**New York State**
**EDUCATION DEPARTMENT**
Knowledge › Skill › Opportunity

**2021-2022 Receivership School Quarterly Report #3**
Report Period: *January 14, 2022 – April 14, 2022 (Due April 29, 2022)*

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

The reporting portion of this document is a self-assessment of the **implementation and outcomes of key strategies** related to Receivership, and as such, is not considered a formal evaluation via the New York State Education Department. Once finalized and accepted, this document in its entirety **_must be posted_** in a conspicuous place on the district website.  All responses should directly align with or be adaptations to the previously approved intervention plans and **require explicit engagement and input from community engagement teams**.

| School Name | School BEDS Code | District | Lead Partner or EPO | Hyperlink to where this plan will be posted on the district website: | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sheridan Preparatory Academy | 010100010044 | Albany | N/A | Receivership: Sheridan Preparatory Academy | | | |

| Superintendent | School Principal (If new, please attach resume) | Additional District Staff working on Program Oversight | Grade Configuration | High School Graduation Rate (If applicable, please provide the most recent graduation rate data available.): | Total Enrollment | % ELL | % SWD | % Students designated as both ELL & SWD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kaweeda G. Adams | Zuleika Sanchez-Gayle<br><br>Appointment Date: 7/1/2011 | Dr. Cecily Wilson-Turner, Assistant Superintendent for Elementary<br> Michele Bridgewater, District Improvement Director | PreK-5 | N/A | 307 | 10.75% | 14.01% | .7% |

*Updated March 2022*

**New York State
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT**
Knowledge › Skill › Opportunity

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| Executive Summary |
|---|
| Please provide a *plain-language summary* of this completed report, reflecting changes and progress made since the last reporting period, with a focus on the action taken to implement lead strategies, engage the community, and enact Receivership powers. The summary should be written in terms easily understood by the community-at-large. Please avoid terms and acronyms that are unfamiliar to the public and limit the summary to *no more than 500 words*. **Any links included must be made publicly available prior to submitting the report.** |

*Updated March 2022*

New York State
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Knowledge > Skill > Opportunity

Since the last reporting period, we continue to carefully analyze student data with our classroom teachers and support staff.  During CPT, our work has focused more on teachers and their support staff utilizing student work for analysis to develop rigorous tasks.  All grade levels have hyper-focused on student release opportunities.  Teachers are becoming more reflective in how their scaffolding techniques can hold students back, due to their not releasing tasks to students.  Our resources continue to be focused in grades 3rd - 5th, however we've made some adjustments to support our 2nd and 1st graders.  We continue to hold our kindergarten students to their data, meaning… they are still performing at grade level, therefore should not need any additional support than those already provided.  Our instructional coaches have been more focused on providing our teachers with opportunities to analyze their data and make decisions.  Peer observations have been supported, since teachers are now using data to identify those classrooms they would like to visit, based on student success.

Classroom visits are conducted regularly, reinforcing the need for student release and ownership.  With feedback provided particularly when it is observed that students are being "held too tightly."  BLT members are being trained with accountable questions, so that they are also able to have collegial conversations with their colleagues,to move our instructional practice to the next level.

The substitute Home School Coordinator continues following our Attendance Flow Map to the best of his ability.  He has had to play "catch up" on some of our processes with specific students, because of the high number of absences.  We are beginning to see an uptick with attendance, with some of our students who would be absent a day here and there, actually being more consistent with their attendance.  For the last quarter, we will be focused on students who are currently chronic, but do not have to be for the year.  These students will be a high priority for the remainder of the school year to make sure we can keep their attendance in the best possible place.

The members of the Community Engagement Team continue to review and provide recommendations to the school improvement plan. Members include school staff, parents, and community members. The community and families were also included through outreach from staff. Outreach strategies included home-visits, meetings with families and community members, open forums (Star Talks with Mrs. Gayle), and through video uploads. The School Receiver negotiated with the Teachers' Union in 2018 and an MOA was passed which added an additional two hours of professional development for instructional staff. There are no changes to the MOA as of this date.

***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 steps taken to implement lead strategies since the second  quarter. Include processes that were **used to assess the impact** of strategies implemented on student learning outcomes.

This is also an opportunity for district and school staff to provide a reflective outline of proposed actions, strategies, and process adaptations made to the school's 2021-2022 Continuation Plan, with a **focus on how evidence** guided decisions made through continuous and comprehensive planning, by articulating explicit support of student social-emotional well-being, diversity, equity, inclusion, and active engagement in learning.

*Updated March 2022*

New York State
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Knowledge > Skill > Opportunity

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

## Part I –*Lead Strategies for Improvement*

| Lead Strategies for School Improvement | | |
|---|---|---|
| *List the 3-4 of core lead strategies that are central to the school's improvement plan, and outline the progress made this quarter by applying each strategy. Lead strategies are key levers for improvement that are identified based on trends in student performance data and serve as overarching approaches for implementing strategically focused action steps toward achieving demonstrable improvement during this quarter.* | | |
| **Quarterly Report #3 with Reflection on Lead Strategies Utilized during January 14, 2022 – April 14, 2022** | | |
| Identify the lead strategies that guided the school's improvement work during the reporting period, including any that were discontinued. | Status (R/Y/G) | For each lead strategy, outline how the strategy helped achieve progress toward this year's demonstrable improvement targets. If a strategy was discontinued since the prior reporting period, please provide an *evidence-based* explanation for why it was discontinued and if/how a new strategy will be implemented in its place. Any hyperlinks included to provide evidence, such as data, information, and/or relevant documents, must be **made publicly available prior** to submitting the report. |
| Weekly Common Planning Time (1 hour) | | Common planning time was structured for teachers to understand their student data and make sense of what instructional moves were necessary to increase student achievement. Instructional Coaches led this work. Professional Development focuses on teacher instructional decisions, specifically focusing on how student voice is used for scaffolding Common planning time will be used for teachers to understand their student data and plan for instructional moves necessary to increase student achievement. Based on informal and formal walkthroughs, teacher planning is aligned to New York State Standards, however when implemented, instruction tends to be scaffolded to the disadvantage of student voice and rigor. |
| Weekly Attendance Review Meetings | | Attendance meetings were moved from bi-weekly to weekly meetings. The reason for this move was to be able to watch ALL students' attendance on a week-to-week basis. Every week, decisions are made based on students' change in attendance rate, week-to-week. In order to address our Chronic Absenteeism rate, a "Barriers Worksheet" will be completed with families. The school will develop incentives and address barriers to have a more culturally responsive approach to attendance, that isn't antagonistic. |

*Updated March 2022*

| Use of Pedagogical Flow-map for planning | | In order to measure if the work being done with grade levels at Common Planning Time, to address the disconnect between planning with standards in mind and instructional practices, has an impact, Administrators are completing walkthroughs to collect anecdotal evidence of follow-through. |
|---|---|---|
| Coaching | | Instructional coaches supported classroom teachers through coaching cycles from group planning, teaching demonstrations, and providing instructional strategies for implementation. This includes ongoing review of student data. The coaching strategy is enhanced this school year, by adding informal walkthroughs from administration to provide feedback to classroom teachers. |

## 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 inform the implementation of specific strategies and action steps that support progress toward the Demonstrable Improvement Indicators during this quarter.* |

| | | Quarterly Report #3 Reflection on Activities Completed for this Indicator during January 14, 2022 – April 14, 2022 | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Indicator | Status (R/Y/G) | Identify specific strategies and action steps implemented to support progress for each of the Demonstrable Improvement Indicators. | ● Provide the **specific data/evidence** used to determine progress and impact on instruction, student learning, and achievement. <br> ● Describe how the data trends that emerged during this reporting period will inform future action steps. <br> ● Include a description of any adjustments made to the continuation plan along with the **corresponding data** used to inform the adjustment. <br> ● Any hyperlinks included to provide evidence, such as data, information, and/or relevant documents, must be **made publicly available prior** to submitting the report. |

