

George L Catrambone

District: LONG BRANCH CITY

County: MONMOUTH

Team: NA

School Identification: NA

Targeted Subgroup

CDS: 252770300

Annual School Planning 2020-2021

ASP Development Team Members

Stakeholder Representative Title	Name	Comprehensive Analysis and Needs	Root Cause Analysis	Smart Goal Development	Signature	Date
Principal	Christopher Volpe	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Vice Principal	Michelle Merckx	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Building Representative	Maria Maisto	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Bilingual Teacher Representative	Kelly Vargas	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Teacher Representative	Katie Wachter	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Teacher Representative	Laura Tracey	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Teacher Representative	Maria Manzo	Yes	Yes	Yes		
ELL Teacher Representative	Elizabeth Betsy	Yes	Yes	Yes		

Stakeholder Representative Title	Name	Comprehensive Analysis and Needs	Root Cause Analysis	Smart Goal Development	Signature	Date
Guidance Counselor	Gabriela Stanziale	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Guidance Counselor	Carlos Villacres	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Teacher Representative	Laurie DeMuro	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Teacher Representative	Lisa Roesch	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Paraprofessional	Dudley Davis	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Parent Representative	Daniela Stabile	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Parent Representative	Renee White	Yes	Yes	Yes		

ASP Development Team Meetings

Date	Topic	Agenda Uploaded	Minutes Uploaded
09/19/2019	Prior Year Evaluation	Yes	Yes
10/24/2019	Comprehensive Data Analysis and Needs Assessment	Yes	Yes
11/20/2019	Priority Performance Needs and Root Cause Analysis	Yes	Yes
12/11/2019	Priority Performance Needs and Root Cause Analysis	Yes	Yes
01/23/2020	Smart Goal Development	Yes	Yes
02/19/2020	Smart Goal Development	Yes	Yes

Evaluation of Prior Year Interventions and Data Analysis

PRIOR YEAR INTERVENTIONS

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
<p>The Treasures McGraw-Hill Literacy Program has been used as a core reading program at the George L. Catrambone School. This research-based program, provides teachers with the tools and strategies to drive ELA instruction in our K-5 classrooms. Teachers infuse a balanced literacy approach with guided reading lessons and framework. Evidence based interventions are implemented to support students with low academic growth in reading.</p>	<p>English and Language Arts</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The LinkIt! Reading Benchmark A is administered to all students in September. This is used as a baseline reading assessment that will allow teachers to tier their students according to level and needs. The results of the benchmark enables teachers to look closely at the New Jersey Student Learning Standards and focus on specific skills. Students take a mid-year, Benchmark B, for teachers to assess growth and progress and alter instruction as needed. The final assessment, Benchmark C, is administered at the end of the year and used as a comparison for year-long growth and anticipated achievement. The Linkit! Benchmarks are an integral part in determining student needs in ELA and helpful for teachers to utilize the appropriate interventions from the Treasures Program. However, because of Covid-19, all Long Branch Schools were closed effective March 13, 2020 and we were unable to administer Benchmark C. Data from ELA Linkit Benchmark A,</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
						<p>(September 2019) to Benchmark B, (December 2019) shows the following: Grade 2 increased from an average test score of 28% on form A to 31.7% on form B (increase of 3.7%). Grade 3 increased from an average test score of 27% on form A to 38.3% on form B (increase of 11.3%). Grade 4 increased from an average test score of 29% on form A to 42.3% on form B (increase of 13.3%). Grade 5 increased from an average test score of 43.3% on form A to 46.2% on form B (increase of 2.9%).</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
<p>The Everyday Mathematics Curriculum has been the math curriculum for several years at GLC School. This is a research-based and field-tested program designed to develop student's understanding in math. Teachers use real-life examples to introduce key concepts and help build a foundation with mathematical skills. The premise of this program is that students work in whole-group, small-group, and individually. Evidence based interventions are utilized to support students with low academic growth in math.</p>	<p>Mathematics</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The LinkIt! Mathematics Benchmark A is administered to all students in September. This is used as a baseline math assessment that will allow teachers to tier their students according to level and needs. The results of the benchmark enables teachers to look closely at the New Jersey Student Learning Standards and focus on specific skills. Students take a mid-year, Benchmark B, for teachers to assess growth and progress and alter instruction as needed. The final assessment, Benchmark C, is administered at the end of the year and used as a comparison for year-long growth and anticipated achievement. The Linkit! Benchmarks are an integral part in determining student needs in mathematics and helpful for teachers to utilize the appropriate interventions from the Everyday Math Program. However, because of Covid-19, all Long Branch Schools were closed effective March 13, 2020 and we were unable to administer Benchmark C. Data from MATH Linkit Benchmark A, (September 2019) to Benchmark B, (December 2019) shows the following: Grade 1 increased from an average test score of 41.8% on form A to</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
						<p>74.8% on form B (increase of 33%). Grade 2 increased from an average test score of 36.6% on form A to 60.7% on form B (increase of 24.1%). Grade 3 increased from an average test score of 27.6% on form A to 45.5% on form B (increase of 17.9%). Grade 4 increased from an average test score of 31.6% on form A to 49.6% on form B (increase of 18%). Grade 5 increased from an average test score of 30.4% on form A to 55.6% on form B (increase of 25.2%).</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
<p>Guided Reading gives teachers the opportunity to observe as they read from texts at their instructional reading levels. The teacher works with a small group of students (6 or less) performing at the same instructional level. Small group instruction is driven by formal and informal data. During small group the teacher selects students to observe while they whisper read. The teacher listens closely and collects data based on observations and questioning. As students read, the teachers should prompt and coach as needed. Teacher</p>	<p>English and Language Arts</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The evidence of effectiveness of guided reading are evident through three data measures, the Diagnostic Reading Assessment, the Reading Inventory, and the ELA Linkit! Benchmarks. From October 2019 to January 2020 the average of 1st grade students on grade level increased from 24.6% to 34.7% (increase of 10.1%). The average 2nd grade students on grade level decreased from 49.6% to 47.4% (decrease of 2.2%). The average 3rd grade students on grade level decreased from 38.0% to 28.3%(decrease of 9.7%). 4th and 5th grade students were not all assessed using DRA data, however, 4th grade lexile ranges are measured by the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) assessment from September to January decreased from 46.5% of students on grade level to 44.4% students on grade level (decrease of 2.1%). 5th grade students decreased from 41.9% of students on grade level to 38.5% of students on grade level (decrease of 3.4%). Due to Covid-19 students were not tested one more time for the DRA and two more times for the SRI (Scholastic Reading Inventory). Data from ELA Linkit Benchmark A, (September 2019)</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
<p>scaffolds and guides readers with strategies that will help them become independent readers. Data collected through small group instruction is then used to plan future lessons.</p>						<p>to Benchmark B, (December 2019) shows the following: Grade 2 increased from an average test score of 28% on form A to 31.7% on form B (increase of 3.7%). Grade 3 increased from an average test score of 27% on form A to 38.3% on form B (increase of 11.3%). Grade 4 increased from an average test score of 29% on form A to 42.3% on form B (increase of 13.3%). Grade 5 increased from an average test score of 43.3% on form A to 46.2% on form B (increase of 2.9%). Students would have been assessed one more time in May for Benchmark C.</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
<p>Small Group Strategy Instruction is a support system that brings learners together to practice a particular skill or strategy in texts that are easily accessible. The objective is to create a supportive context in which strategies are practiced while the teacher coaches and scaffolds for independence. The goal is for students to problem-solve, doing as much of the work themselves as possible, while the teacher coaches and extends understanding.</p>	<p>English and Language Arts</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The DRA-2 provides teachers with expectations per grade level. It is suggested by the end of the school year (EOY) students attain the following DRA score: Grade 1 EOY score of 16. Grade 2: EOY score of 28. Grade 3: EOY score of 38. This guidance helps teachers track student progress and assess low growth readers. Teachers can make specific goals for students and work on those goals during small group instruction. The test is administered 3 times a year in October, January, and May. However, May was not administered due to Covid-19, all Long Branch Schools were closed effective March 13, 2020. DRA2 data from the baseline (October 2019) to Mid Year (January 2019) shows that 24.6% of 1st grade students were on grade level for the baseline DRA2 and 34.7% of 1st grade students were on grade level for the mid year DRA2 assessment (increase of 10.1%). In 2nd grade 49.6% of students were on grade level for the baseline DRA2 and 47.4% of 2nd grade students were on grade level for the mid year DRA2 assessment (decrease of 2.2%). In 3rd grade 38.0% of students were on grade level for the baseline DRA2 and</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
						28.3 of 3rd grade students were on grade level for the mid year DRA2 assessment (decrease of 9.7%). The DRA2 will continue to be implemented with additional teacher PD focused on using data collected to implement targeted strategies identified on the DRA2 focus for instruction.
<p>Research has shown that parental involvement in their child's education as shown an increase in student achievement both socially and academically. The George L. Catrambone School has focused on increasing parental involvement in both educational and non-educational activities both in and outside the classroom which is evidenced through parent sign-in sheets and events.</p>	<p>Parent Involvement</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>George L. Catrambone School recorded 75% attendance at Back to School Night and 95% attendance at Fall Conferences. Spring Conferences did not occur this year due to Covid-19 all Long Branch Schools were closed effective March 13, 2020 . Average attendance for parent visitation week for in class activities was 40% which was the same as last year.</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
<p>The George L. Catrambone School offered an after-school tutorial program for students identified in 2nd through 5th grade below proficiency on two indicators, Linkit Mathematics Form A and/or Linkit ELA Form A. Tutors used a project based model to address learning gaps and specific skills during instruction. Additionally, the IXL online program was utilized for supplemental instruction and reinforcement of identified skills in need of improvement.</p>	<p>English Language Arts and Mathematics</p>	<p>2nd-5th Grade</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Title I Extended Learning Day Tutors worked in conjunction with homeroom teachers to track academic growth. The DRA2 Assessment, Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) and progress monitoring through Linkit! benchmarks were used to measure and track progress. After analyzing the results from September 2019 to March 2020 there was a notable improvement in those students who were tutored with their DRA2, SRI, and Math benchmark. The average growth for tutoring students in grade 2 for the DRA2 was 3.6 levels, 130 lexile points for the SRI, and a 21.52% increase from Math Benchmark A to Math Benchmark B. The average growth for tutoring students in grade 3 for the DRA2 was 4.83 levels, 128 lexile points for the SRI, and a 10.25% increase from Math Benchmark A to Math Benchmark B. The average growth for tutoring students in grade 4 for the DRA2 was 7.22 levels, 77.56% lexile points for the SRI, and a 18.25% increase from Math Benchmark A to Math Benchmark B. The average growth for tutoring students in grade 5 for the DRA2 was 5.11 levels, 78.60% lexile points for the SRI, and a 20.25% increase from Math Benchmark A to</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
						Math Benchmark B.

