

Receivership Schools ONLY

Quarterly Report #1: July 1, 2019 to October 11, 2019 (Due October 31, 2019)

School Name	School BEDS Code	District	Lead Partner or EPO	Hyperlink to where this report will be posted on the district website:			
Giffen Memorial Elementary School	010100010029	City School District of Albany		Check which plan below applies:			
				SIG			SCEP
				Cohort (6 or 7):			
Model: Transformation							
Superintendent/EPO	School Principal	Additional District Staff working on Program Oversight		Grade Configuration	% ELL	% SWD	Total Enrollment
Kaweeda G. Adams	Jasmine Brown	Suzann Cornell, Assistant Principal for School Improvement, Michele Bridgewater, District Improvement Director Dr. Cecily Wilson-Turner, Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Instruction		Pre K-6	15%	15%	523
	Appointment Date: 8/1/2012						

Executive Summary

Please provide a *plain-language summary* of this quarter in terms of implementing key strategies, engaging the community, enacting Receivership, and assessing Level 1 and Level 2 indicator data. 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*.

A significant focus of our quarter one plan centers on providing professional development and coaching support focused on increasing lesson rigor, using standards based instruction and learning targets for all grade levels. Instructional support has been provided based on student data to ensure that teachers and students will be receiving differentiated supports aligned to identified needs. School administrators are utilizing their walkthroughs as an opportunity to provide ongoing feedback to teachers and to monitor the impact of the professional



development and coaching support on student achievement. Walkthrough results and an analysis of data have been shared with the school's Building Leadership Team, Community Engagement Team/School Advisory Team.

Although not an identified indicator, chronic absenteeism has been a focus of our data review and strategies focused on improving chronic absenteeism and increasing communication to the school community are occurring that will remove barriers to attendance.

The Community Engagement Team/School Advisory Team has met to review the progress that the school is making on the implementation of the plan and the progress towards meeting the annual indicators.

Negotiations began in October.

Attention – This document is intended to be completed by the school receiver in conjunction with district and building staff and submitted electronically to OISR@NYSED.gov. It 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 also serves as the Progress Review Report for receivership schools receiving Persistently Struggling School (PSSG), School Improvement Grant (SIG), and Community School Grant (CSG) funds. Additionally, this document serves as the quarterly reporting instrument for receivership schools with School Comprehensive Education Plans (SCEP). The Quarterly Report, in its entirety, must be posted on the district website.



Directions for parts I and II - District and school staff should respond to the sections of this document by both analyzing and summarizing the key strategies of the first quarter in light of their realized level of implementation and their impact on student learning outcomes. 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 – Demonstrable Improvement Indicators (Level 1)

Identify Indicator # and Name	Baseline	2019-2020 Progress Target	Status (R/Y/G)	Based on the current implementation status, does the school expect to meet the 2019-2020 progress target for this indicator? For each Level 1 indicator, please answer yes or no below.	What are the SCEP/SIG goals and or key strategies that have supported progress made in meeting this indicator? Describe adjustments made to key strategies since the approval of the 18-19 continuation plan and a rationale as to why these adjustments were made.	List the formative data points being used to assess progress towards meeting the target for this indicator?	Based upon those formative data points, provide quantitative and/or qualitative statement(s) that demonstrate impact towards meeting the target.
# 33 ELA All Students MGP	46.6	48.6		yes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers will unpack the priority ELA Standards for each grade level in order to scaffold grade level standards for all students. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sept. 5, 2019: ELA coaches facilitated PD on unpacking the ELA standards; Instructional Routines; and ELA curriculum map review Sept. 2019: Self Guided PD: Collaborative Strategic Reading - Preview & Get the Gist Sept. 2019: PD on the Go - Text Evidence Icon; Vocabulary routines; Instructional Routine Handbook; Strategies for supporting struggling readers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NWEA Benchmark Assessment (CGP and Projected Proficiency) Curriculum Checkpoint Assessments Data Team Short Cycle Assessments 	<p><u>NYS Assessment 18-19</u> Goal 47.6, Achieved 49.4</p> <p><u>NWEA results from fall administration: Fall 18 - Fall 19</u> Student Growth Summary Report: Reading Conditional Growth Percentile (aligned with NYS Exam)</p> <p><u>Grade 3</u> 51%</p> <p><u>Grade 4</u> 53%</p> <p><u>Grade 5</u> 70%</p> <p><u>Grade 6</u> 59%</p>