*Updated March 2022*

New York State
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Knowledge > Skill > Opportunity

| #33<br>3-8 ELA All Students MGP | | The instructional staff, literacy specialists, and ELA coach will review the mid- year data (NWEA, Easy CBM, Lori Strong, and Wonders Benchmarks) to analyze the Tier 1 support plan's effectiveness.<br><br>ELA coach will provide targeted professional development (PD) to all instructional staff on researched based strategies that support the retaining for mastery ( i.e. review, student reflection of learning and assessment with feedback) element of the Pedagogical Flow-Map (PFM), to focus on culturally responsive and rigorous student tasks.<br><br>ELA coach will plan and provide four-week coaching cycles to support one grade level at a time with the development and implementation of rigorous tasks based on data (i.e. NWEA, easyCBM or Wonders data).<br><br>Intermediate CORE ELA teachers and the ELA coach will engage in vertically aligned coaching cycles that include peer observations based on the PFM, and development and implementation of rigorous writing tasks.<br><br>Communicate Lori Strong data with community organizations to add outside support; specifically Growing Readers Albany Public Library program, (library card registration); train volunteers on how to support students using the | Easy CBM<br><br>**Kindergarten: Easy CBM Measure: Letter Sounds**<br>Class 1: Winter Average: 18- Mid Point Average: 30<br>Notes:<br>  • increased proficiency from 33% to 56%<br>  • decreased percent below from 33% to 13%<br>Class 2: Winter Average: 15- Mid Point Average: 24<br>Notes:<br>  • increased proficiency from 24% to 27%<br>  • decreased percent below from 29% to 20%<br>Class 3: Winter Average: 20- Mid Point Average: 25<br>Notes:<br>  • increased proficiency from 31% to 44%<br>  • increased percent below from 12% to 24%<br><br>**Grade 1: Easy CBM Measure: Word Reading Fluency**<br>Class 1: Winter Average: 19 words - Mid Point Average: 21 words<br>Notes:<br>  • proficiency remained the same at 22%<br>  • decreased percent below from 56% to 50%<br>Class 2: Winter Average: 18 words - Mid Point Average: 25 words<br>Notes:<br>  • increased proficiency from 28% to 32%<br>  • decreased percent below from 44% to 37%<br><br>**Grade 2 Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency**<br>Class 1: Winter Average 37 wpm to Mid Point Average: 47 wpm<br>Notes:<br>  • increased proficiency from 13% to 17%<br>  • decreased percent below from 57% to 52%<br>Class 2: Winter Average: 40 wpm to Mid Point Average: 50 wpm<br>Notes: |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |

*Updated March 2022*

| | | L. Strong deficit data in grades Kindergarten through 2nd grade.<br><br>Administrators will conduct informal walkthroughs and classroom visits of instructional staff to provide feedback on PD provided. Specifically addressing student reflection of learning and rigor of student tasks.<br><br>The Building Leadership Team (BLT) will meet with the consultant to analyze the anecdotal notes from the walkthroughs to support planning of professional development (PD) to be offered to instructional staff.<br><br>ELA coach will use Parent University to build workshops based on the leaning gaps identified by Lori Strong results.<br><br>Teachers, reading teachers, and the ELA coach will meet monthly to evaluate Tier 1 data and plan instruction that supports students' needs.<br><br>ELA coach will provide targeted professional development (PD) to all instructional staff on researched based strategies that support the retaining for mastery ( i.e.review, student reflection of learning and assessment with feedback) element of the Pedagogical Flow-Map (PFM), to focus on asking additional questions that deepen student understanding and | • increased proficiency from 15% to 20%<br>• percent below remained the same at 50%<br><br>**Grade 3: Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency**<br>Class 1: Winter Average: 88 wpm - Mid Point Average: 89 wpm<br>Notes:<br>• proficiency increased from 29% to 38%<br>• percent below remained the same at 24%<br>Class 2: Winter Average 73 wpm - Mid Point Average: 71 wpm<br>Notes:<br>• increased proficiency from 20% to 26%<br>• increased percent below from 55% to 58%<br><br>**Grade 4: Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency**<br>Class 1: Winter Average: 111 wpm - Mi Point Average: 122 wpm<br>Notes:<br>• increased proficiency from 56% to 59%<br>• decreased percent below from 25% to 18%<br>Class 2: Winter Average: 121 wpm - Mid Point Average: 118 wpm<br>Notes:<br>• proficiency stayed the same at 50%<br>• increased percent below from 13% to 17%<br>Class 3: Winter Average 118 wpm- Mid Point Average: 122 wpm<br>Notes:<br>• increased proficiency from 36% to 42%<br>• decreased percent below from 21% to 17%<br><br>**Grade 5: Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency**<br><br>Class 1: Winter Average: 139 wpm- Mid Point Average: 150 wpm<br>Notes:<br>• proficiency increased from 43% to 50%<br>  percent below increased from 0% to 7% |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | approach incorrect answers as learning opportunities. | Class 2: Winter Average: 113 wpm- Mid Point Average: 109<br>Notes:<br>   • proficiency stayed the same at 31%<br>   • percent below increased from 38% to 46%<br>Class 3: Winter Average: 146 wpm- Mid Point Average: 158 wpm<br>Notes:<br>   • proficiency increased from 45% to 58%<br>   • percent below increased from 0% to 8%<br><br>**Trends**:<br>Our data shows consistent movement of students who were below, but not moving into proficiency. Our data for on level and proficient students shows growth in all classrooms except three classrooms that held the same proficiency rate. However, there is not one classroom at 80% proficiency. Our 1st and 2nd grades are seeing the slowest proficiency growth rate increase. Four of our six 4th and 5th grade classrooms have proficiency rates at or above 50%. We will continue to focus on Tier 1 instructional practices during our professional development time. |
| #39<br>3-8 Math All Students MGP | | Embedded professional development will focus on facilitating high leverage tasks/routines ("Explore" portion of lesson) to promote reasoning and problem solving using the math language routines, math teaching practices, and student math practices. Coaching cycles will be utilized to model and/or co-teach high leverage tasks/routines with a focus on teacher monitoring and questioning, task complexity based on the standards' rigor, and accountable talk. | Math Curriculum Assessment<br><u>3rd Grade:</u><br>There were a total of 37 students with valid Quarter 3 Pre-Assessment data. 0 students performed at Level 4 (0%), 0 students performed at Level 3 (0%), 0 students performed at Level 2 (0%) and 37 students performed at Level 1 (100%).<br><br>There were a total of 41 students with valid Quarter 3 Post Assessment data. This assessment measured the priority standards from Quarter 3 (3.NF.1, 3.NF.2, 3.NF.3, 3.G.2, 3.MD.3 and 3.OA.8). 13 students performed at Level 1 (32%), 9 students |

The instructional coach will provide targeted professional development around the implementation of the Bridges Curriculum (i.e., lesson structure, domain alignment, and progress monitoring, etc.)