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
<p>The Treasures McGraw-Hill Literacy Program has been used as a core reading program at the George L. Catrambone School. This research-based program, provides teachers with the tools and strategies to drive ELA instruction in our K-5 classrooms. Teachers infuse a balanced literacy approach with guided reading lessons and framework. Evidence based interventions are implemented to support students with low academic growth in reading.</p>	<p>English and Language Arts</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Scholastic Reading Inventory is a reading comprehension assessment tool that helps educators monitor the growth of reading comprehension skills on the Lexile Framework for Reading, a scientifically accurate system for matching readers to texts. Students complete the SRI at the end of each marking period. Once a reader has been measured, it is possible to forecast how well the reader will likely comprehend hundreds of thousands of texts that have been analyzed using the Lexile metric. Students complete the SRI at the end of each marking period. End of year grade-level Lexile expectations are as follows; Grade 2 - 420, Grade 3 - 520, Grade 4 - 740, and Grade 5 - 830. Two more SRI assessments would have been administered but due to Covid-19 all Long Branch Schools were closed effective March 13, 2020 Data from September 2019 to January 2020 show an increase in the average reading lexile for students in Grades 2-5. From September 2019 to January 2020 Grade 2 students increased their lexile mean average from 116 to 232. Grade 3 students increased their lexile mean average from 299 to 375. Grade 4 students increased their lexile</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
						<p>mean average from 469 to 519. Grade 5 students increased their lexile mean average from 616 to 665. The results have shown steady growth in reading level for students in Grade 2-5, however, the majority of students are still performing below grade level. Through increased PD supporting balanced literacy instruction and data driven differentiated instruction, we anticipate student lexile scores in grades 2-5 to improve at an increased rate.</p>

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data						Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
NJSLA Proficiency	Consider comparing previous year's and current year's NJSLA results in the noted subject areas. <a 231="" 271"="" 347="" 444="" href="http://www.nj.gov/education/schools/achievement/target='_blank'>Link to website with access to reports. </td> <td data-bbox=">Student Group	ELA	Math	Alg1	Alg2	Geo	2018-2019 NJSLA ELA Grade 5: Not Meeting: 12% Partially Meeting: 21% Approaching: 34% Meeting: 31% Exceeding: 2% 2018-2019 NJSLA MATH Grade 5: Not Meeting: 11% Partially Meeting: 24% Approaching: 38% Meeting: 27% Exceeding: 1% 2018-2019 NJSLA ELA Grade 4: Not Meeting: 23% Partially Meeting: 23% Approaching: 25% Meeting: 27% Exceeding: 2% 2018-2019 NJSLA MATH Grade 4: Not Meeting: 17% Partially Meeting: 25% Approaching: 27% Meeting: 31% Exceeding: 0% 2018-2019 NJSLA ELA	When analyzing the 2018-2019 NJSLA Evidence Table in determining areas in need of improvement and reviewing our own internal benchmark data, the data showed weakness in the following areas of English Language Arts: Students in grade 3 demonstrated difficulty with standards in Reading: Literature (RL 3.2.3) and Reading: Informational Text (RL 3.9-1). Students in grade 4 demonstrated difficulty with standards Reading: Informational Text (RI 4.9.1 and RI 4.7.1). Students in grade 5 demonstrated difficulty with standards Reading: Informational Text (RI 5.9.1 and RI 5.6.2). When analyzing the	
		Schoolwide	27.9 %	31.2%					
		White	40.9 %	40.3%					
		Hispanic	23.3 %	28.7%					
		Black or African American	21.4 %	21.4%					
		Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	*	*					
		American Indian or Alaska Native							
		Two or More Races	*	*					
		Female	30.6 %	34.5%					
		Male	25.3 %	28.1%					
		Economically Disadvantaged Students	26.8 %	30%					
		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Students	43.3 %	47.1%					
		Students with Disabilities	10%	10%					
		Students without Disabilities	28.7 %	32.2%					
		English Learners	22.3 %	28.8%					
Non-English Learners	36.4 %	35.2%							
Homeless Students	*	*							
Students in Foster Care	*	*							

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data					Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends	
		Student Group	ELA	Math	Alg1	Alg2	Geo	Grade 3: Not Meeting: 30% Partially Meeting: 31% Approaching: 19% Meeting: 20% Exceeding: 0%	2018-2019 NJSLA Evidence Table in determining areas in need of improvement and reviewing our own internal benchmark data, the data showed weakness in the following areas of Math: Students in grade 3 demonstrated difficulty with standards in Numbers & Operations-Fractions (NF.) and Measurement & Data (3.MD.5). Students in grade 4 demonstrated difficulty with standards in Measurement & Data (4.MD.4-2 and 4.MD.2-2), Geometry (4.G.2), and Modeling & Reasoning (4.C.5-6). Students in grade 5 demonstrated difficulty with standards in Modeling & Reasoning (5.C.8-2), Measurement & Data (5.MD.1-1), Numbers & Operation-Fractions (5.NF.7.c and 5.NF.1-4), and Number & Operations in Base 10
		Military-Connected Students	*	*					
		Migrant Students							
							2018-2019 NJSLA MATH Grade 3: Not Meeting: 8% Partially Meeting: 26% Approaching: 33% Meeting: 30% Exceeding: 3%		

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data	Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
				(5.NBT.7-4).