				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Oct. 4, 2019: ELA Supervisor facilitated embedded PD on analytical writing strategies for ELA ● October 17th Synonyms for Standards and Text structure/features ● Oct. 2019: PD on the Go - Text Features; Decodables Protocol <p>2. Teachers will participate in data driven practices to continually improve teaching and learning through assessment, analysis, and action.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Grades K, 2, 4, 5, 6 - Data teaming in ELA. ● Sept. 26, 2019: ELA coaches facilitated COGNOS report review and analysis ● Set long and short term goals around Standard RL/RI 3 ● Identified skills from the Learning Continuum (NWEA) to identify differentiated learning targets based upon current level of performance <p>3. Teachers will provide students opportunities to practice ELA strategies that will improve independence and increase student participation in their own learning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sept. 20, 2019: ELA coaches facilitated embedded PD for 		<p>A conditional growth score of 50 means that the students have 1 year of growth. Growth scores above 50 indicate that students are growing more than a year.</p> <p>Also, this year’s students are starting with a NWEA RIT score that is higher than last year’s cohort of students.</p> <p><u>Grade 3: Mean RIT Scores</u> Fall 18: 163 - Beginning Gr. 1 Fall 19: 177 - End of Year Gr. 1</p> <p><u>Grade 4: Mean RIT Scores</u> Fall 18: 177 - End of Year Gr. 1 Fall 19: 190 - Beginning Gr. 3</p> <p><u>Grade 5: Mean RIT Scores</u> Fall 18: 182 - Mid year Gr. 2 Fall 19: 194 - Beginning Gr. 3</p> <p><u>Grade 6: Mean RIT Scores</u> Fall 18: 187 - Mid Year Gr. 2 Fall 19: 195 - Mid Year Gr. 3</p> <p>The data indicates that we have a stronger cohort of students than in previous years, however, students continue to perform below grade level peers. We believe that the stronger cohort and a continued CGP above 50% for grades 4-6 has us on target to meet the end of the year MGP of 48.6.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---



					Kindergarten Teaching Assistants on Early Literacy Strategies to use with students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Oct. 17: Coach provided PD: Wonders 5-day lesson plan and Collaborative Strategic Reading/Questioning for K-5 teachers 		The current CGP for this indicator is 54.6. *Curriculum Checkpoint Assessment and Data Team Short Cycle Assessment data not yet available
#39 3-8 Math All Students MGP	42.3	44.3		yes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will unpack the priority Math Standards for each grade level in order to scaffold grade level standards for all students. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sept.5,12,17: Teachers participated in Standards Progression PD for K-6 on Priority standards in math for the first quarter of the year. 2. Teachers will participate in data driven practices to continually improve teaching and learning through assessment, analysis, and action. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ongoing through grade level data teaming ● Coaching cycles have been conducted ● Teacher math cohorts have been identified for scaffolded training ● Dreambox PD: using data to assign students ● Sept. 26: Cognos Report PD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NWEA Benchmark Assessment (CGP and Projected Proficiency) ● Math Checkpoint Assessments ● Data Team Short Cycle Assessment 	<u>NYS Assessment 18-19 Goal 43.3, Achieved 49.1</u> <u>NWEA results from fall administration: Fall 18 - Fall 19</u> NWEA Student Growth Summary Report: Math Conditional Growth Percentile (aligned with NYS Exam) <u>Grade 3</u> 39% <u>Grade 4</u> 51% <u>Grade 5</u> 69% <u>Grade 6</u> 50% A conditional growth score of 50 means that the students have 1 year of growth. Growth scores above 50 indicate that students are growing more than year. Also, this year's students are starting with a NWEA RIT score that is higher than last year's cohort of students.



				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Oct. 3: Introduction to Instructional Strategies Tool Kit ● Oct. 28-30 Math Studio for teachers grades 3-6 3. Teachers will provide students opportunities to practice conceptual Math understanding vs. procedural learning that will improve independence and increase student participation in their own learning. ● Teachers implemented <i>The First Ten Days CSDA curriculum</i> to establish community classroom routines and procedures. ● Oct. 3: Roll out of the Instructional Strategies Toolkit Support of instructional strategies and routines ● Oct. 17: Coach presented PD for grades 4-6: Using manipulatives as an instructional strategy to deepen understanding of multiplication and division 		<p>Grade 3: Mean RIT Scores Fall 18: 167 - Beginning Gr. 1 Fall 19: 180 - Beginning Gr. 2</p> <p>Grade 4: Mean RIT Scores Fall 18: 180 - Beginning Gr. 2 Fall 19: 191 - Beginning Gr. 3</p> <p>Grade 5: Mean RIT Scores Fall 18: 185 - Beginning Gr. 2 Fall 19: 197 - Beginning Gr. 3</p> <p>Grade 6: Mean RIT Scores Fall 18: 194 - Beginning Gr. 3 Fall 19: 199 - Mid Year Gr. 3</p> <p>The data indicates that we have a stronger cohort of students than in previous years, however, students continue to perform below grade level peers. We believe that the stronger cohort and a continued CGP above 50% for grades 4-6 has us on target to meet the end of the year MGP of 44.3.</p> <p>The current CGP for this indicator is 51.8.</p> <p>*Curriculum Checkpoint Assessment not yet available Data Team Short Cycle Assessment data listed in #110 Core Subject Performance Data</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--	---