During weekly data team meetings teachers will provide evidence of instructional strategies through student work and ACSD data points.
Administrator walkthroughs/instructional rounds and classroom visits will allow for consistent monitoring of the implementation of Tier 1, standards aligned instruction.
During weekly data team meetings teachers will provide evidence of instructional strategies through student work and ACSD data points.
Embedded professional development will focus on teacher selection of student work samples for the debrief conversation centered on sequencing and connecting student work to create math meaning, link math ideas and relationships as well as making the math concepts visible and understandable.
Coaching cycles will be utilized to model and/or co-teach the debrief section of the three phase instructional model.

performed at Level 2 (22%), 12 students performed at Level 3 (29%) and 9 students performed at Level 4 (17%). The 3rd grade team was able to decrease students performing at Level 1 from 100% to 32% and increase proficiency for students at Level 2 from 0% to 22%, students at Level 3 from 0% to 29% and students at Level 4 from 0% to 17%. Teachers are continuing to engage in vertical teaming around priority standards and the progressions amongst the grade levels. Intermediate departmentalized math teachers are engaging in professional development around the Explore section of a LED lesson model that focuses on high leverage, rigorous tasks to promote reasoning and problem solving for all students.

4th Grade:
There were a total of 38 students with valid Quarter 3 Pre-Assessment data. 0 students performed at Level 4 (0%), 0 students performed at Level 3 (0%), 0 students performed at Level 2 (0%) and 43 students performed at Level 1 (100%).

There were a total of 41 students with valid Quarter 3 Post Assessment data. This assessment measured the priority standards from Quarter 2 (4.MD.5b, 4.MD.5a, 4.MD.4, 4.NF.4, 4.NF.3, 4.OA.3, 4.NF.3 and 4.NF.4). 11 students performed at Level 1 (27%), 5 students performed at Level 2 (12%), 12 students performed at Level 3 (29%) and 13 students performed at Level 4 (32%). The 4th grade team was able to decrease students performing at Level 1 from 100% to 27% and increase proficiency for students at Level 2 from 0% to 12%, students at Level 3 from 0% to 29% and students at Level 4 from 0% to 32%. Teachers are continuing to engage in vertical teaming around priority standards and the progressions amongst the grade levels. Intermediate departmentalized math teachers are engaging in professional

*Updated March 2022*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | development around the Explore section of a LED lesson model that focuses on high leverage, rigorous tasks to promote reasoning and problem solving for all students.<br><br>5th Grade:<br>There were a total of 35 students with valid Quarter 3 Pre-Assessment data. 0 students performed at Level 4 (0%), 0 students performed at Level 3 (0%), 0 students performed at Level 2 (0%) and 40 students performed at Level 1 (100%).<br><br>There were a total of 36 students with valid Quarter 3 Post Assessment data. This assessment measured the priority standards from Quarter 2 (5.NF.7, 5.MD.5b, 5.OA.1, 5.NF.7, 5.MD.4, 3.MD.5, 5.MD.1). 23 students performed at Level 1 (64%), 4 students performed at Level 2 (11%), 3 students performed at Level 3 (8%) and 6 students performed at Level 4 (17%). Teachers are continuing to engage in vertical teaming around priority standards and the progressions amongst the grade levels. Intermediate departmentalized math teachers are engaging in professional development around the Explore section of a LED lesson model that focuses on high leverage, rigorous tasks to promote reasoning and problem solving for all students.<br><br>Trends:<br>All students were level 1 to begin the quarter, our practices are moving students, however we are not moving 80% of our students to proficiency at this time. This signals that we need to continue our focus on Tier 1 practices through our professional development. |
| #100<br>ELA All Students Core Subject PI | | The instructional staff, literacy specialists, and ELA coach will review the mid- year data (NWEA, Easy CBM, Lori Strong, and Wonders | Easy CBM<br><br>**Kindergarten: Easy CBM Measure: Letter Sounds**<br>Class 1: Winter Average: 18- Mid Point Average: 30 |

<table>
<tr><td>

Benchmarks) to analyze the Tier 1 support plan's effectiveness.

ELA coach will provide targeted professional development (PD) to all instructional staff on researched based strategies that support the retaining for mastery ( i.e. review, student reflection of learning and assessment with feedback) element of the Pedagogical Flow-Map (PFM), to focus on culturally responsive and rigorous student tasks.

ELA coach will plan and provide four-week coaching cycles to support one grade level at a time with the development and implementation of rigorous tasks based on data (i.e. NWEA, easyCBM or Wonders data).

Intermediate CORE ELA teachers and the ELA coach will engage in vertically aligned coaching cycles that include peer observations based on the PFM, and development and implementation of rigorous writing tasks.

Communicate Lori Strong data with community organizations to add outside support; specifically Growing Readers Albany Public Library program, (library card registration); train volunteers on how to support students using the L. Strong deficit data in grades Kindergarten through 2nd grade.

</td><td>

Notes:
- increased proficiency from 33% to 56%
- decreased percent below from 33% to 13%

Class 2:  Winter Average: 15- Mid Point Average: 24
Notes:
- increased proficiency from 24% to 27%
- decreased percent below from 29% to 20%

Class 3: Winter Average: 20- Mid Point Average: 25
Notes:
- increased proficiency from 31% to 44%
- increased percent below from 12% to 24%

**Grade 1: Easy CBM Measure: Word Reading Fluency**
Class 1: Winter Average: 19 words - Mid Point Average: 21 words
Notes:
- proficiency remained the same at 22%
- decreased percent below from 56% to 50%

Class 2: Winter Average: 18 words - Mid Point Average: 25 words
Notes:
- increased proficiency from 28% to 32%
- decreased percent below from 44% to 37%

**Grade 2 Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency**
Class 1: Winter Average 37 wpm to Mid Point Average: 47 wpm
Notes:
- increased proficiency from 13% to 17%
- decreased percent below from 57% to 52%

Class 2: Winter Average: 40 wpm to Mid Point Average: 50 wpm
Notes:
- increased proficiency from 15% to 20%
- percent below remained the same at 50%

**Grade 3: Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency**

</td></tr>
</table>

*Updated March 2022*

| | | Administrators will conduct informal walkthroughs and classroom visits of instructional staff to provide feedback on PD provided. Specifically addressing student reflection of learning and rigor of student tasks.<br><br>The Building Leadership Team (BLT) will meet with the consultant to analyze the anecdotal notes from the walkthroughs to support planning of professional development (PD) to be offered to instructional staff.<br><br>ELA coach will use Parent University to build workshops based on the leaning gaps identified by Lori Strong results.<br><br>Teachers, reading teachers, and the ELA coach will meet monthly to evaluate Tier 1 data and plan instruction that supports students' needs.<br><br>ELA coach will provide targeted professional development (PD) to all instructional staff on researched based strategies that support the retaining for mastery ( i.e.review, student reflection of learning and assessment with feedback) element of the Pedagogical Flow-Map (PFM), to focus on asking additional questions that deepen student understanding and approach incorrect answers as learning opportunities. | Class 1: Winter Average: 88 wpm - Mid Point Average: 89 wpm<br>Notes:<br>• proficiency increased from 29% to 38%<br>• percent below remained the same at 24%<br>Class 2: Winter Average 73 wpm - Mid Point Average: 71 wpm<br>Notes:<br>• increased proficiency from 20% to 26%<br>• increased percent below from 55% to 58%<br><br>**Grade 4: Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency**<br>Class 1: Winter Average: 111 wpm - Mi Point Average: 122 wpm<br>Notes:<br>• increased proficiency from 56% to 59%<br>• decreased percent below from 25% to 18%<br>Class 2: Winter Average: 121 wpm - Mid Point Average: 118 wpm<br>Notes:<br>• proficiency stayed the same at 50%<br>• increased percent below from 13% to 17%<br>Class 3: Winter Average 118 wpm- Mid Point Average: 122 wpm<br>Notes:<br>• increased proficiency from 36% to 42%<br>• decreased percent below from 21% to 17%<br><br>**Grade 5: Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency**<br><br>Class 1: Winter Average: 139 wpm- Mid Point Average: 150 wpm<br>Notes:<br>• proficiency increased from 43% to 50%<br>percent below increased from 0% to 7%<br>Class 2: Winter Average: 113 wpm- Mid Point Average: 109<br>Notes:<br>• proficiency stayed the same at 31%<br>• percent below increased from 38% to 46% |
|---|---|---|---|