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data				Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
Science	NJSLA Science Homepage, https://measinc-nj-science.com/	NJSLA-S				7.2% of grade 5 students from George L. Catrambone School performed on level 3 or higher for the NJSLA Science. Gender Female: 6.8% Male: 7.5% Ethnicity/Race Hispanic/Latino: 3.0% American Indian or Alaska Native: 0% Asian: 0% Black or African American: 0% Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander: 0% White: 19.5% Two or more races: 0% Not indicated: 0% Students with Disabilities IEP: 0% 504: 0% English Language Learner Current EL: 0% Former EL students: 13.3% Other Economically Disadvantaged: 6.9% Non Economically Disadvantaged: 12.5%	When analyzing the grade 5 NJSLA Science Performance Report the average scale score for the state was 170. The average scale score for the district was 140 as well as the average scale score for the school. 29.2% of grade 5 students in the state scored on level 3 or higher. 9.2% of 5th grade students in the Long Branch District scored on level 3 or higher and 7.2% of grade 5 students in George L. Catrambone scored on level 3 or higher.
		Student Group	Grade 5	Grade 8	Grade 11		
		Schoolwide	7%				
		White	19%				
		Hispanic	3%				
		Black or African	0%				
		Asian, Native	*				
		American Indian or	*				
		Two or More Races	*				
		Female	7%				
		Male	8%				
		Economical ly					
		Non-Economical					
		Students with					

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data				Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
		Student Group	Grade 5	Grade 8	Grade 11	Homeless: 0% Migrant: 0%	
		Students without					
		English Learners	0%				
		Non-English	11%				
		Homeless Students	*				
		Students in Foster Care					
		Military-Connected					
		Migrant Students	*				

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data			Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
SGP	Student growth on state assessments. (Grades 4-8) *Identify overall school wide growth performance by content. *Identify interaction between student proficiency level.	Student Group	ELA	Math	The following a further breakdown of scored by grade level and subject over a two year period of time meeting or exceeding: NJSLA ELA Grade 4: 2017-2018: 21% 2018-2019: 29% NJSLA MATH Grade 4: 2017-2018: 29% 2018-2019: 31% NJSLA ELA Grade 5: 2017-2018: 36% 2018-2019: 33% NJSLA MATH Grade 5: 2017-2018: 39% 2018-2019: 28%	When analyzing the 2018-2019 NJSLA Evidence Table in determining areas in need of improvement and reviewing our own internal benchmark data, the data showed weakness in the following areas of English Language Arts: Students in grade 4 demonstrated difficulty with standards Reading: Informational Text (RI 4.9.1 and RI 4.7.1). Students in grade 5 demonstrated difficulty with standards Reading: Informational Text (RI 5.9.1 and RI 5.6.2). When analyzing the 2018-2019 NJSLA Evidence Table in determining areas in need of improvement and reviewing our own internal benchmark data, the data showed weakness in the
		Schoolwide	58.5%	52%		
		White	74%	54.5%		
		Hispanic	57%	50%		
		Black or African American	42.5%	54%		
		Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific				
		American Indian or Alaska Native				
		Two or More Races	*	*		
		Female	56%	55%		
		Male	59%	50%		
		Economically Disadvantaged	58%	53.5%		
		Non-Economically Disadvantaged				
		Students with Disabilities	44%	35%		
Students without Disabilities						

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data			Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
		Student Group	ELA	Math		<p>following areas of Math: Students in grade 4 demonstrated difficulty with standards in Measurement & Data (4.MD.4-2 and 4.MD.2-2), Geometry (4.G.2), and Modeling & Reasoning (4.C.5-6). Students in grade 5 demonstrated difficulty with standards in Modeling & Reasoning (5.C.8-2), Measurement & Data (5.MD.1-1), Numbers & Operation-Fractions (5.NF.7.c and 5.NF.1-4), and Number & Operations in Base 10 (5.NBT.7-4).</p>
		English Learners	58.5%	57%		
		Non-English Learners				
		Homeless Students	*	*		
		Students in Foster Care	*	*		
		Military-Connected Students	*	*		
		Migrant Students				

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data					Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
Benchmark Assessment Participation	Please list any cycles where the 95% participation rate was not met. Please provide explanation. *Identify patterns by subgroup *Identify patterns by grade	ELA					100% of students participated in Benchmark Assessments.	There are no established patterns for non participation on Benchmark Assessments. Teachers provide students with the opportunities to complete the tests as well as allow makeup time for absences.
		Grade	Cycle 1	Cyclle 2	Cycle 3	Cycle 4		
		K	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		1	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		2	100%	100%	0%	0%		
		3	100%	100%	0%	0%		
		4	100%	100%	0%	0%		
		5	100%	100%	0%	0%		
		6	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		7	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		8	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		9	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		10	0%	0%	0%	0%		
11	0%	0%	0%	0%				

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data					Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
		Grade	Cycle 1	Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Cycle 4		
		12	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		Math						
		Grade	Cycle 1	Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Cycle 4		
		K	100%	100%	0%	0%		
		1	100%	100%	0%	0%		
		2	100%	100%	0%	0%		
		3	100%	100%	0%	0%		
		4	100%	100%	0%	0%		
		5	100%	100%	0%	0%		
		6	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		7	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		8	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		9	0%	0%	0%	0%		

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data					Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
		Grade	Cycle 1	Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Cycle 4		
		10	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		11	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		12	0%	0%	0%	0%		

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data					Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
Benchmark Assessment (Proficiency) ELA Rates	Please share results of analysis of % passing, including YTD analysis by grades and subgroups. *Identify patterns by grade/subgroups *Identify patterns by chronic absenteeism *Identify patterns by students with chronic disciplinary infractions	Grade	Cycle 1	Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Cycle 4	Data from ELA Linkit Benchmark A, (September 2019) to Benchmark B, (December 2019) shows the following: Grade 2 increased from an average test score of 28% on form A to 31.7% on form B (increase of 3.7%). Grade 3 increased from an average test score of 27% on form A to 38.3% on form B (increase of 11.3%). Grade 4 increased from an average test score of 29% on form A to 42.3% on form B (increase of 13.3%). Grade 5 increased from an average test score of 43.3% on form A to 46.2% on form B (increase of 2.9%). Although there has been an increase in overall growth in all grades, we were unable to administer ELA Benchmark C due to Covid 19 to see the full potential growth from beginning to end of 2019-2020 school year.	Trends include: Grade 2: Increased a total of 3.7% from Benchmark A to B Grade 3: Increased a total of 11.3% from Benchmark A to B Grade 4: Increased a total of 13.3% from Benchmark A to B Grade 5: Increased a total of 2.9% from Benchmark A to B In analyzing trends and benchmark scores for the 2019-2020 school year, we anticipate a continued increase in average percentages per grade level for the 2020-2021 school year.
		K	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		1	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		2	3%	3%	0%	0%		
		3	9%	9%	0%	0%		
		4	4%	8%	0%	0%		
		5	27%	26%	0%	0%		
		6	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		7	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		8	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		9	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		10	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		11	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		12	0%	0%	0%	0%		

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data					Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
Benchmark Assessment (Proficiency) Math Rates	Please share results of analysis of % passing, including YTD analysis by grades and subgroups. *Identify patterns by grade/subgroups *Identify patterns by chronic absenteeism *Identify patterns by students with chronic disciplinary infractions	Grade	Cycle 1	Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Cycle 4	Data from MATH Linkit Benchmark A, (September 2019) to Benchmark B, (December 2019) shows the following: Grade 1 increased from an average test score of 41.8% on form A to 74.8% on form B (increase of 33%). Grade 2 increased from an average test score of 36.6% on form A to 60.7% on form B (increase of 24.1%). Grade 3 increased from an average test score of 27.6% on form A to 45.5% on form B (increase of 17.9%). Grade 4 increased from an average test score of 31.6% on form A to 49.6% on form B (increase of 18%). Grade 5 increased from an average test score of 30.4% on form A to 55.6% on form B (increase of 25.2%). Although there has been an increase in overall growth in all grades, we were unable to administer MATH Benchmark C due to Covid 19 to see the full potential growth from beginning to end of 2019-2020 school year.	Trends include: Grade 1: Increased a total of 33% from Benchmark A to B Grade 2: Increased a total of 24.1% from Benchmark A to B Grade 3: Increased a total of 17.9% from Benchmark A to B Grade 4: Increased a total of 18% from Benchmark A to B Grade 5: Increased a total of 25.2% from Benchmark A to B
		K	71%	74%	0%	0%		
		1	35%	72%	0%	0%		
		2	14%	28%	0%	0%		
		3	10%	14%	0%	0%		
		4	12%	20%	0%	0%		
		5	5%	16%	0%	0%		
		6	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		7	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		8	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		9	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		10	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		11	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		12	0%	0%	0%	0%		

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data		Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
English Language Proficiency (ELP)	Student progress to English Language Proficiency (Grades K-12).	Percent of English Learners Making Expected Growth to	41.3%	<p>Grade: K Cluster: K Entering: 39% Emerging: 23% Developing: 10% Expanding: 26% Bridging: 3% Reaching: 0%</p> <p>Grade: 1 Cluster: 1 Entering: 3% Emerging: 27% Developing: 60% Expanding: 8% Bridging: 0% Reaching: 0%</p> <p>Grade: 2 Cluster: 2-3 Entering: 10% Emerging: 15% Developing: 57% Expanding: 15% Bridging: 0% Reaching: 0%</p> <p>Grade: 3 Cluster: 2-3 Entering: 10% Emerging: 16% Developing: 46% Expanding: 22% Bridging: 1% Reaching: 0%</p> <p>Grade: 4 Cluster: 4-5 Entering: 11% Emerging: 9% Developing: 34%</p>	<p>When analyzing the Frequency Report for the ACCESS for ELL's it was found that Grade 2 Cluster 2-3 had the most students assessed with 110 students. In that cluster, 57% of students are considered Developing - Knows and uses social English and some specific academic language with visual and graphic support. In fact, Grades K-3 the highest percentage of students assessed are considered Developing- (Knows and uses social English and some specific academic language with visual and graphic support). Grade 4 Cluster 4-5 had an equal percentage of students in Developing and Expanding- (Knows and uses social English and some technical academic</p>