<p>#100 3-8 ELA All Students Core subject Performance Index</p>	52.5	62.5		yes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will unpack the priority ELA Standards for each grade level in order to scaffold grade level standards for all students. 2. Teachers will participate in data driven practices to continually improve teaching and learning through assessment, analysis, and action. 3. Teachers will provide students opportunities to practice ELA strategies that will improve independence and increase student participation in their own learning. <p>*see activities, applicable to this indicator, listed above for indicator #33</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NWEA Benchmark Assessment (CGP and Projected Proficiency) ● Curriculum Checkpoint Assessments ● Data Team Short Cycle Assessments 	<p>NYS Assessment 18-19 Goal 57.5, Achieved 55.4</p> <p>Grades 3-6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Level 1: 60% ● Level 2: 27% ● Level 3: 10% ● Level 4: 3% <p>NWEA results from fall administration: Projected Proficiency Report (aligned with NYS ELA exam)</p> <p>Grades 3-6 Level 1: 69.1% Level 2: 21.8% Level 3: 6.9% Level 4: 2.3%</p> <p>Grade 3 Level 1: 64.3% Level 2: 26.8% Level 3: 7.1% Level 4: 1.8%</p> <p>Grade 4 Level 1: 71.1% Level 2: 17.1% Level 3: 9.2% Level 4: 2.6%</p> <p>Grade 5 Level 1: 68.1% Level 2: 20.3% Level 3: 8.7% Level 4: 2.9%</p> <p>Grade 6 Level 1: 72.1% Level 2: 24.6%</p>
---	------	------	--	-----	--	---	---



							<p>Level 3: 1.6% Level 4: 1.6%</p> <p>Fall benchmark data projections suggest that we are not on target to meet this indicator. The current PI for this indicator is 40.4.</p> <p><u>Common Planning Time Data Team Cycles:</u></p> <p><u>4th grade:</u> <u>Long-Term Area of Focus: RI 4.3</u> Long Term Goal: The % of students scoring proficient and higher in standard 3- reading for information will increase from 17% to 80% (smart goal of 32%) as measured by Spring NWEA ELA Assessment (Understand Key Ideas, Details, Connections). *not completed as of Q1 report</p> <p><u>Short Term SMART Goal:</u> The % of students scoring proficient and higher in standard RL 4.3 will increase from 21% to 80% (smart goal 34%) as measured by NWEA Winter ELA Assessment which will be administered by January 2020</p> <p><u>5th grade:</u> <u>Long-Term Area of Focus: RI 5.3</u> Long Term Goal: The % of students scoring proficient and</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---



							<p>higher in standard 3- reading for information will increase from 9% to 80% (smart goal of 23%) as measured by Spring NWEA ELA Assessment.</p> <p>Short Term SMART Goal: The % of students scoring proficient and higher in standard RL 5.3 will increase from _18_% to 80% (smart goal 38%) as measured by NWEA Winter ELA Assessment which will be administered by January 2020.</p>
#110 3-8 Math All Students Core Subject Performance Index	33.5	43.5		yes	<p>1. Teachers will unpack the priority Math Standards for each grade level in order to scaffold grade level standards for all students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coaches provided 3-6 grade teachers with item-analysis for standards-aligned questions from the administered pre-assessment; links for standard progressions were also provided <p>2. Teachers will participate in data driven practices to continually improve teaching and learning through assessment, analysis, and action.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coaches provided teachers with data from pre-assessment which is analyzed and used to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NWEA Benchmark Assessment (CGP and Projected Proficiency) Math Checkpoint Assessments Data Team Short Cycle Assessment3 	<p><u>NYS Assessment 18-19 Goal 38.5, Achieved 48.6 Grades 3-6</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level 1: 67% Level 2: 20% Level 3: 9% Level 4: 4% <p><u>NWEA results from fall administration:</u> Projected Proficiency Report (aligned with NYS Math exam) Grades 3-6 Level 1: 65.3% Level 2: 26.4% Level 3: 7.2% Level 4: 1.1%</p> <p><u>Grade 3</u> Level 1: 53.6% Level 2: 26.8% Level 3: 16.1%</p>



				<p>scaffold core instruction and build RtI groups</p> <p>3. Teachers will provide students opportunities to practice conceptual Math understanding vs. procedural learning that will improve independence and increase student participation in their own learning.</p> <p>*see additional activities, applicable to this indicator, listed above for indicator #39</p>		<p>Level 4: 3.6%</p> <p>Grade 4</p> <p>Level 1: 59.0%</p> <p>Level 2: 32.1%</p> <p>Level 3: 7.7%</p> <p>Level 4: 1.3%</p> <p>Grade 5</p> <p>Level 1: 74.4%</p> <p>Level 2: 20.5%</p> <p>Level 3: 5.1%</p> <p>Level 4: 0%</p> <p>Grade 6</p> <p>Level 1: 77.3%</p> <p>Level 2: 26.2%</p> <p>Level 3: 1.5%</p> <p>Level 4: 0%</p> <p>*Fall benchmark data projections suggest that we are not on target to meet this indicator. The current PI for this indicator is 42.0.</p> <p>Grades 3-5 Pre-assessments (standards-aligned) administered in September</p> <p>Grade 3</p> <p>Level 1: 98%</p> <p>Level 2: 2%</p> <p>Level 3: 0%</p> <p>Level 4: 0%</p> <p>Grade 4</p> <p>Level 1: 100%</p> <p>Level 2: 0%</p> <p>Level 3: 0%</p> <p>Level 4: 0%</p> <p>Grade 5</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---