*Updated March 2022*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Class 3: Winter Average: 146 wpm- Mid Point Average: 158 wpm<br>Notes:<br>• proficiency increased from 45% to 58%<br>• percent below increased from 0% to 8%<br><br>**Trends**:<br>Our data shows consistent movement of students who were below, but not moving into proficiency. Our data for on level and proficient students shows growth in all classrooms except three classrooms that held the same proficiency rate. However, there is not one classroom at 80% proficiency. Our 1st and 2nd grades are seeing the slowest proficiency growth rate increase. Four of our six 4th and 5th grade classrooms have proficiency rates at or above 50%. We will continue to focus on Tier 1 instructional practices during our professional development time. |
| | | Embedded professional development will focus on facilitating high leverage tasks/routines ("Explore" portion of lesson) to promote reasoning and problem solving using the math language routines, math teaching practices, and student math practices.<br>Coaching cycles will be utilized to model and/or co-teach high leverage tasks/routines with a focus on teacher monitoring and questioning, task complexity based on the standards' rigor, and accountable talk.<br><br><br>The instructional coach will provide targeted professional development around the implementation of the Bridges Curriculum (i.e., | 3rd Grade:<br>Below is the breakdown of growth based on the Quarter 3 Priority Standards assessed.<br>3.NF.1: The team was able to increase proficiency from 67% to 95%.<br>3.NF.2: The team was able to increase proficiency from 39% to78%<br>3.NF.3: The team was able to increase proficiency from 17% to 50%<br>3.G.2: Based on a 2 point scoring criteria, the team was able to decrease the students performing at a Level 1 from 72% to 8% and increase students scoring 2 points from 3% proficiency to 33%.<br>3.MD.3: The team was able to increase students scoring full credit from 17% to 68%.<br>3.OA.8: Based on a 3 point scoring criteria, the team was able to decrease the percentage of students performing at a Level 1 from 97% to 45% and increase proficiency on the 3 point response problem from 0% to 23%. |

*Updated March 2022*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | lesson structure, domain alignment, and progress monitoring, etc.) | 4th Grade: |
| | | Below is the breakdown of growth based on the Quarter 3 Priority Standards assessed. |
| | During weekly data team meetings teachers will provide evidence of instructional strategies through student work and ACSD data points. Administrator walkthroughs/instructional rounds and classroom visits will allow for consistent monitoring of the implementation of Tier 1, standards aligned instruction. | 4.MD.5b: The team was able to increase proficiency from 32% to 81%. |
| | | 4..MD.5a: The team was able to increase proficiency from 11% to 73%. |
| | | 4.MD.4: The team was able to increase proficiency from 41% to 83%. |
| | | 4.NF.3: There were 2 questions that addressed this standard on the Quarter 3 Post Assessment. The team was able to increase proficiency on the 2 point problem from 16% to 88% and 3% to 80%. |
| | During weekly data team meetings teachers will provide evidence of instructional strategies through student work and ACSD data points. Embedded professional development will focus on teacher selection of student work samples for the debrief conversation centered on sequencing and connecting student work to create math meaning, link math ideas and relationships as well as making the math concepts visible and understandable. Coaching cycles will be utilized to model and/or co-teach the debrief section of the three phase instructional model. | 4.OA.3 The team was able to increase proficiency from 14% to 32%. |
| | | 4.NF.4 There were 2 questions that addressed this standard on the Quarter 3 Post Assessment. The team was able to increase proficiency on the 2 point problem from 35% to 77% and 3% to 83%. |
| | | 5th Grade: |
| | | Below is the breakdown of growth based on the Quarter 3 Priority Standards assessed. |
| | | 5.NF.7: The team was able to increase proficiency from 3% to 50%. |
| | | 5.Md.5b: The team was able to increase proficiency from 20% to 72%. |
| | | 5.OA.1: The team was able to increase proficiency from 26% to 47%. |
| | | 5.MD.4: Based on a 2 point scoring criteria, the team was able to decrease students who scored 0 points from 37% to 14% and increase students who scored 2 points from 26% to 64%. |
| | | 5.MD.5: The team was able to increase proficiency from 0% to 41% proficiency. |
| | | 5.MD.1: Based on a 2 point scoring criteria, the team was able to decrease the students who scored 0 points from 89% to 47%, and increase the students who scored 2 points from 0% to 31%. |

*Updated March 2022*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | **Trends:**<br>All students were level 1 to begin the quarter, our practices are moving students, however we are not moving 80% of our students to proficiency at this time. This signals that we need to continue our focus on Tier 1 practices through our professional development. |
| #150 Grades 4 Science All Students Core Subject PI | | Sheridan Preparatory Academy will have (4) days to provide (2) 90 minute small grade level training or departmentalized training (3rd-5th). (January/February).<br><br>Building and instructional supervisor will conduct walkthroughs and classroom visits 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 followed-up by written and/or face to face feedback.<br><br>Elementary curriculum resource coordinator will provide professional development via Teacher PD sessions to 2nd-4th grade teams unpacking investigations with a focus on how to enhance student engagement with the targeted Science and Engineering Practices (1,3,4,5).<br><br>(K-5th) Spotlight on the various uses of science journals and the essential need for a writing component. Will include 8 practices with a special focus on 1, 3, 4, & 5. | **Science:**<br>There were a total of 38 students with valid Quarter 3 Science Checkpoint data. 16 students performed at Level 4 (42%), 13 students performed at Level 3 (34%), 1 student performed at Level 2 (5%) and 7 students performed at Level 1 (18%). We were able to decrease the students at Level 1 from 31% to 18%, increase students at Level 2 from 17% to 5%, students at Level 3 from 38% to 34% and students at Level 4 from 14% to 42%. The team was able to increase proficiency from 52% to 76% proficiency. We were able to increase student proficiency in the areas of Metric Units from 63% to 78% and erosion and deposition from 34% to 81%. In addition, the PD around the 2 point response has increased student proficiency around extended response questions from 26% and 95% to 94% and 95 % respectfully. Students were also able to increase their proficiency surrounding interpreting data tables from 66% to 84%. There is no focus area that students scored less than 70% on, proving that the Tier 1 strategies are leading to student impact. Departmentalized Science Teachers will continue to engage in PD around the 2 point response and will continue to learn about explicit instruction on how to answer and justify your response with evidence. Teachers have surpassed sentence writing and are moving into the 2 point response criteria. Teachers are also building centers around science concepts that focus on student voice and choice. In addition, students are beginning to work through the performance labs through a center model. Students will continue to be engaged in center activities (reading,writing, hands-on experiments and virtual simulations) to build their understanding of these science concepts. |

*Updated March 2022*

| | | 1. Asking questions and defining problems<br>3. Planning and carrying out investigations<br>4. Analyzing and interpreting data<br>5. Using mathematics and computational thinking<br><br>Instructional coach for science will use the Pedagogical Flow-Map to plan for the spring unit of study and an appropriate "Capstone Project" during CPT. | |