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data	Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
			<p>Expanding: 34% Bridging: 11% Reaching: 0%</p> <p>Grade: 5 Cluster: 4-5 Entering: 14% Emerging: 20% Developing: 10% Expanding: 45% Bridging: 8% Reaching: 4%</p>	<p>language). Grade 5 Cluster 4-5 had the most percentage of students in Expanding- (Knows and uses social English and some technical academic language). These results show the higher grades have a higher proficiency level.</p>

CLIMATE & CULTURE					
Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data		Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
Enrollment	Number of students enrolled in your building *Identify overall enrollment trends *Identify enrollment by grade and subgroup	Overall YTD Student Enrollment Average	898	Overall enrollment: Kindergarten: 57 students Grade 1: 146 students Grade 2: 149 students Grade 3: 189 students Grade 4: 179 students Grade 5: 178 students	Student enrollment remains consistent from 2018-2019 and 2019-2020. 2019-2020 school year has increased by 25 students. Overall YTD Student Enrollment Average: 2018-2019: 873 students 2019-2020: 898 students
		Subgroup 1 YTD Student Enrollment Average	0		
		Subgroup 2 YTD Student Enrollment Average	0		
Attendance Rate (Students)	The average daily attendance for students in your building *Identify patterns by grade *Identify patterns by teacher *Identify interventions	Overall YTD Student Attendance Average	95.88%	September: 97% October: 97% November: 96% December: 95% January: 94% February: 95% March: n/a due to Covid-19 April: n/a due to Covid-19 May: n/a due to Covid-19 June: n/a due to Covid-19	Daily attendance remains consistent throughout the school year, averaging around 96% which was the same as 2018-2019 school year. No trends observed as this is a school wide and district issue. January had a slight decline due to the increase of the flu that kept many students home.
		Subgroup 1 YTD Student	0.00%		
		Subgroup 2 YTD Student Attendance Average	0.00%		

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data		Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
Chronic Absenteeism (Students)	Chronic absenteeism is defined as the percentage of students who are absent 10% or more of the days between the start of school to the current date ("year to date") and includes both excused and unexcused absences. For chronic absenteeism for students in your building *Identify patterns by grade *Identify patterns by teacher *Identify interventions	Overall YTD Chronic Absenteeism	0.00%	The following are students of students who are absent 10% or more: Kindergarten: 6% Grade 1: 9% Grade 2: 4% Grade 3: 11% Grade 4: 10% Grade 5: 9%	Chronic absenteeism is trending in the right direction. It continues to be a focus of the guidance department. Attendance initiatives have been implemented school wide and attendance numbers have improved. Students are identified as chronically absent at weekly meetings with guidance counselors and administration. Following a tiered model, phone calls are made, parent meetings are set up and chronic absenteeism is monitored and tracked.
		Subgroup 1 YTD Chronic	0.00%		
		Subgroup 2 YTD Chronic Absenteeism	0.00%		

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data		Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
Attendance Rate (Staff)	<p>The average daily attendance for staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Identify patterns by grade *Identify chronic absenteeism *Identify reasons for absenteeism 	Staff Attendance YTD	95.53%	<p>Of the Days Taken:</p> <p>Comp. Time: 7 days Dock/Unpaid Day: 6 days Floating Holiday: 0 days Leave/Unpaid Days: 89 days Sick: 370 days Sick Less Sub: 0 days Urgent Business: 69 days Vacation: 70 days</p> <p>Staff attendance excluding maternity or medical leaves: September: 34 absences October: 78 absences November: 53 absences December: 66 absences January: 114 absences February: 75 absences March: 75 absences April: 35 absences May: 9 absences June: 4 absences</p>	<p>These numbers are consistent with previous years. January there was an increase in sick days due to the flu.</p> <p>George L. Catrambone School has used Child Rearing Leave Days, Death-Immediate Family Days, Maternity Leave Days and Workers and Compensation Days.</p>

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data		Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
Discipline	The number of suspensions, expulsions, and incident reports *Identify types of incidents *Identify patterns by subgroup *Identify chronic offenders	Student Suspension YTD Average - In School	0.68%	Students Suspension (in school): September: 13 students October: 20 students November: 7 students December: 16 students January: 14 students February: 5 students March: 4 students April: n/a due to Covid-19 May: n/a due to Covid-19 June: n/a due to Covid-19 Students Suspension (out of school): September: 1 student October: 1 student November: 1 student December: 1 student January: 1 student February: 2 students March: 0 students April: n/a due to Covid-19 May: n/a due to Covid-19 June: n/a due to Covid-19	Incidents are categorized by those that show disrespect towards peers, profanity, and insubordination. ISS is given to students that continuously show disrespect, profanity, insubordination, as well as theft. Some of these students are repeated offenders. George L. Catrambone continues Peer Mediation Program and SEL (Social and Emotional Learning) was implemented with Peekapack as an intervention to decrease the number of suspensions, expulsions, and incident reports as a focus for our school improvement plan.
		Student Suspension YTD Average - In School for Subgroup 1	0.00%		
		Student Suspension YTD Average - In School for Subgroup 2	0.00%		
		Student Suspension YTD Average - Out of School	0.12%		
		Student Suspension YTD Average - Out of School for Subgroup 1	0.00%		
		Student Suspension YTD Average - Out of School for Subgroup 2	0.00%		

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data	Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
Climate & Culture Surveys	Results from surveys *Identify staff satisfaction and support *Identify perception of the environment *Identify perceptions of students *Identify perceptions of family		The total Domain Scores for the 2019-2020 NJSCS Climate Surveys are as follows: Physical Environment: (ES):81.8 (S):41.2 (P): 88.9 Teaching and Learning: (ES):60.4 (S):50.7 (P):88.9 Morale in School Community: (ES):77.2 (P): 86.3 Student Relationships: (ES):36.8 (P): 85.6 Parental Support: (ES):83.1 (P): 85.3 Safety: (ES):81.6 (S):31.4(P): 86.9 Emotional Environment: (ES):60.0 (S): 33.1	The Domain Scores from the Parents Survey all averaged around about the same. Physical Environment and Teaching and Learning had the highest Parent Domain score of 88.9. The Domain Scores from the Student survey revealed Parental Support received the highest Domain of 83.1 and Student Relationship received the lowest Domain of 36.8. The Domain Scores from the Staff survey revealed Teaching and Learning received the highest Domain of 50.7 and Safety received the lowest Domain of 31.4.

COLLEGE & CAREER READINESS						
Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data			Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
Graduation Cohort (HS ONLY)	What interventions are in place for students at risk? Examples of what could cause a student to be at risk: * under credited * chronically absent * frequent suspension (* - Data suppressed)	Student Group	5 Year Rate	4 Year Rate		
		Schoolwide				
		White				
		Hispanic				
		Black or African American				
		Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander				
		American Indian or Alaska Native				
		Two or More Races				
		Economically Disadvantaged Students				
		Students with Disabilities				
		English Learners				
		Homeless Students				
Students in Foster Care						

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data	Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
Post-Secondary Rates	% of students that enroll in post-secondary institution.			
College Readiness Test Participation	Percentage of students enrolled in the 12th grade who took the SAT or ACT and the percentage of students enrolled in 10th and 11th grade who took the PSAT			
Algebra	Previous year's data provided. Please provide current year's data if possible.			

