement plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include any changes that will be made to CET membership for the 2021-22 school year. Include the role/title of any new members.</li> </ul>
<p>Administrators          Teachers          Parents          Community School Site Coordinator          Home School Coordinator          Community Members          School Program Providers</p>	<p>While the categories of stakeholders on the CET will not change, there was discussion of the team on 7.26.2021 to add additional members (replace those no longer available/present) based on changes to staff, addition of programs and providers, as well as new parents who currently have students in attendance at the building.</p> <p>The CET has been informed and has approved of the plan set forth in our School Improvement Plan for the 21.22 school year.</p>

**Part V - Receivership Powers**

<p><b><u>Powers of the Receiver</u></b>  <i>Provide a summary of the use of the School Receiver’s powers during 2020-21 school year.</i></p>	<p><i>Describe the anticipated use of the School Receiver’s powers during the 2021-2022 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.</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.</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 Commissioner's Regulation § 100.19 have been met.

Name of Receiver (Print): Kaweeda G. Adams

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 has had the opportunity to review, and update if necessary, its 2021-2022 Community Engagement Team plan and membership.

Name of CET Representative (Print): \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of CET Representative: \_\_\_\_\_

Title of CET Representative: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_



*Revised May 19, 2021*