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

| **Level 2 Indicators** |
| :--- |
| *Please list the school's Level 2 indicators and complete all columns below. This information should provide details about how lead strategies will inform the implementation of specific strategies and action steps that will support progress toward the Demonstrable Improvement Indicators during this quarter.* |

| Quarterly Report #3 Reflection on Activities Completed for this Indicator during<br>January 14, 2022 – April 14, 2022 | | | |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Indicator | Status (R/Y/G) | What specific strategies and action steps were implemented to support progress for each of the Demonstrable Improvement Indicators? | ● Provide the **specific data/evidence** used to determine progress and impact on instruction, student learning, and achievement.<br>● Describe how the data trends that emerged during this reporting period will inform future action steps.<br>● Include a description of any adjustments made to the continuation plan along with the **corresponding data** used to inform the adjustment.<br>● Any hyperlinks included to provide evidence, such as data, information, and/or relevant documents, must be **made publicly available prior** to submitting the report. |
| #160<br>EM Chronic Absenteeism - All Students | | The Attendance Committee will monitor all students' attendance for the first ten days of school after holiday recess. Strategic plans will be | January - April Attendance Percentage:<br>K: 86%<br>1: 88%<br>2: 87% |

| | | developed for students who are showing warning signs of chronic absenteeism.<br><br>Kickboard Mid-year "Check-in" with tech support for staff by appointment, if needed.<br>The Attendance Committee will have a mid-year meeting to identify at-risk students so that the home school coordinator can conduct home-visits with Tier 1B, Tier 2, and Tier 3 parents to address attendance barriers.<br><br>Kickboard App will be used by Attendance Committee members as a 2-way communication platform with parents/families. With automated messages sent monthly to update families on their child's attendance rate.<br><br>The 2nd round of Attendance Town Hall-week will be held for families interested in participating in<br><br>After-School Programs and to provide Kickboard App support for those that need it, to emphasize the importance of attending school on a regular basis. Events will be held at multiple times, so that families can have multiple access opportunities. Videos will be made available to families that enter school after January 2022.<br><br>Attendance Flow Map developed in summer 2021, will be reviewed mid-year with all stakeholders at multiple events (Staff Meetings, PTO Meetings, and YouTube video). | 3: 90%<br>4: 87%<br>5: 89%<br>School Average: 88%<br>43% of our students are currently listed as Chronically Absent. With 30% of those students having attendance that would not make them chronic at the end of the school year (high priority students).<br><br>Our substitute Home School Coordinator has been able to maintain our procedures for supporting students with attendance issues.  We have been able to connect more families with supports, they've identified through our Barriers Worksheet.  We have used the assistance of our District Attendance Teacher for our more severely chronically absent students, however we have not seen much improvement for those students, no matter the interventions provided. The current priority will be to focus on the 70+ students who are hovering with percentages in the low 90s or high 80s. Hopefully with continued outreach and education, these families will work to maintain their students' current absences, so they do not end up on our chronic list. |

*Updated March 2022*

| | | Home school coordinator will conduct home-visits a minimum of 3 days per week to families whose attendance rate falls below 91%.

Weekly attendance meetings will occur to monitor all students' attendance. Decisions will be made based on student year-to-date and period-to date rates to design student success plans using our

Community School model's Pillars. Weekly meetings will be chaired by the home school coordinator, with the principal, community school site coordinator,  school secretary, behavior specialist, and social worker.

Administrative staff will have a "pop-up" dance party for classes that have 100% attendance daily.

Attendance study hall will be offered to students who are absent from school as an opportunity to catch up on school work missed as an after school program. Students will be selected by the Attendance Committee based on weekly attendance rates.

Monthly, the home school coordinator will visit classes individually to distribute attendance incentives to students who have 95+% attendance and those who have the most improvement (1/28, 2/18, 4/1, 4/29, 5/26, 6/17). | |

Community school site coordinator will host a monthly Attendance Breakfast of Champions for the parents/families of students who have 95+% attendance(1/28, 2/18, 4/1,, 4/29, 5/26).

Monthly recognition of top three classes with best attendance at Blue & Gold Day. Classes will receive a trophy and banner to hang on their door. 1st place class will also receive attendance incentives (1/28, 2/18, 3/25, 4/29, 5/26, 6/17).

The community schools site coordinator will use student data (NYS exams and NWEA data) to share with CET, so that partnerships and resources can be selected to support the academic needs of students. CET meets bi-monthly (February, April, June).
The community schools site coordinator will report monthly to BLT any recommendations provided by the CET (Community Engagement Team) to support the goals of the comprehensive plan.
To keep families informed of where their student is, the Attendance Committee will distribute personalized Attendance Tier Letter with report cards quarterly.

PBIS in conjunction with the Attendance Committee will utilize the March (4/1 or 3/25, Responsible) Blue & Gold Day to re-teach students the importance of good attendance.

| #35<br>3-8 ELA Black Students<br>MGP | | The instructional staff, literacy specialists, and ELA coach will review the mid- year data (NWEA, Easy CBM, Lori Strong, and Wonders Benchmarks) to analyze the Tier 1 support plan's effectiveness.<br><br>ELA coach will provide targeted professional development (PD) to all instructional staff on researched based strategies that support the retaining for mastery ( i.e. review, student reflection of learning and assessment with feedback) element of the Pedagogical Flow-Map (PFM), to focus on culturally responsive and rigorous student tasks.<br><br>ELA coach will plan and provide four-week coaching cycles to support one grade level at a time with the development and implementation of rigorous tasks based on data (i.e. NWEA, easyCBM or Wonders data).<br><br>Intermediate CORE ELA teachers and the ELA coach will engage in vertically aligned coaching cycles that include peer observations based on the PFM, and development and implementation of rigorous writing tasks.<br><br>Communicate Lori Strong data with community organizations to add outside support; specifically Growing Readers Albany Public Library program, (library card registration); train volunteers on how | Easy CBM<br><br>**Kindergarten: Easy CBM Measure: Letter Sounds**<br>Class 1:  Winter Average: 18- Mid Point Average: 30<br>Notes:<br>● increased proficiency from 33%  to 56%<br>● decreased percent below from 33% to 13%<br>Class 2:  Winter Average: 15- Mid Point Average: 24<br>Notes:<br>● increased proficiency from 24%  to 27%<br>● decreased percent below from  29% to 20%<br>Class 3: Winter Average: 20- Mid Point Average: 25<br>Notes:<br>● increased proficiency from 31%  to 44%<br>● increased percent below from 12% to 24%<br><br>**Grade 1: Easy CBM Measure: Word Reading Fluency**<br>Class 1: Winter Average: 19 words - Mid Point Average: 21 words<br>Notes:<br>● proficiency remained the same at  22%<br>● decreased percent below from 56% to 50%<br>Class 2: Winter Average: 18 words - Mid Point Average: 25 words<br>Notes:<br>● increased proficiency from 28%  to 32%<br>● decreased percent below from 44% to 37%<br><br>**Grade 2 Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency**<br>Class 1: Winter Average 37 wpm to Mid Point Average: 47 wpm<br>Notes:<br>● increased proficiency from 13% to 17%<br>● decreased percent below from  57% to 52%<br>Class 2: Winter Average: 40 wpm to Mid Point Average: 50 wpm |
|---|---|---|---|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | to support students using the L. Strong deficit data in grades Kindergarten through 2nd grade.<br><br>Administrators will conduct informal walkthroughs and classroom visits of instructional staff to provide feedback on PD provided. Specifically addressing student reflection of learning and rigor of student tasks.<br><br>The Building Leadership Team (BLT) will meet with the consultant to analyze the anecdotal notes from the walkthroughs to support planning of professional development (PD) to be offered to instructional staff.<br><br>ELA coach will use Parent University to build workshops based on the leaning gaps identified by Lori Strong results.<br><br>Teachers, reading teachers, and the ELA coach will meet monthly to evaluate Tier 1 data and plan instruction that supports students' needs.<br><br>ELA coach will provide targeted professional development (PD) to all instructional staff on researched based strategies that support the retaining for mastery ( i.e.review, student reflection of learning and assessment with feedback) element of the Pedagogical Flow-Map (PFM), to focus on asking additional questions | Notes:<br>● increased proficiency from 15% to 20%<br>● percent below remained the same at 50%<br><br>**Grade 3: Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency**<br>Class 1: Winter Average: 88 wpm - Mid Point Average: 89 wpm<br>Notes:<br>● proficiency increased from 29% to 38%<br>● percent below remained the same at 24%<br>Class 2: Winter Average 73 wpm - Mid Point Average: 71 wpm<br>Notes:<br>● increased proficiency from 20% to 26%<br>● increased percent below from 55% to 58%<br><br>**Grade 4: Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency**<br>Class 1: Winter Average: 111 wpm - Mi Point Average: 122 wpm<br>Notes:<br>● increased proficiency from 56% to 59%<br>● decreased percent below from 25% to 18%<br>Class 2: Winter Average: 121 wpm - Mid Point Average: 118 wpm<br>Notes:<br>● proficiency stayed the same at 50%<br>● increased percent below from 13% to 17%<br>Class 3: Winter Average 118 wpm- Mid Point Average: 122 wpm<br>Notes:<br>● increased proficiency from 36% to 42%<br>● decreased percent below from 21% to 17%<br><br>**Grade 5: Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency**<br><br>Class 1: Winter Average: 139 wpm- Mid Point Average: 150 wpm<br>Notes:<br>● proficiency increased from 43% to 50% |