EVALUATION INFORMATION

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where Possible)		Your Data (Provide only additional data)	Observations / Trends
Classroom Observations	Teacher practice as measured on state-approved teacher practice instrument *Identify % of teachers on CAP in the previous school year *Identify instructional trends *Identify professional development needs	Evaluation framework	McRel Evaluation Tool	2019-2020 school year there are 2 staff members on CAP. 2018-2019 school year there were 2 staff members on CAP. 2017-2018 school year there were 0 staff members on a CAP. 2016-2017 school year there were 3 staff members were on a CAP.	Similarities between the two teachers on CAP include lack of implementing best researched practices and using data to tailor instruction. All staff were provided with professional development in data analysis and the effective use of data in instructional planning by administration and content level supervisors. 2019-2020 school year there are 2 staff members on CAP. 2018-2019 school year there were 2 staff members on CAP. 2017-2018 school year there were 0 staff members on a CAP. 2016-2017 school year there were 3 staff members were on a CAP. This data shows that the number of teachers on
Observation Waiver?	Yes	# Teachers to Evaluate	57		
# Non-tenure teachers (years 1 & 2)	5	# Non-tenure teachers (years 3 & 4)	1		
# Teachers on CAP	2	# Teachers receiving mSGP	16		
Observations	Total	# Scheduled	120		
# Completed	120	# Highly Effective	0		
# Effective	0				

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where Possible)		Your Data (Provide only additional data)	Observations / Trends
		Observations	Total		CAP have stayed consistent.
		# Partially Effective	0		
		# Ineffective	0		

< Other Indicators - NO DATA >

Process Questions and Growth and Reflection Tool

Component	Indicator Descriptor Level		Overall Strengths Summary	Areas of Focus Summary	
Standards, Student Learning Objectives (SLOs), and Effective Instruction	1	A	3-Developing	<p>George L. Catrambone's staff meets twice a week in Professional Learning Communities. During these PLC's staff members are given the opportunity to work with colleagues in both the same grade level and/or department to create guiding questions and student learning objectives to meet standards. This time also allows for staff to collaboratively analyze student data and discuss which instruction strategies/models/activities and resources contribute to successful student outcomes.</p>	<p>Additional time may be spent on identifying career ready practices and giving educators the knowledge on how to implement, revise and reflect student learning objectives so that they are aligned to the Career Ready Practice. This would enable staff to assist students to meet the SLO's.</p>
	2	A	3-Developing		
	3	A	2-Emerging		
	4	A	3-Developing		
	5	A	2-Emerging		
	Average		2.60		
Assessment	1	A	3-Developing	<p>George L. Catrambone uses various methods to assess and monitor student progress. Students in all grade levels are assessed in both ELA and Math using curriculum assessments, benchmarks, and anecdotal notes. This allows teachers to use the data from the assessments to plan future whole/small group instruction accordingly.</p>	<p>Teachers will continue to use various forms of assessments to monitor student growth. The use of pre-assessments should be implemented more to drive instruction for the unit. Teachers also should also conference with students after assessments to provide feedback in areas they struggled with.</p>
	2	A	2-Emerging		
	3	A	3-Developing		
	Average		2.67		

Component	Indicator Descriptor Level		Overall Strengths Summary	Areas of Focus Summary
Professional Learning Community (PLC)	1	A	3-Developing	Staff will continue to collaboratively focus their work on SMART goals directly related to student learning and/or the development of a climate and culture conducive to learning. In addition, during the very first PLC of the school year staff will establish an agreed upon method of resolving team conflicts if needed.
	2	A	3-Developing	
	3	A	3-Developing	
	4	A	2-Emerging	
	Average	2.75		
			<p>George L. Catrambone creates team norms at the first PLC of the school year. Each staff member is given a role and the duties of the role are discussed. The roles are recorded and referred back to during meetings. Staff is provided at least one period a week of common planning times to focus on collaborative job-embedded professional learning. Administration and content area supervisors are frequent attendees at these PLC's to offer insight and collaboration on effective data analysis and instructional practices. In addition, educators, content area specialists, support staff, and administration have been provided a platform to share their best practices and knowledge to staff on Professional Development Days.</p>	

Component	Indicator Descriptor Level		Overall Strengths Summary	Areas of Focus Summary
Culture	1	A	4-Sustaining	<p>George L. Catrambone establishes clear expectations for student behavior. Expectations are reinforced consistently by administration, guidance counselors and teachers. This is evident in morning arrival, the lunchroom, in classrooms. Discipline is consistently applied when students are not adhering to the rules. Students take part in a SEL program that allows them to learn and express about social and emotional feelings as well as how to deal with those feelings. There is a sense of community and belonging on the part of both students and staff. Celebrations are held throughout the school year to build school spirit. For example, we have school spirit days, a pep rally before state testing, concerts, and holiday celebrations. Most students are engaged in extra-curricular, service learning or community related activities. These extra-curricular activities offered to students include: a Debate Team, a Green Team (Recycling and Gardening), Power Safe Team (Saving energy) and a 21st Century Learning Program.</p> <p>Staff will continue to implement initiatives or new programs when needed. Feedback in form of student data should be used to determine effectiveness. Leadership should communicate the connection between the new practice and our mission and monitor the program or practice.</p>
	2	A	3-Developing	
	3	A	3-Developing	
	4	A	4-Sustaining	
	5	A	3-Developing	
	6	A	3-Developing	
	7	A	3-Developing	
	8	A	3-Developing	
	9	A	3-Developing	
	10	A	3-Developing	
	11	A	3-Developing	
	12	A	2-Emerging	
	13	A	3-Developing	
	14	A	3-Developing	
	Average		3.07	
Teacher and Principal Effectiveness	1	A	4-Sustaining	<p>George L. Catrambone uses the McREL teacher evaluation rubric. It is a research-based evaluation framework utilized to evaluate teachers and principals. Teachers and leaders have received training in the evaluation tool being used. Teachers have a pre-conference and post-conference before observations.</p> <p>Staff will continue to use professional improvement plans that are linked to both individual needs identified through the evaluation process and PLC team goals. Units of study will be used to provide the context for applying the elements of effective practice.</p>
	Average		4.00	

Priority Performance Needs and Root Cause Analysis

Area of Focus for SMART Goals	Priority Performance Need	Possible Root Causes (Based upon the CNA and data analysis, what factors are most likely to have contributed to this	Targeted Subgroup (s)	Strategies to Address Challenge (What does the root cause imply for next steps in improvement planning?)	
Effective Instruction	Data from ELA Linkit Benchmark A, (September 2019) to Benchmark B, (December 2019) shows the following: Grade 2 increased from an average test score of 28% on form A to 31.7% on form B (increase of 3.7%). Grade 3 increased from an average test score of 27% on form A to 38.3% on form B (increase of 11.3%). Grade 4 increased from an average test score of 29% on form A to 42.3% on form B (increase of 13.3%). Grade 5 increased from an average test score of 43.3% on form A to 46.2% on form B (increase of 2.9%).	Due to socioeconomic status, environmental disadvantages, and non-English speaking homes, much of the population comes to school with limited background knowledge and exposure to foundational skills for reading, such as phonemic awareness, phonics and word recognition. Teachers received professional development through job embedded training, reviewed data to modify instruction, and attend PLC meetings in an effort to address the educational needs of historically underserved populations. However, teachers are continuing to refine their best practices as they also try new research-based practices to aid instruction. Also, it is evident that social and emotional growth within the school for students is an issue that has a direct impact on student learning.	All	1	Provide materials and training to help parents to work with their children to improve their child's reading achievement through literacy training and use of technology.
				2	Use common planning sessions and grade level PLC meetings to support teacher in their understanding of the data, and provide guidance in using the data to plan future lessons. Incorporate professional development that promotes how to use effective practices that support areas of need identified through data.
				3	Continue to track and analyze Benchmark Assessments, SRI, DRA-2, NJSLA data to identify how low-performing content areas and provide professional development supporting components of phonological awareness and ways to help young children learn how to read.

Area of Focus for SMART Goals	Priority Performance Need	Possible Root Causes (Based upon the CNA and data analysis, what factors are most likely to have contributed to this	Targeted Subgroup (s)	Strategies to Address Challenge (What does the root cause imply for next steps in improvement planning?)	
Curriculum and Standards	Data from MATH Linkit Benchmark A, (September 2019) to Benchmark B, (December 2019) shows the following: Grade 1 increased from an average test score of 41.8% on form A to 74.8% on form B (increase of 33%). Grade 2 increased from an average test score of 36.6% on form A to 60.7% on form B (increase of 24.1%). Grade 3 increased from an average test score of 27.6% on form A to 45.5% on form B (increase of 17.9%). Grade 4 increased from an average test score of 31.6% on form A to 49.6% on form B (increase of 18%). Grade 5 increased from an average test score of 30.4% on form A to 55.6% on form B (increase of 25.2%). Through the continued implementation of the mathematics curriculum and small group instruction we anticipate the trend of increased proficiency to increase.	Due to the significant low level of students reading below grade level, this has an impact on their ability to read and comprehend math problems. These challenges affect many students, which result in lower math proficiency. Teachers received professional development through job embedded training's, reviewed data to modify instruction, and attend PLC meetings in an effort to address the educational needs of historically undeserved populations. However, teachers are continuing to refine their best practices as they also try new research-based practices to aid instruction. Also, it is evident that social and emotional growth within the school for students is an issue that has a direct impact on student learning.	All	1	Continue to track and analyze Benchmark Assessments, and NJSLA data to identify low performing content areas and provide professional development supporting components of problem solving and guided math.
				2	Provide differentiated coaching and professional development to all educational staff members, either individually and specific or as a group on an as needed basis with a goal of increasing student engagement and knowledge acquisition.
				3	Provide Professional Development for teachers to encourage new instructional strategies for low-growth and ELL students. Continue to provide feedback from classroom observations that can assist teachers with new instructional strategies.