								<p>Level 1: 100% Level 2: 0% Level 3: 0% Level 4: 0%</p> <p><u>Common Planning Time Data</u> <u>Team Cycles:</u></p> <p><u>3rd Grade</u> <u>Long Term Goal:</u> The % of students scoring proficient and higher in <u>3rd Grade Priority Standards (Fall to Winter)</u> will increase from <u>0 to 80% (2%)</u> as measured by <u>ACSD Fall Post-Assessment</u>. The team is <u>planning to reduce the number of Level 1s by 50%</u>. *not completed as of Q1 report</p> <p><u>Short Term SMART Goal:</u> The % of students scoring proficient and higher in standards <u>3.OA.1,2,3,5,9</u> will increase from <u>_2_ % to 80% (_12_ %)</u> as measured by <u>Checkpoint 2</u> which will be administered by <u>12/19-12/20</u>.</p> <p><u>4th grade:</u> <u>Short Term SMART Goal:</u> The % of students scoring proficient and higher in standards <u>4.NBT.4-6</u> will increase from <u>_0_ % to 80% (10%)</u> as measured by <u>Checkpoint #2</u></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



							<p>which will be administered by <u>12/19-12/20</u>. *not completed as of Q1 report</p> <p>5th grade: Long Term Goal: The % of students scoring proficient and higher in standard <u>NBT</u> will increase from <u>0%</u> to <u>80%</u> (<u>10%</u>) as measured by <u>post-assessment</u>. (<u>Reach Goal 80%</u>)</p> <p>Short Term SMART Goal: The % of students scoring proficient and higher in standard <u>NBT</u> will increase from <u>0%</u> to <u>80%</u> (<u>10%</u>) as measured by <u>checkpoint 1</u> which will be administered by 10/31/19.</p> <p>6th grade: Long Term Goal: The % of students scoring proficient and higher in standard <u>OA</u> will increase from <u>3%</u> to <u>80%</u> (actual <u>18%</u>) as measured by <u>NWEA-Spring</u>.</p> <p>Short Term SMART Goal: The % of students scoring proficient and higher in standards <u>6.NS.5-6</u> will increase to <u>80%</u> (<u>%</u>) as measured by <u>Topic 2 Assessment</u></p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



#150 Science All Students Core Subject Performance Index	151.6	161.3		yes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Science is taught with fidelity daily. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lab time has been scheduled; Adjustments were made to grade 4 and 5 teachers' schedules to accommodate the curriculum. Teachers will shift shared lab time after each unit, rather than split the day to account for the full lesson model to be implemented with fidelity ● Oct. 3, 2019 Science meeting to work out logistics for utilizing the science lab to complete FOSS with fidelity 2. Teachers of Science are lesson planning around the set NYS Science standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Science Performance Benchmarks ● Pre and Post Assessments 	<p><u>NYS Assessment 18-19 Goal</u> 156.5, Achieved 174.2</p> <p><u>Grade 4</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Level 1: 10.7% ● Level 2: 25.3% ● Level 3: 34.7% ● Level 4: 29.3 <p>Pre-assessment data will be available in December</p>
---	-------	-------	--	-----	---	--	--



					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informal PDs have occurred with Math Science supervisor around Science lesson planning and implementation • Oct. 11: Meeting with Instructional Supervisor for Math & Science to review curriculum and implementation • *May need to reschedule for second half of the year: The instructional coaches (Math) will work with Grade 4 Science/Math teachers to review Science performance task benchmarks around Grade 4 Science Standards and offer suggestions on where to infuse Science understanding during Math and ELA instruction. <p>3. Students are meeting proficiency on those standards (exhibited through performance on NYS exams).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An adjustment to the Continuation Plan: 4th grade Pre-assessment will be administered in December 			
Green	Expected results for this phase of the project are fully met, work is on budget, and the school is fully implementing this strategy <i>with impact</i> .			Yellow	Some barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending exist; with adaptation/correction school will be able to achieve desired results.	Red	Major barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending encountered; results are at-risk of not being realized; major strategy adjustment is required.	



Part II – Demonstrable Improvement Indicators (Level 2)

Identify Indicator # and Name	Baseline	2019-2020 Progress Target	Status (R/Y/G)	Based on the current implementation status, does the school expect to meet the 2019-2020 progress target for this indicator? For each Level 2 indicator, please answer yes or no below.	What are the SCEP/SIG goals and or key strategies which have supported progress made in meeting this indicator? Describe adjustments made to key strategies since the approval of the 18-19 continuation plan and a rationale as to why these adjustments were made.	List the formative data points being used to assess progress towards meeting the target for this indicator?	Based upon those formative data points, provide quantitative and/or qualitative statement(s) which demonstrate impact towards meeting the target.
#7 Tenet Practices and Decisions DTSDE Tenet 4	P1 29% P2 32%	P1 90% P2 50% P3 4 indicators		yes	<p>Classrooms need to exhibit 90% of the Phase 1 indicators, 50% of the Phase 2 indicators, and 4 of the Phase 3 indicators identified in the Comprehensive DTSDE School Framework Phases of Implementation document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sept. 5: All staff completed Tenet 4 survey; results shared out building-wide; discussion of look-fors for each element ● Oct. 9: Document of Tenet 4 Phase 1 look-fors shared with staff ● Teacher assistant training began to enable TAs to work on instructional strategies with students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Staff self-assessment ● Administrative/peer classroom walkthroughs 	<p>*Assessment survey provided our baseline number. It will be readministered at a later date TBD</p> <p>*Administrative Walkthroughs have begun; quantitative data has not been accumulated as of the date of this report</p>