*Updated March 2022*

| | | that deepen student understanding and approach incorrect answers as learning opportunities. | percent below increased from 0% to 7%<br>Class 2: Winter Average: 113 wpm- Mid Point Average: 109<br>Notes:<br>• proficiency stayed the same at 31%<br>• percent below increased from 38% to 46%<br>Class 3: Winter Average: 146 wpm- Mid Point Average: 158 wpm<br>Notes:<br>• proficiency increased from 45% to 58%<br>• percent below increased from 0% to 8%<br><br>**Trends**:<br>Our data shows consistent movement of students who were below, but not moving into proficiency. Our data for on level and proficient students shows growth in all classrooms except three classrooms that held the same proficiency rate. However, there is not one classroom at 80% proficiency. Our 1st and 2nd grades are seeing the slowest proficiency growth rate increase. Four of our six 4th and 5th grade classrooms have proficiency rates at or above 50%. We will continue to focus on Tier 1 instructional practices during our professional development time. |
| | | The instructional staff, literacy specialists, and ELA coach will review the mid- year data (NWEA, Easy CBM, Lori Strong, and Wonders Benchmarks) to analyze the Tier 1 support plan's effectiveness.<br><br>ELA coach will provide targeted professional development (PD) to all instructional staff on researched based strategies that support the retaining for mastery ( i.e. review, student reflection of learning and assessment with feedback) element of the Pedagogical Flow-Map | Easy CBM<br><br>**Kindergarten: Easy CBM Measure: Letter Sounds**<br>Class 1: Winter Average: 18- Mid Point Average: 30<br>Notes:<br>• increased proficiency from 33% to 56%<br>• decreased percent below from 33% to 13%<br>Class 2: Winter Average: 15- Mid Point Average: 24<br>Notes:<br>• increased proficiency from 24% to 27%<br>• decreased percent below from 29% to 20%<br>Class 3: Winter Average: 20- Mid Point Average: 25<br>Notes: |

| | | (PFM), to focus on culturally responsive and rigorous student tasks.<br><br>ELA coach will plan and provide four-week coaching cycles to support one grade level at a time with the development and implementation of rigorous tasks based on data (i.e. NWEA, easyCBM or Wonders data).<br><br>Intermediate CORE ELA teachers and the ELA coach will engage in vertically aligned coaching cycles that include peer observations based on the PFM, and development and implementation of rigorous writing tasks.<br><br>Communicate Lori Strong data with community organizations to add outside support; specifically Growing Readers Albany Public Library program, (library card registration); train volunteers on how to support students using the L. Strong deficit data in grades Kindergarten through 2nd grade.<br><br>Administrators will conduct informal walkthroughs and classroom visits of instructional staff to provide feedback on PD provided. Specifically addressing student reflection of learning and rigor of student tasks.<br><br>The Building Leadership Team (BLT) will meet with the consultant to analyze the anecdotal notes from the walkthroughs to support planning of | •     increased proficiency from 31% to 44%<br>•     increased percent below from 12% to 24%<br><br>**Grade 1: Easy CBM Measure: Word Reading Fluency**<br>Class 1: Winter Average: 19 words - Mid Point Average: 21 words<br>Notes:<br>•     proficiency remained the same at 22%<br>•     decreased percent below from 56% to 50%<br>Class 2: Winter Average: 18 words - Mid Point Average: 25 words<br>Notes:<br>•     increased proficiency from 28% to 32%<br>•     decreased percent below from 44% to 37%<br><br>**Grade 2 Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency**<br>Class 1: Winter Average 37 wpm to Mid Point Average: 47 wpm<br>Notes:<br>•     increased proficiency from 13% to 17%<br>•     decreased percent below from 57% to 52%<br>Class 2: Winter Average: 40 wpm to Mid Point Average: 50 wpm<br>Notes:<br>•     increased proficiency from 15% to 20%<br>•     percent below remained the same at 50%<br><br>**Grade 3: Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency**<br>Class 1: Winter Average: 88 wpm - Mid Point Average: 89 wpm<br>Notes:<br>•     proficiency increased from 29% to 38%<br>•     percent below remained the same at 24%<br>Class 2: Winter Average 73 wpm - Mid Point Average: 71 wpm<br>Notes:<br>•     increased proficiency from 20% to 26%<br>•     increased percent below from 55% to 58% |

*Updated March 2022*

| | | professional development (PD) to be offered to instructional staff.<br><br>ELA coach will use Parent University to build workshops based on the leaning gaps identified by Lori Strong results.<br><br>Teachers, reading teachers, and the ELA coach will meet monthly to evaluate Tier 1 data and plan instruction that supports students' needs.<br><br>ELA coach will provide targeted professional development (PD) to all instructional staff on researched based strategies that support the retaining for mastery ( i.e.review, student reflection of learning and assessment with feedback) element of the Pedagogical Flow-Map (PFM), to focus on asking additional questions that deepen student understanding and approach incorrect answers as learning opportunities. | **Grade 4: Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency**<br>Class 1: Winter Average: 111 wpm - Mi Point Average: 122 wpm<br>Notes:<br>● increased proficiency from 56% to 59%<br>● decreased percent below from 25% to 18%<br>Class 2: Winter Average: 121 wpm - Mid Point Average: 118 wpm<br>Notes:<br>● proficiency stayed the same at 50%<br>● increased percent below from 13% to 17%<br>Class 3: Winter Average 118 wpm- Mid Point Average: 122 wpm<br>Notes:<br>● increased proficiency from 36% to 42%<br>● decreased percent below from 21% to 17%<br><br>**Grade 5: Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency**<br><br>Class 1: Winter Average: 139 wpm- Mid Point Average: 150 wpm<br>Notes:<br>● proficiency increased from 43% to 50%<br>  percent below increased from 0% to 7%<br>Class 2: Winter Average: 113 wpm- Mid Point Average: 109<br>Notes:<br>● proficiency stayed the same at 31%<br>● percent below increased from 38% to 46%<br>Class 3: Winter Average: 146 wpm- Mid Point Average: 158 wpm<br>Notes:<br>● proficiency increased from 45% to 58%<br>● percent below increased from 0% to 8%<br><br><br>**Trends**:<br>Our data shows consistent movement of students who were below, but not moving into proficiency. Our data for on level and proficient students shows growth in all |