Area of Focus for SMART Goals	Priority Performance Need	Possible Root Causes (Based upon the CNA and data analysis, what factors are most likely to have contributed to this	Targeted Subgroup (s)	Strategies to Address Challenge (What does the root cause imply for next steps in improvement planning?)	
Climate and Culture, including Social and Emotional Learning	Based on 2019-2020 Parent Involvement attendance rates, for activities that are non-academic based show trend to be higher than those that are academic based. George L. Catrambone School recorded 75% attendance at Back to School Night, 95% attendance at fall conferences. Average attendance for parent visitation week for in class activities was 40%.	Due to socioeconomic status, environmental disadvantages, and non English speaking homes, much of the population may not feel comfortable to attend academic functions due to limited background knowledge and exposure to foundational skills. Also school events and home/work schedules (i.e- childcare, transportation, work), or lack of connection/ follow up between school and home.	All	1	Develop partnerships with families, community and staff in support for academic growth. Provide training to help parents work with their children at home.
				2	After each benchmark assessment, communicate with parents of students needing assistance to help determine root causes and develop next steps that can be implemented at home and school.
				3	Plan additional academic events per grade level throughout the school year to accommodate parent needs and promote visitation to the classroom. Parents can also see practices that can be easily implemented in the home to foster academic support.
No option for the fourth SMART Goal was selected on the Root Cause page.				1	
				2	
				3	

SMART Goal 1

Students will demonstrate growth on literacy proficiency as measured by DRA2 assessment and the Linkit! Benchmark Assessment by June, 2021.

Subgroup (A) All first grade students who score between levels A-3 baseline will demonstrate growth based on the DRA2 growth chart.

Subgroup (B): All second grade students who score between levels A-18 baseline will show growth based on the DRA2 growth chart.

Subgroup (C): All third grade students who score between levels A-24 baseline will show growth based on the DRA2 growth chart.

Subgroup (D): All fourth grade students who are not meeting or exceeding on Benchmark A will meet the growth based on the decile growth chart.

Subgroup (E): All fifth grade students who are not meeting or exceeding on Benchmark A will meet the growth based on the decile growth chart.

Priority Performance	Data from ELA Linkit Benchmark A, (September 2019) to Benchmark B, (December 2019) shows the following: Grade 2 increased from an average test score of 28% on form A to 31.7% on form B (increase of 3.7%). Grade 3 increased from an average test score of 27% on form A to 38.3% on form B (increase of 11.3%). Grade 4 increased from an average test score of 29% on form A to 42.3% on form B (increase of 13.3%). Grade 5 increased from an average test score of 43.3% on form A to 46.2% on form B (increase of 2.9%).
Strategy 1:	Provide materials and training to help parents to work with their children to improve their child's reading achievement through literacy training and use of technology.
Strategy 2:	Use common planning sessions and grade level PLC meetings to support teacher in their understanding of the data, and provide guidance in using the data to plan future lessons. Incorporate professional development that promotes how to use effective practices that support areas of need identified through data.
Strategy 3:	Continue to track and analyze Benchmark Assessments, SRI, DRA-2, NJSLA data to identify how low-performing content areas and provide professional development supporting components of phonological awareness and ways to help young children learn how to read.
Target Population:	All

Interim Goals

SMART Goal 1

End of Cycle	Interim Goal	Source(s) of Evidence
Nov 15	By the end of Cycle 1, baseline DRA2 and Linkit! Benchmark A will be administered and the assessments will be analyzed to identify current levels of proficiency among students. Results will also be analyzed to drive instruction and plan professional learning.	DRA2 baseline data, Student Form A LinkIt! data, PLC agendas, PD agendas.
Feb 15	By the end of Cycle 2, 60% of targeted students in all grade levels will meet their growth goals on the DRA2 or Linkit! Benchmark Assessment. teachers will have administered mid-year benchmarks to students.	Benchmark B Linkit! data, DRA2 midyear data.
Apr 15	By the end of Cycle 3, 100% of instruction staff in ELA will participate in 2 professional development sessions focused on skills and standards identified in November.	Benchmark B LinkIt! data, DRA2 midyear data, DRA2 Expected Growth Chart, LinkIt! Decile Growth Chart PLC agendas, PD agendas.
Jul 1	<p>Students will demonstrate growth on literacy proficiency as measured by DRA2 assessment and the Linkit! Benchmark Assessment by June, 2021.</p> <p>Subgroup (A) All first grade students who score between levels A-3 baseline will demonstrate growth based on the DRA2 growth chart.</p> <p>Subgroup (B): All second grade students who score between levels A-18 baseline will show growth based on the DRA2 growth chart.</p> <p>Subgroup (C): All third grade students who score between levels A-24 baseline will show growth based on the DRA2 growth chart.</p> <p>Subgroup (D): All fourth grade students who are not meeting or exceeding on Benchmark A will meet the growth based on the decile growth chart.</p> <p>Subgroup (E): All fifth grade students who are not meeting or exceeding on Benchmark A will meet the growth based on the decile growth chart.</p>	Benchmark C LinkIt! data, 2020-2021 DRA2 benchmark data, DRA2 Expected Growth Chart, LinkIt! Decile Growth Chart PLC agendas.

Action Steps

SMART Goal 1

Step Numbe	Strategy	Action Steps	Start Date	End Date	Assigned To
1	1	Analyze mid-year 2019-2020 LinkIt! and DRA2 data to assist in initial reading level placement for instruction.	9/3/20	10/30/20	Teachers
2	1	Once baseline DRA2 and LinkIt! assessments are completed, utilize results to compare to previous year scores. Identify students for student growth objectives.	9/3/20	10/30/20	Teachers
3	1	During professional learning communities, create grade level attainable goals on identified standards for the first and second marking period.	9/3/20	10/30/20	Teachers
4	2	Analyze results from mid-year assessments, locate areas of deficiencies and continue to monitor student progress.	9/3/20	10/30/20	Teachers
5	2	Review grade level goals from beginning of year and monitor student progress.	11/2/20	1/29/21	Teachers
6	2	Teachers will create an action plan to target at risk students and provide interventions within classroom instruction.	11/2/20	1/29/21	Teachers
7	2	Principals will use formal observations to evaluate lessons as well as suggest how grade level and independent goals can be met. Offer suggestions and new interventions.	11/2/20	1/29/21	Principals
8	2	Review Student Growth Objectives and monitor progress.	2/1/21	4/1/21	Principals, Teachers
9	3	Continue to monitor student progress as well as grade level goals.	4/1/21	6/11/21	Principals, Teachers
10	3	Use data to monitor, differentiate and drive instruction.	4/1/21	6/11/21	Teachers
11	3	Analyze results from end of year assessments, analyze student progress and full year growth.	4/1/21	6/11/21	Principals, Teachers
12	1	Purchase instructional supplies supporting student academic growth and Social Emotional Learning.	9/30/20	5/31/21	Counselors, Principals, Teachers

Step Numbe	Strategy	Action Steps	Start Date	End Date	Assigned To
13	2	Hire consultant to provide professional learning focused on student academic growth and Social Emotional Learning.	9/30/20	5/31/21	Counselors, Principals

Budget Items

SMART Goal 1

Correspondin g Action Step	Resource / Description	Funding Category / Object Code	Funding Requested	Funding Source
1	Homeless Reserve	INSTRUCTION - Supplies & Materials / 100-600	\$469	Federal Title I (Intervention Reserve)
1	Homeless Reserve	SUPPORT SERVICES - Supplies & Materials / 200-600	\$469	Federal Title I (Intervention Reserve)
1	Total Schoolwide Amount for George L. Catrambone School	SCHOOLWIDE - Schoolwide Blended / 520-930	\$271,435	Federal Title I (School Allocation)

SMART Goal 2

Students will demonstrate growth in the area of mathematics as measured by the Linkit! Benchmark Assessment by June, 2021.

Subgroup (A) All first grade students who score between 0-43% on Benchmark A will demonstrate typical to high growth based on the decile growth chart.

Subgroup (B): All second grade students who score between 0-56% on Benchmark A will demonstrate typical to high growth based on the decile growth chart.

Subgroup (C): All third grade students who score between 0-44% on Benchmark A will demonstrate typical to high growth based on the decile growth chart.