					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● TBD: Tier I planning with interventionists has not happened at this time; testing window is still open 		
#35 3-8 ELA Black Students MGP	45.8	47.8		yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Teachers will unpack the priority ELA Standards for each grade level in order to scaffold grade level standards for all students. ● Teachers will participate in data driven practices to continually improve teaching and learning through assessment, analysis, and action. ● Teachers will provide students opportunities to practice ELA strategies that will improve independence and increase student participation in their own learning. <p>*see activities, applicable to this indicator, listed above for indicator #33</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NWEA ● CGP ● Checkpoint Assessments ● Core Subject Performance Index 	<p><u>NYS Assessment 18-19</u> Goal 46.8, Achieved 47.1</p> <p><u>NWEA results from fall administration: Fall 18 - Fall 19</u> Student Growth Summary Report: Reading Conditional Growth Percentile (aligned with NYS Exam)</p> <p><u>Black Students:</u> <u>Grade 3</u> 67% <u>Grade 4</u> 39% <u>Grade 5</u> 63% <u>Grade 6</u> 50%</p> <p>A conditional growth score of 50 means that the students have 1 year of growth. Growth scores above 50 indicate that students are growing more than year.</p> <p>Also, this year's students are starting with a NWEA RIT score that is higher than last year's cohort of students.</p> <p><u>Grade 3: Mean RIT Scores</u> Fall 18: 164.9 - Beginning Gr. 1 Fall 19: 179.6 - Beginning Gr. 2</p>



							<p>Grade 4: Mean RIT Scores Fall 18: 179.3 - Beginning Gr. 2 Fall 19: 189.4 - Beginning Gr. 3</p> <p>Grade 5: Mean RIT Scores Fall 18: 181.1 - Beginning Gr. 2 Fall 19: 192.4 - Beginning Gr. 3</p> <p>Grade 6: Mean RIT Scores Fall 18: 189.2 - Beginning Gr. 3 Fall 19: 196.2 - Mid Year Gr. 3</p> <p>The data indicates that we have a stronger cohort of students than in previous years, however, students continue to perform below grade level peers. We believe that the stronger cohort and a continued CGP above 50% for grades 4-6 has us on target to meet the end of the year MGP of 47.8.</p> <p>The current CGP for this indicator is 51.4.</p> <p>*Curriculum Checkpoint Assessment and Data Team Short Cycle Assessment data not yet available</p>
#41 3-8 Math Black Students MGP	41.1	43.1		yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers will unpack the priority Math Standards for each grade level in order to scaffold grade level standards for all students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NWEA Benchmark Assessment (CGP and Projected Proficiency) Math Checkpoint Assessments 	<p>NWEA results from fall administration: Fall 18 - Fall 19 Student Growth Summary Report: Reading Conditional Growth Percentile (aligned with NYS Exam)</p>



					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Teachers will participate in data driven practices to continually improve teaching and learning through assessment, analysis, and action. ● Teachers will provide students opportunities to practice conceptual Math understanding vs. procedural learning that will improve independence and increase student participation in their own learning. <p>*see activities, applicable to this indicator, listed above for indicator #39</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Data Team Short Cycle Assessment 	<p>Black Students:</p> <p>Grade 3 36%</p> <p>Grade 4 54%</p> <p>Grade 5 68%</p> <p>Grade 6 46%</p> <p>A conditional growth score of 50 means that the students have 1 year of growth. Growth scores above 50 indicate that students are growing more than year.</p> <p>Also, this year’s students are starting with a NWEA RIT score that is higher than last year’s cohort of students.</p> <p>Grade 3: Mean RIT Scores Fall 18: 162.2 - Beginning Gr. 1 Fall 19: 175.9 - Mid Year Gr. 1</p> <p>Grade 4: Mean RIT Scores Fall 18: 179.5 - Beginning Gr. 2 Fall 19: 190.5 - Beginning Gr. 3</p> <p>Grade 5: Mean RIT Scores Fall 18: 181.7 - Beginning Gr. 2 Fall 19: 194.1 - Beginning Gr. 3</p> <p>Grade 6: Mean RIT Scores Fall 18: 193 - Beginning Gr. 3 Fall 19: 198.2 - Mid Year Gr. 3</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--