*Updated March 2022*

| | | | classrooms except three classrooms that held the same proficiency rate. However, there is not one classroom at 80% proficiency.  Our 1st and 2nd grades are seeing the slowest proficiency growth rate increase. Four of our six 4th and 5th grade classrooms have proficiency rates at or above 50%.  We will continue to  focus on Tier 1 instructional practices during our professional development time. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Embedded professional development will focus on facilitating high leverage tasks/routines ("Explore" portion of lesson) to promote reasoning and problem solving using the math language routines, math teaching practices, and student math practices.<br>Coaching cycles will be utilized to model and/or co-teach high leverage tasks/routines with a focus on teacher monitoring and questioning, task complexity based on the standards' rigor, and accountable talk.<br><br>The instructional coach will provide targeted professional development around the implementation of the Bridges Curriculum (i.e., lesson structure, domain alignment, and progress monitoring, etc.)<br><br>During weekly data team meetings teachers will provide evidence of instructional strategies through student work and ACSD data points. Administrator walkthroughs/instructional rounds and classroom visits will allow for consistent monitoring of the implementation of Tier 1, standards aligned instruction. | |

*Updated March 2022*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | During weekly data team meetings teachers will provide evidence of instructional strategies through student work and ACSD data points. Embedded professional development will focus on teacher selection of student work samples for the debrief conversation centered on sequencing and connecting student work to create math meaning, link math ideas and relationships as well as making the math concepts visible and understandable.<br>Coaching cycles will be utilized to model and/or co-teach the debrief section of the three phase instructional model. | |
| NWEA Math Growth CGP - Grades 1 & 2 Cohort | | Embedded professional development will focus on facilitating high leverage tasks/routines ("Explore" portion of lesson) to promote reasoning and problem solving using the math language routines, math teaching practices, and student math practices. Coaching cycles will be utilized to model and/or co-teach high leverage tasks/routines with a focus on teacher monitoring and questioning, task complexity based on the standards' rigor, and accountable talk.<br><br>The instructional coach will provide targeted professional development around the implementation of the Bridges Curriculum (i.e., lesson structure, domain alignment, and progress monitoring, etc.) | 1st Grade:<br>There were a total of 35 students with valid Quarter 3 Pre-Assessment data. 0 students performed at Level 4 (0%), 0 students performed at Level 3 (0%), 1 student performed at Level 2 (3%) and 30 students performed at Level 1 (97%).<br><br>There were a total of 35 students with valid Quarter 3 Post Assessment data. This assessment measured the priority standards from Quarter 3 (1.NBT.2, 1.NBT.3, 1.NBT.4 and 1.NBT.6). 12 students performed at Level 1 (34%), 3 students performed at Level 2 (9%), 5 students performed at Level 3 (14%) and 16 students performed at Level 4 (46%). The 1st grade team was able to decrease students performing at Level 1 from 97% to 34% and increase proficiency for students at Level 2 from 3% to 9%, students at Level 3 from 0% to 14% and students at Level 4 from 0% to 46%. Teachers are continuing to engage in planning around priority standards and how to increase student dialogue during the launch and explore |

*Updated March 2022*

| | | During weekly data team meetings teachers will provide evidence of instructional strategies through student work and ACSD data points. Administrator walkthroughs/instructional rounds and classroom visits will allow for consistent monitoring of the implementation of Tier 1, standards aligned instruction. During weekly data team meetings teachers will provide evidence of instructional strategies through student work and ACSD data points. Embedded professional development will focus on teacher selection of student work samples for the debrief conversation centered on sequencing and connecting student work to create math meaning, link math ideas and relationships as well as making the math concepts visible and understandable. Coaching cycles will be utilized to model and/or co-teach the debrief section of the three phase instructional model. | parts of a math lesson. The 1st grade team is engaging in professional development around the Explore section of a LED lesson model that focuses on high leverage, rigorous tasks to promote reasoning and problem solving for all students. Below is the breakdown of growth based on the Quarter 2 Priority Standards assessed. 1.NBT.2: The team was able to increase proficiency from 9% to 61%. 1.NBT.3: There were 2 questions that addressed this standard. The team was able to increase proficiency from 9% to 61%. The team was able to increase proficiency from 3% to 72%. 1.NBT.4 The team was able to increase proficiency from 26% to 56%. 1.NBT.6: There were 2 questions that addressed this standard. The team was able to increase proficiency from 6% to 58% and 3% to 64%. 2nd Grade: There were a total of 42 students with valid Quarter 3 Pre-Assessment data. 0 students performed at Level 4 (0%), 0 students performed at Level 3 (0%), 0 students performed at Level 2 (0%) and 42 students performed at Level 1 (100%). There were a total of 44 students with valid Quarter 3 Post Assessment data. This assessment measured the priority standards from Quarter 2 (2.NBT.1, 2.NBT.4, 2.NBT.7, 2.NBT.9, 2.NBT.8, 2.NBT.2 and 2.MD.7 ). 27 students performed at Level 1 (61%), 4 students performed at Level 2 (9%), 5 students performed at Level 3 (11%) and 8 students performed at Level 4 (18%). The 2nd grade team was able to decrease students performing at Level 1 from 100% to 61% and increase proficiency for students at Level 2 from 0% to 9%. students at Level 3 from 0% to 11 % and students at Level 4 from 0% to 18%. Teachers are continuing to engage in planning around priority standards and how to increase student dialogue during |

the launch and explore parts of a math lesson. The 2nd grade team is engaging in professional development around the Explore section of a LED lesson model that focuses on high leverage, rigorous tasks to promote reasoning and problem solving for all students.

Below is the breakdown of growth based on the Quarter 2 Priority Standards assessed.

2.NBT.1 and 2.NBT.4: The team was able to increase proficiency from 7% to 57%.
2.NBT.1 and 2.NBT.7): The team was able to increase proficiency from 2% to 32%.
2.NBT.7 and 2.NBT.9: The team was able to increase proficiency from 0% to 23%.
2.NBT.8.: The team was able to increase proficiency from 2% to 48%.
2.NBT.2:  The team was able to increase proficiency from 7% to 50%.
2.MD.7: The team was able to increase proficiency from 0% to 30%.

**Trends**:
Our data shows movement within individual standards and domains for math in First and Second Grades, however, we are not moving students to 80% proficiency. We will continue to work on our Tier 1 practices related to math, increasing student voice and spiraling in pre-requisite standards through launch routines and high leverage explore routines.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| NWEA Reading Growth CGP - Grades 1 & 2 Cohort | | The instructional staff, literacy specialists, and ELA coach will review the mid- year data (NWEA, Easy CBM, Lori Strong, and Wonders Benchmarks) to analyze the Tier 1 support plan's effectiveness. | Easy CBM<br><br>**Kindergarten: Easy CBM Measure: Letter Sounds**<br>Class 1:  Winter Average: 18- Mid Point Average: 30<br>Notes:<br>● increased proficiency from 33%  to 56% |

| | | ELA coach will provide targeted professional development (PD) to all instructional staff on researched based strategies that support the retaining for mastery ( i.e. review, student reflection of learning and assessment with feedback) element of the Pedagogical Flow-Map (PFM), to focus on culturally responsive and rigorous student tasks. | ● decreased percent below from 33% to 13% |
|---|---|---|---|

ELA coach will provide targeted professional development (PD) to all instructional staff on researched based strategies that support the retaining for mastery ( i.e. review, student reflection of learning and assessment with feedback) element of the Pedagogical Flow-Map (PFM), to focus on culturally responsive and rigorous student tasks.