Subgroup (D): All fourth grade students who score between 0-52% on Benchmark A will demonstrate typical to high growth based on the decile growth chart.

Subgroup (E): All fifth grade students who score between 0-52% on Benchmark A will demonstrate typical to high growth based on the decile growth chart.

Priority Performance	Data from MATH Linkit Benchmark A, (September 2019) to Benchmark B, (December 2019) shows the following: Grade 1 increased from an average test score of 41.8% on form A to 74.8% on form B (increase of 33%). Grade 2 increased from an average test score of 36.6% on form A to 60.7% on form B (increase of 24.1%). Grade 3 increased from an average test score of 27.6% on form A to 45.5% on form B (increase of 17.9%). Grade 4 increased from an average test score of 31.6% on form A to 49.6% on form B (increase of 18%). Grade 5 increased from an average test score of 30.4% on form A to 55.6% on form B (increase of 25.2%). Through the continued implementation of the mathematics curriculum and small group instruction we anticipate the trend of increased proficiency to increase.
Strategy 1:	Continue to track and analyze Benchmark Assessments, and NJSLA data to identify low performing content areas and provide professional development supporting components of problem solving and guided math.
Strategy 2:	Provide differentiated coaching and professional development to all educational staff members, either individually and specific or as a group on an as needed basis with a goal of increasing student engagement and knowledge acquisition.
Strategy 3:	Provide Professional Development for teachers to encourage new instructional strategies for low-growth and ELL students. Continue to provide feedback from classroom observations that can assist teachers with new instructional strategies.
Target Population:	All

Interim Goals

SMART Goal 2

End of Cycle	Interim Goal	Source(s) of Evidence
Nov 15	By the end of Cycle 1, all students will be administered the baseline LinkIt! Assessment. Results of the benchmark assessment as well as the mathematics portfolio, formative assessments, and unit assessment data will be analyzed to identify current levels of proficiency among students.	LinkIt! Math Form A Benchmark data, LinkIt! Math Decile Growth Chart, NJSLA data.
Feb 15	By the end of Cycle 2, 60% of targeted students in all grade levels will meet their growth goals on LinkIt! Benchmark Assessment.	LinkIt! Math Form B Benchmark data, LinkIt! Math Decile Growth Chart.
Apr 15	By the end of Cycle 3, 100% of instructional staff in math will participate in 2 professional development sessions focused on skills and standards identified in November.	LinkIt! Math Form A and B Benchmark data, professional development agendas.
Jul 1	<p>Students will demonstrate growth in the area of mathematics as measured by the LinkIt! Benchmark Assessment by June, 2021.</p> <p>Subgroup (A) All first grade students who score between 0-43% on Benchmark A will demonstrate typical to high growth based on the decile growth chart.</p> <p>Subgroup (B): All second grade students who score between 0-56% on Benchmark A will demonstrate typical to high growth based on the decile growth chart.</p> <p>Subgroup (C): All third grade students who score between 0-44% on Benchmark A will demonstrate typical to high growth based on the decile growth chart.</p> <p>Subgroup (D): All fourth grade students who score between 0-52% on Benchmark A will demonstrate typical to high growth based on the decile growth chart.</p> <p>Subgroup (E): All fifth grade students who score between 0-52% on Benchmark A will demonstrate typical to high growth based on the decile growth chart.</p>	LinkIt! Math Form C Benchmark data, LinkIt! Math Decile Growth Chart.

Action Steps

SMART Goal 2

Step Numbe	Strategy	Action Steps	Start Date	End Date	Assigned To
1	1	Analyze mid-year 2019-2020 LinkIt! data and Everyday Mathematics data to assist in initial math level placement for instruction.	9/3/20	10/30/20	Teachers
2	1	Once baseline LinkIt! assessment is completed, utilize results to compare to previous year scores. Identify students for student growth objectives.	9/3/20	10/30/20	Teachers
3	1	During professional learning communities, create grade level attainable goals on identified standards for the first and second marking period.	9/3/20	10/30/20	Teachers
4	1	Analyze results from baseline assessments, locate areas of deficiencies and continue to monitor student progress.	9/3/20	10/30/20	Teachers
5	3	Teachers will create pre-recorded lessons in the case of virtual learning to keep students up to date on current standards and curriculum.	9/3/20	6/11/21	Teachers
6	2	Teachers will create an action plan to address and to target at risk students and provide interventions within classroom instruction.	11/2/20	1/1/21	Teachers
7	2	Principals will use formal observations to evaluate lessons as well as suggest how grade level and independent goals can be met. Offer suggestions and new interventions.	11/10/20	4/23/21	Principals, Teachers
8	2	Review Student Growth Objectives and monitor progress.	1/1/21	4/23/21	Principals, Teachers
9	3	Continue to monitor student progress as well as grade level goals.	4/5/21	6/11/21	Principals, Teachers
10	3	Use data to monitor, differentiate and drive instruction.	4/5/21	6/11/21	Teachers
11	3	Analyze results from end of year assessments, analyze student progress and full year growth.	4/5/21	6/11/21	Teachers
12	1	Purchase instructional supplies supporting student academic growth and Social Emotional Learning.	9/30/20	5/31/21	Counselors, Principals, Teachers

Step Number	Strategy	Action Steps	Start Date	End Date	Assigned To
13	2	Hire consultant to provide student programs focused on student growth and Social Emotional Learning.	9/30/20	5/31/21	Counselors, Principals

< SMART Goal 2 - Budget Items: NO DATA >

SMART Goal 3

By June 2021, less than 10% of students will be identified as chronically absent according to the Genesis database attendance report.

Priority Performance Based on 2019-2020 Parent Involvement attendance rates, for activities that are non-academic based show trend to be higher than those that are academic based. George L. Catrambone School recorded 75% attendance at Back to School Night, 95% attendance at fall conferences. Average attendance for parent visitation week for in class activities was 40%.

Strategy 1: Develop partnerships with families, community and staff in support for academic growth. Provide training to help parents work with their children at home.

Strategy 2: After each benchmark assessment, communicate with parents of students needing assistance to help determine root causes and develop next steps that can be implemented at home and school.

Strategy 3: Plan additional academic events per grade level throughout the school year to accommodate parent needs and promote visitation to the classroom. Parents can also see practices that can be easily implemented in the home to foster academic support.

Target Population: All

Interim Goals

SMART Goal 3

End of Cycle	Interim Goal	Source(s) of Evidence
Nov 15	Identify all students at risk for chronic attendance concerns. Hold individual meetings with 80% of parents/guardians of identified students. Have 1 event addition to back to school night focused on academic instruction.	Parent sign in sheets, attendance data as monitored by Genesis information.
Feb 15	All parents/guardians will be informed of the state and district attendance policy, procedures, and ramifications of negative attendance and correlation to academic achievement.	Parent sign in sheets, attendance data as monitored by Genesis information.

End of Cycle	Interim Goal	Source(s) of Evidence
Apr 15	Identification of all students at risk for chronic attendance concerns. Hold individual meetings with 100% of parents/guardians of identified students. Identification of all parents/guardians who have not attended an academic related event and support their participation in any way possible.	Parent sign in sheets, attendance data as monitored by Genesis information.
Jul 1	By June 2021, less than 10% of students will be identified as chronically absent according to the Genesis database attendance report.	Parent sign in sheets, attendance data as monitored by Genesis information.

Action Steps

SMART Goal 3

Step Numbe	Strategy	Action Steps	Start Date	End Date	Assigned To
1	1	Chronically absent students will be identified at weekly meetings and monitored through the Genesis database. Parents and gaurdians will be notified and support will be provided.	9/3/20	10/30/20	Principals, Counselors, Teachers
2	3	Weekly review of chronically absent student data. Advisors will provide follow up to staff regarding the latest data and develop strategies accordingly based on findings.	9/3/20	10/30/20	Principals, Counselors, Teachers
3	3	Students will be rewarded with monthly attendance incentives either in person or virtually.	9/3/20	10/30/20	Principals, Counselors, Teachers
4	2	PLC, Department, and Grade Level Meetings, monitoring of teachers, and analysis of data action plans.	9/3/20	10/30/20	Principals, Counselors, Teachers
5	1	Hold family events to support and educate parents in positive social and academic behaviors either in person or virtually.	9/3/20	10/30/20	Principals, Counselors, Teachers
6	2	Classroom observations to ensure action plans are in place, implemented and reinforced (follow steps on district action plan).	9/3/20	10/30/20	Principals