							<p>The data indicates that we have a stronger cohort of students than in previous years, however, students continue to perform below grade level peers. We believe that the stronger cohort and a continued CGP above 50% for grades 4-6 has us on target to meet the end of the year MGP of 43.1.</p> <p>The current CGP for this indicator is 52.2.</p> <p>*Curriculum Checkpoint Assessment and Data Team Short Cycle Assessment data not yet available</p>
#103 3-8 ELA Hispanic Core Performance Index	58.9	67.7		yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers will unpack the priority ELA Standards for each grade level in order to scaffold grade level standards for all students. Teachers will participate in data driven practices to continually improve teaching and learning through assessment, analysis, and action. Teachers will provide students opportunities to practice ELA strategies that will improve independence and increase student 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NWEA CGP Checkpoint Assessments Core Subject Performance Index 	<p><u>NWEA results from fall administration:</u> Projected Proficiency Report (aligned with NYS Math exam)</p> <p><u>Grade 3</u> Level 1: 71.4% Level 2: 21.4% Level 3: 7.1% Level 4: 0.0%</p> <p><u>Grade 4</u> Level 1: 68.4% Level 2: 21.1% Level 3: 10.5% Level 4: 0.0%</p> <p><u>Grade 5</u> Level 1: 61.9% Level 2: 19.0% Level 3: 9.5%</p>



					<p>participation in their own learning.</p> <p>*see activities, applicable to this indicator, listed above for indicator #33</p>		<p>Level 4: 9.5%</p> <p>Grade 6</p> <p>Level 1: 61.5%</p> <p>Level 2: 38.5%</p> <p>Level 3: 0.0%</p> <p>Level 4: 0.0%</p> <p>The current PI for this indicator is 46.3.</p> <p>*Curriculum Checkpoint Assessment and Data Team Short Cycle Assessment data not yet available</p>
#113 3-8 Math Hispanic Core Subject Performance Index	46.2	56.1		yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers will unpack the priority Math Standards for each grade level in order to scaffold grade level standards for all students. Teachers will participate in data driven practices to continually improve teaching and learning through assessment, analysis, and action. Teachers will provide students opportunities to practice conceptual Math understanding vs. procedural learning that will improve independence and increase student participation in their own learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NWEA Benchmark Assessment (CGP and Projected Proficiency) Math Checkpoint Assessments Data Team Short Cycle Assessment 	<p><u>NWEA results from fall administration:</u> Projected Proficiency Report (aligned with NYS Math exam)</p> <p>Grade 3</p> <p>Level 1: 50.0%</p> <p>Level 2: 42.9%</p> <p>Level 3: 7.1%</p> <p>Level 4: 0.0%</p> <p>Grade 4</p> <p>Level 1: 63.2%</p> <p>Level 2: 26.3%</p> <p>Level 3: 10.5%</p> <p>Level 4: 0.0%</p> <p>Grade 5</p> <p>Level 1: 60.0%</p> <p>Level 2: 32.8%</p> <p>Level 3: 5.0%</p> <p>Level 4: 0.0%</p> <p>Grade 6</p> <p>Level 1: 71.4%</p> <p>Level 2: 28.6%</p>



					*see activities, applicable to this indicator, listed above for indicator #39		<p>Level 3: 0.0% Level 4: 0.0%</p> <p>The current PI for this indicator is 44.8.</p> <p>*Curriculum Checkpoint Assessment and Data Team Short Cycle Assessment data not yet available</p>
#nw1 NWEA Math Growth for SWD	30.0	32.0		yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Teachers will unpack the priority Math Standards for each grade level in order to scaffold grade level standards for all students. ● Teachers will participate in data driven practices to continually improve teaching and learning through assessment, analysis, and action. ● Teachers will provide students opportunities to practice conceptual Math understanding vs. procedural learning that will improve independence and increase student participation in their own learning. <p>*see activities, applicable to this indicator, listed above for indicator #39</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● NWEA Benchmark Assessment (CGP and Projected Proficiency) ● Math Checkpoint Assessments ● Data Team Short Cycle Assessment 	<p><u>NWEA results from fall administration: Fall 18 - Fall 19 Student Growth Summary Report: Reading Conditional Growth Percentile (aligned with NYS Exam) 40.1</u></p> <p>This data indicates that we are currently on target to meet our progress target of 32.0</p> <p>*Curriculum Checkpoint Assessment and Data Team Short Cycle Assessment data not yet available</p>



<p>#nw2 NWEA Reading Growth for SWD</p>	<p>35.3</p>	<p>37.3</p>		<p>yes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers will unpack the priority ELA Standards for each grade level in order to scaffold grade level standards for all students. Teachers will participate in data driven practices to continually improve teaching and learning through assessment, analysis, and action. Teachers will provide students opportunities to practice ELA strategies that will improve independence and increase student participation in their own learning. <p>*see activities, applicable to this indicator, listed above for indicator #33</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NWEA CGP Checkpoint Assessments Core Subject Performance Index 	<p><u>NWEA results from fall administration: Fall 18 - Fall 19 Student Growth Summary Report: Reading Conditional Growth Percentile (aligned with NYS Exam) 46.2</u></p> <p>This data indicates that we are currently on target to meet our progress target of 37.3</p> <p>*Curriculum Checkpoint Assessment and Data Team Short Cycle Assessment data not yet available</p>
<p>Green</p>	<p>Expected results for this phase of the project are fully met, work is on budget, and the school is fully implementing this strategy <i>with impact</i>.</p>		<p>Yellow</p>	<p>Some barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending exist; with adaptation/correction school will be able to achieve desired results.</p>		<p>Red</p>	<p>Major barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending encountered; results are at-risk of not being realized; major strategy adjustment is required.</p>