ELA coach will plan and provide four-week coaching cycles to support one grade level at a time with the development and implementation of rigorous tasks based on data (i.e. NWEA, easyCBM or Wonders data).

Intermediate CORE ELA teachers and the ELA coach will engage in vertically aligned coaching cycles that include peer observations based on the PFM, and development and implementation of rigorous writing tasks.

Communicate Lori Strong data with community organizations to add outside support; specifically Growing Readers Albany Public Library program, (library card registration); train volunteers on how to support students using the L. Strong deficit data in grades Kindergarten through 2nd grade.

Administrators will conduct informal walkthroughs and classroom visits of instructional staff to provide feedback on PD provided. Specifically

● decreased percent below from 33% to 13%

Class 2: Winter Average: 15- Mid Point Average: 24
Notes:
● increased proficiency from 24% to 27%
● decreased percent below from 29% to 20%

Class 3: Winter Average: 20- Mid Point Average: 25
Notes:
● increased proficiency from 31% to 44%
● increased percent below from 12% to 24%

**Grade 1: Easy CBM Measure: Word Reading Fluency**
Class 1: Winter Average: 19 words - Mid Point Average: 21 words
Notes:
● proficiency remained the same at 22%
● decreased percent below from 56% to 50%

Class 2: Winter Average: 18 words - Mid Point Average: 25 words
Notes:
● increased proficiency from 28% to 32%
● decreased percent below from 44% to 37%

**Grade 2 Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency**
Class 1: Winter Average 37 wpm to Mid Point Average: 47 wpm
Notes:
● increased proficiency from 13% to 17%
● decreased percent below from 57% to 52%

Class 2: Winter Average: 40 wpm to Mid Point Average: 50 wpm
Notes:
● increased proficiency from 15% to 20%
● percent below remained the same at 50%

**Grade 3: Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency**
Class 1: Winter Average: 88 wpm - Mid Point Average: 89 wpm
Notes:

| | | addressing student reflection of learning and rigor of student tasks.<br><br>The Building Leadership Team (BLT) will meet with the consultant to analyze the anecdotal notes from the walkthroughs to support planning of professional development (PD) to be offered to instructional staff.<br><br>ELA coach will use Parent University to build workshops based on the leaning gaps identified by Lori Strong results.<br><br>Teachers, reading teachers, and the ELA coach will meet monthly to evaluate Tier 1 data and plan instruction that supports students' needs.<br><br>ELA coach will provide targeted professional development (PD) to all instructional staff on researched based strategies that support the retaining for mastery ( i.e.review, student reflection of learning and assessment with feedback) element of the Pedagogical Flow-Map (PFM), to focus on asking additional questions that deepen student understanding and approach incorrect answers as learning opportunities. | •   proficiency increased from  29% to 38%<br>•   percent below remained the same at  24%<br>Class 2:  Winter Average 73 wpm - Mid Point Average: 71 wpm<br>Notes:<br>•   increased proficiency from 20% to 26%<br>•   increased percent below from 55% to 58%<br><br>**Grade 4: Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency**<br>Class 1: Winter Average: 111 wpm - Mi Point Average: 122 wpm<br>Notes:<br>•   increased proficiency from 56%  to 59%<br>•   decreased percent below from 25% to 18%<br>Class 2: Winter Average: 121 wpm - Mid Point Average: 118 wpm<br>Notes:<br>•   proficiency stayed the same at  50%<br>•   increased percent below from  13% to 17%<br>Class 3: Winter Average 118 wpm- Mid Point Average: 122 wpm<br>Notes:<br>•   increased  proficiency  from 36% to 42%<br>•   decreased percent  below from  21% to 17%<br><br>**Grade 5: Easy CBM Measure: Passage Read Fluency**<br><br>Class 1: Winter Average: 139 wpm- Mid Point Average: 150 wpm<br>Notes:<br>•   proficiency increased from 43% to 50%<br>  percent below increased from  0% to 7%<br>Class 2: Winter Average: 113 wpm- Mid Point Average: 109<br>Notes:<br>•   proficiency stayed the same at  31%<br>•   percent below increased from 38% to 46%<br>Class 3: Winter Average: 146 wpm- Mid Point Average: 158 wpm<br>Notes: |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | ● proficiency increased from 45% to 58%<br>● percent below increased from 0% to 8%<br><br>**Trends**:<br>Our data shows consistent movement of students who were below, but not moving into proficiency. Our data for on level and proficient students shows growth in all classrooms except three classrooms that held the same proficiency rate. However, there is not one classroom at 80% proficiency. Our 1st and 2nd grades are seeing the slowest proficiency growth rate increase. Four of our six 4th and 5th grade classrooms have proficiency rates at or above 50%. We will continue to focus on Tier 1 instructional practices during our professional development time. |

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

| **Community Engagement Team (CET)** |
|---|
| *The role of the CET is to serve as an active thought partners in contributing to and supporting the development of recommendations for school improvement through public engagement. Recommendations made by the CET, including how the school community (i.e., school principal, parents and guardians, teachers and other school staff and students) was engaged to seek input/feedback to guide implementation of the school's improvement plan, should be addressed in response to the prompts below.* |

| Report Out of 2021-22 CET Plan Implementation | |
|---|---|
| ● List the categories of stakeholders that have participated as members this reporting period.<br><br>● Include any changes made to the CET's membership since the development of the Quarter #2 Report. Include the role/title of any new members. | Describe how recommendations made by the CET during this reporting period were used to inform implementation of the school's improvement plan. |
| ● Administrators<br>● Teachers<br>● Parents<br>● Community School Site Coordinator<br>● Home School Coordinators<br>● Community Members | The CET met on April 12, 2022 to review and discuss the implementation of the improvement plan and made recommendations prior to the submission of this quarterly report |

| | |
|---|---|
| ● School Program Providers<br>No changes made to the CET this reporting period. | |

**Part V** - *Receivership Powers*

**Powers of the Receiver**

*Provide a summary of the use of the School Receiver's powers* ***during this reporting period***.

The School Receiver negotiated with the Teachers' Union, and an MOA was passed which added an additional two hours of professional development for instructional staff.  Each of these professional development hours have been directly connected to the SCEP strategies identified above to lift practices of instructors as it applies to CORE ELA and MATH instruction.

*Updated March 2022*

**New York State
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT**
Knowledge › Skill › Opportunity

## Part VI – *Assurance and Attestation*

By signing below, I attest to the fact that the information in this Receivership 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 Commissioner's Regulation §100.19 have been met.

Name of Receiver (Print):  _____

Signature of Receiver:  _____

Date:  _____


By signing below, I attest to the fact that the Community Engagement Team has had the opportunity to provide input into this Receivership Quarterly Report, and has had the opportunity to review, and update as necessary, the 2021-2022 Community Engagement Team plan and membership.

Name of CET Representative (Print):  _____Janis Adams_____

Signature of CET Representative:  _____*Janis Adams*_____

Title of CET Representative:  _____Community Member_____

Date:  _____4/12/2022_____

*Updated March 2022*