Step Numbe	Strategy	Action Steps	Start Date	End Date	Assigned To
7	1	Chronically absent students will be identified at weekly meetings and monitored through the Genesis database. Parents and guardians will be notified and support with be provided.	11/2/20	2/26/21	Principals, Counselors
8	3	Students with excellent or improved attendance will be rewarded with monthly attendance incentives either in person or virtually.	11/2/20	2/26/21	Principals, Counselors, Teachers
9	1	Hold family events to support and educate parents in positive social and academic behaviors either in person or virtually.	3/1/21	5/28/21	Principals, Counselors, Teachers
10	1	Chronically absent students will be identified at weekly meetings and monitored through the Genesis database. Parents and guardians will be notified and support with be provided.	3/1/21	5/28/21	Counselors
11	3	Weekly review of chronically absent student data. Advisors will provide follow up to staff regarding the latest data and develop strategies accordingly based on findings.	3/1/21	5/28/21	Counselors
12	3	Students with excellent or improved attendance will be rewarded with monthly attendance incentives either in person or virtually.	3/1/21	5/28/21	Principals, Counselors, Teachers

Budget Items

SMART Goal 3

Correspondin g Action Step	Resource / Description	Funding Category / Object Code	Funding Requested	Funding Source
1	Parent Involvement Reserve	INSTRUCTION - Supplies & Materials / 100-600	\$581	Federal Title I (Intervention Reserve)
1	Parent Involvement Reserve	SUPPORT SERVICES - Purchased Professional & Technical Services / 200-300	\$1,000	Federal Title I (Intervention Reserve)

Corresponding Action Step	Resource / Description	Funding Category / Object Code	Funding Requested	Funding Source
1	Parent Involvement Reserve	SUPPORT SERVICES - Supplies & Materials / 200-600	\$495	Federal Title I (Intervention Reserve)

SMART Goal 4

Priority Performance

Strategy 1:

Strategy 2:

Strategy 3:

Target Population:

Interim Goals

SMART Goal 4

End of Cycle	Interim Goal	Source(s) of Evidence
Nov 15		
Feb 15		
Apr 15		
Jul 1		

< SMART Goal 4 - Action Steps: NO DATA >

< SMART Goal 4 - Budget Items: NO DATA >

Other Title 1 Expenditures

Resource / Description	Start Date	End Date	Assigned To	Funding Category /	Funding Requested	Funding Resource
Purchase instructional supplies supporting student academic and social emotional needs.	10/1/20	5/31/21	Improvement Leader	INSTRUCTION - Supplies & Materials / 100-600	\$5,000.00	Federal Title I (Reallocated)
Nonpublic Allocation-YKT	10/1/20	5/31/21	Funded Grants Office	SUPPORT SERVICES - Purchased Professional & Technical Services / 200-300	\$400.00	Federal Title I (Reallocated)
Consultant to provide professional learning for staff and student programs focused on student academic and social emotional learning needs.	10/1/20	5/31/21	Improvement Leader	SUPPORT SERVICES - Purchased Professional & Technical Services / 200-300	\$19,148.00	Federal Title I (Reallocated)

Budget Summary

Budget Category	Sub Category	Function & Object Code	State/Local Budget for School	Federal Title I (Priority / Focus Interventions Reserve)	Federal Title I (School Allocation)	Federal Title I (Reallocated Funds)	Federal CARES - ESSER Funds	Other Federal Funds Allocated to School	SIA (If Applicable) Allocated to School	SIA Carryover	TOTAL
INSTRUCTION	Personnel Services - Salaries	100-100	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
INSTRUCTION	Purchased Professional & Technical Services	100-300	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
INSTRUCTION	Other Purchased Services	100-500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
INSTRUCTION	Supplies & Materials	100-600	\$0	\$312	\$274	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$586
INSTRUCTION	Other Objects	100-800	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
INSTRUCTION	Sub-total		\$0	\$312	\$274	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$586
SUPPORT SERVICES	Personnel Services - Salaries	200-100	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SUPPORT SERVICES	Personnel Services - Employee Benefits	200-200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SUPPORT SERVICES	Purchased Professional & Technical Services	200-300	\$0	\$662	\$3,005	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,667
SUPPORT SERVICES	Purchased Property Services	200-400	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Budget Category	Sub Category	Function & Object Code	State/Local Budget for School	Federal Title I (Priority / Focus Interventions Reserve)	Federal Title I (School Allocation)	Federal Title I (Reallocated Funds)	Federal CARES - ESSER Funds	Other Federal Funds Allocated to School	SIA (If Applicable) Allocated to School	SIA Carryover	TOTAL
SUPPORT SERVICES	Other Purchased Services	200-500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SUPPORT SERVICES	Travel	200-580	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SUPPORT SERVICES	Supplies & Materials	200-600	\$0	\$1,983	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,983
SUPPORT SERVICES	Other Objects	200-800	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SUPPORT SERVICES	Indirect Costs	200-860	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SUPPORT SERVICES	Sub-total		\$0	\$2,645	\$3,005	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,650
FACILITIES	Buildings	400-720	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FACILITIES	Instructional Equipment	400-731	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FACILITIES	Noninstructional Equipment	400-732	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FACILITIES	Sub-total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SCHOOLWIDE	Schoolwide Blended	520-930	\$0	\$0	\$269,382	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$269,382
SCHOOLWIDE	Sub-total		\$0	\$0	\$269,382	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$269,382

Budget Category	Sub Category	Function & Object Code	State/Local Budget for School	Federal Title I (Priority / Focus Interventions Reserve)	Federal Title I (School Allocation)	Federal Title I (Reallocated Funds)	Federal CARES - ESSER Funds	Other Federal Funds Allocated to School	SIA (If Applicable) Allocated to School	SIA Carryover	TOTAL
Total Cost			\$0	\$2,957	\$3,279	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$275,618

Overview of Total Title 1 Expenditures

	Federal Title 1 (Priority/Focus Interventions)	Federal Title 1 (School Allocation) Total	Federal Title 1 (Reallocated Funds)	TOTAL
Included in SMART Goal Pages	\$2,957	\$3,279	\$0	\$6,236
Other Title 1 Expenditures	\$0	\$0	\$24,548	\$24,548
Total	\$2,957	\$3,279	\$24,548	\$30,784

School Level Certification Page

x	The results of the Comprehensive Needs Assessment are included in the designated tabs. For designated Targeted Support and all Comprehensive Support schools, the Comprehensive Data Analysis and Needs Assessment process must be completed in collaboration, and with the concurrence of your Comprehensive Support Network (CSN) Team.	
x	The Annual School Plan requires a minimum of three SMART goals with an option to create a fourth. At least one of these goals must be developed with an area of focus "Effective Instruction." Goals must address the areas of priority performance needs identified during Comprehensive Needs Assessment process. Check all the SMART Goal areas included in your ASP.	
x		Effective Instruction
x		Curriculum and Standards
x		Climate and Culture, including Social and Emotional Learning
		No option for the fourth SMART Goal was selected on the Root Cause page.
	For Comprehensive Support and Targeted Support schools, the Annual School Plan includes evidence-based interventions to improve academic achievement for all students who are not yet performing on grade level, and all SIA funds will be used for evidence-based interventions that meet the requirements set forth in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).	
x	The Budget Summary includes all planned expenditures, as identified within the 'Budget Items' section of the SMART goal pages.	
x	This plan has been submitted for final review and approval by the District Business Administrator, Federal Programs Administrator, Chief School Administrator, and any other district personnel with responsibility for expenditures of federal funds to ensure all purchases and uses of funds (SIA, other Title I, other federal, and state/local) are reviewed and approved.	

Completed By: Christopher Volpe

Title: Building Principal

Date: 06/30/2020

District Business Administrator or District Federal Programs Administrator Certification

x	The Annual School Plan (ASP) has been reviewed by designated district-level personnel to ensure all services and proposed uses of funds meet the statutory and regulatory requirements as stipulated under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and 2 CFR Part 200.
x	I certify that I have reviewed this school's ASP and ensure proposed funding in the ASP is aligned with the ESEA Consolidated application in EWEG and used to address the school's priority performance needs.

For Comprehensive Support and Targeted Support schools only:

	I certify I have completed and certified the required LEA Resource Equity Review.
--	---

Certified By: PETER E GENOVESE III

Title: SBA

Date: 06/30/2020

ASP District CSA Certification and Approval Page

x	The Annual School Plan (ASP) has been reviewed by the District CSA/designated district-level personnel to ensure all services and proposed uses of funds meet the statutory and regulatory requirements as stipulated under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and
x	I certify that I have reviewed this school's ASP and ensure proposed funding in the ASP is aligned with the ESEA Consolidated application in EWEG and used to address the school's priority performance needs.

Certified By: Roberta Freeman
Title: Chief Academic Officer
Date: 06/30/2020