Part III – Additional Key Strategies – (As applicable)

Key Strategies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not repeat strategies described in Parts I and II. • If the school has selected the SIG 6 or SIG 7 Innovation Framework model, include an analysis of the evidence of the impact of the required lead partner. • Every school must discuss the use of technology in the classroom to deliver instruction. 		
List the Key Strategy from your approved intervention plan (SIG or SCEP).	Status (R/Y/G)	Analysis/Report Out
1. By June 2020, Giffen Memorial Elementary School will decrease the <u>chronic absenteeism rate to 26%. Our current baseline is 29%.</u> At the conclusion of the 18.19 school year, Giffen’s chronic absenteeism rate was 32%. This is below our expected measured progress of 27%. There is a need to: (1) Communicate the importance of attendance to students and parents (2) Provide tiered interventions and support for chronically absent students, and (3) Support families of chronically absent students with the resources necessary to assist getting students to school consistently.		Our Chronic Absenteeism rate as of <u>October 28th is 15.4%. This suggests that we are currently on track to meet our baseline target of 29%.</u> SCEP action plan through December 2019: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The attendance committee will meet monthly to plan for student interventions based on identification from the 18.19 school year. Students will be ranked as Tier 1 (90%+), 2(80-90%), and 3 (80%) based on attendance rate through the attendance data dashboard. • Students ranked at Tier 1 will be monitored on a monthly basis by the Attendance Committee. • Students ranked as Tier 2 will be placed in an eight week attendance SAIG and attendance will be monitored on a weekly basis by HSC's and attendance officer. • Home school coordinators will make home visits to ensure emergency contact forms are updated ; address verifications; and parent contact as needed. Tier 2 students will receive a home visit at 2+ absences per week. • Students ranked as Tier 3 will be given an attendance plan in collaboration with the attendance officer, attendance building representative, parent, student, and teacher. • BLT and CET will review the SCEP for Attendance metric progress. Our data suggests that our targeted support and interventions have made an impact in reducing our chronic absenteeism percentage.



G	results for this phase of the project are fully met, work is on budget, and the school is fully implementing this strategy <i>with impact</i> .	Yellow	Some barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending exist; with adaptation/correction school will be able to achieve desired results.	Red	Major barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending encountered; results are at-risk of not being realized; major strategy adjustment is required.
----------	---	---------------	---	------------	---

Part IV – Community Engagement Team and Receivership Powers

Community Engagement Team (CET)

Describe the type, nature, frequency and outcomes of meetings conducted this quarter by the CET. Describe the same for sub-committees. Describe specific outcomes of the CET plan implementation; school support provided; and dissemination of information to whom and for what purpose. If the 2019-2020 CET plan and/or the 19-20 CET membership changed, please attach copies of those updated documents to this report.

Status
(R/Y/G)

Analysis/Report Out

In order to assure that families are engaged-in and empowered and informed about their children’s academic success, we have found there is a lack of effective communication between school and home that enables parents to support their child's academic success on a regular basis. Our need is to 1. increase our quality/frequency of communication with families. 2. Increase our capacity to maintain home connections. 3. Increase the perception that our school and family organizations work well together.

- Training on Schoolmessenger for all coordinators, to increase information sharing throughout the school year.
- Survey of staff and parents regarding effectiveness of school communication (with opportunity for feedback)
- BLT will review survey data from September
- Coordinator's Corner in quarterly Gator Gazette, highlighting (and promoting) HSC or CSSC and parent communication on a school topic/theme
- Strategic placement of HSCs at arrival and dismissal doors, in order to have consistent face to face communication with families to reinforce information shared via email, robocalls, flyers, etc.
- The Home School Coordinators will consistently be present at PTA meetings
- Parent focus meetings will occur. The first one was September 27th.

The CET team met to review the state’s Demonstrable Indicator data results on Wed. October 16th. There has been no change to membership for this school year. A public hearing meeting occurred on Monday, October 29th to update families on the current status of Giffen’s year two in Receivership, including its’ Demonstrable Indicators for the 2019-2020 school year and the school’s Continuation Plan. The Building Leadership Team has also reviewed the information on Monday, October 7th.

Powers of the Receiver




Use of the school receiver’s powers (pursuant to CR §100.19) during this reporting period. Discuss the goal of each power and its expected impact.			
Status (R/Y/G)	Analysis/Report Out		
	The Receiver, Superintendent Adams, has engaged in negotiations with the teacher’s union. The negotiations focused on increased Principal control of 2 professional development periods that have contractually decided by teachers. The result of the negotiations has led to the development of a tentative MOU (pending vote by staff) that allows the Principal to direct all three professional development opportunities in the teachers’ contract. The teachers, in exchange with the increased Principal determined professional development, will receive 2 half days during the month of June and half the Superintendent’s day in May to determine their own professional development in alignment with the schools Continuation plan.		
Green	Expected results for this phase of the project are fully met, work is on budget, and the school is fully implementing this strategy <i>with impact</i> .	Yellow	Some barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending exist; with adaptation/correction school will be able to achieve desired results.
		Red	Major barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending encountered; results are at-risk of not being realized; major strategy adjustment is required.

Part V – Community Schools Grant (CSG)

(This section needs to be completed by every receivership school receiving CSG funds during the 8/1/17 – 6/30/20 budget period.)

Community Schools Grant (CSG)	
As per CR §100.19, receivership schools receiving CSG funds will submit quarterly written reports to the Commissioner containing specific information about the progress of the planning, implementation, and operations of the CSG and the requirements of the regulations.	
Required Activities	Provide updates to each activity with regard to its planning, implementation, or operations.
Community-Wide Needs Assessment (if one is being conducted in 18-19)	
To ensure substantial parent, teacher, and community engagement at this school, provide specific details about these three areas for this reporting period:	
1. public meetings held with parents, teachers, and community members to provide information and solicit input (CR §100.19: held at least quarterly during the school year)	
2. written notices and communications provided to parents, teachers, other school personnel, and community members (emails, postings, translated into recipients’ native language)	



 s, teachers, and community members’ access to Community School Site Coordinator and Steering Committee	
Steering Committee (challenges, meetings held, accomplishments)	
Feeder School Services (specific services offered and impact)	
Community School Site Coordinator (accomplishments and challenges)	
Programmatic Costs (accomplishments and challenges based on the approved activities on the Attachment C school plan)	
Capital Cost Project(s) (accomplishments and challenges based on the approved activities on the Attachment C school plan)	

Green	Expected results for this phase of the project are fully met, work is on budget, and the school is fully implementing this strategy <i>with impact</i> .	Yellow	Some barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending exist; with adaptation/correction school will be able to achieve desired results.	Red	Major barriers to implementation / outcomes / spending encountered; results are at-risk of not being realized; major strategy adjustment is required.
--------------	--	---------------	---	------------	---

Part VI – Budget

(This section should be completed by all schools funded by the Persistently Struggling Schools Grant (PSSG), the School Improvement Grant (SIG), and the Community Schools Grant (CSG). Add rows as needed.)

<u>Budget Analysis</u>		
Identify the grant.	Status(R/Y/G)	If expenditures from the approved 2017-2020 (PSSG, CSG) or 2019-2020 (SIG 1003(g) FS-10 are on target, describe their impact. If there are challenges describe the course correction to be put in place for Quarter 2.
PSSG:		
SIG: 1003(g) grant		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Edgenuity - Computer based ELA program directly connected to NWEA scores of students. Learning pathways are created for students based on the performance of the NWEA local assessment. Teachers integrate the computer based program



		<p>into their RtI ELA rotations. Currently, based on our growth data, this program is assisting in student progress along individual student learning targets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Teacher compensation for BLT meetings outside of the school day. Currently the SCEP outlines quarterly reviews of the building leadership team to review data and make corrections to the plan. The intended impact of this activity is to make sure the building is responsive to the needs of teachers and students. ● GMES is contracted with an NUA (National Urban Alliance) consultant to work directly with the BLT around consistent implementation of Tenet 4 practices. The intended impact is to lift teacher instructional practice thus positively impacting student outcomes. ● Tutoring - GMES has set aside funds for teacher compensation to conduct tutoring for intermediate Level 2 students. This tutoring will begin in November and go until the end of May. The intended impact is to provide targeted students the instructional support needed to reach grade level proficiency. ● Math Studio - GMES is participating in a Math Studio professional development facilitated by the Center for Educational Leadership. The intended impact is to improve teacher instructional math practices. ● UnBound Ed - GMES is sending a team of teachers, Grades 1 - 6, to attend the Standards Institute in February. This conference is directly connected to teacher learning of the standards. The intended impact is to help teachers gain a greater understanding of what standards-based instruction looks and sounds like in all grades and content areas, as well as an opportunity for teachers to turn-key the learner information to their colleagues upon return.
CSG:		

Part VII: Best Practices (Optional)

<p>Best Practices The New York State Education Department recognizes the importance of sharing best practices within schools and districts. Please take this opportunity to share one or more best practices currently being implemented in the school. It is the intention of the Department to share these best practices with schools and districts in receivership.</p>	
List the best practice currently being implemented in the school.	Describe the significant improvements in student performance, instructional practice, student/family engagement, and/or school climate that the best practice has had. Discuss the analysis of data/evidence to determine the impact. Describe the possibility of replication in other schools.



2.		
3.		

Part VIII – Assurance and Attestation

By signing below, I attest to the fact that the information in this quarterly report 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 CR§ 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 quarterly report, and the opportunity to review, and update if necessary, its 2019-2020 community engagement team plan and membership.

Name of CET Representative (Print): _____
 Signature of CET Representative: _____
 Date: _____