



[Home \(view\)](#)

[ASP Home \(addsip?id=11404\)](#)

[Logoff \(logoff\)](#)

Annual School Plan Information

Hi Bridgette Burt

Plan Id	School	District	Team	County	CDS	Level of Support	Targeted Subgroup(s)	Create Date
11404	George L Catrambone	LONG BRANCH CITY	NA	MONMOUTH	252770300	Level I	NA	19-Jan-18

Annual School Plan Builder Home

Pages	Components to consider for a well developed Annual School Plan	Status
ASP Team & Meetings (sipteam? &year=2018-2019)	<p>*Principal, school leadership team, and district support representative/s work collaboratively on the needs assessment and intervention strategy with input from the Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) Teams (for Level III schools), and multiple family and community members. *All meetings have agendas and minutes on file and uploaded into the ASPs. *Throughout the current school year, the school leadership team has met regularly to discuss the Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and Annual School Plan (ASP). For example, during Comprehensive Support Improvement (CSI) cycle reviews, faculty meetings and data team meetings when the ASP is discussed.</p>	Complete
Comprehensive Data Analysis and Prior Year Interventions (dataanalysis? &year=2018-2019)	<p>*The Data Analysis section is a critical component of your Needs Assessment. The data provided shows measurable outcomes for each given data source and specifically shows initial observations, emerging questions and trends. *There are identified strengths, challenges, and impact of services provided. *The effectiveness of the service is identified. The information is specific and includes multiple measurable outcomes. *The measurable outcomes for Prior Year Interventions are linked to the documentation of effectiveness. (For example, student performance on common assessments, cycle grades, attendance.)</p>	Complete

Pages	Components to consider for a well developed Annual School Plan	Status
Comprehensive Needs Assessment Rubric (cna? &year=2018-2019)	*The Overall Strengths and Area of Improvement Summaries are supported by data, observations and District/CSI assessments. *For Level III schools, school and CSI Team ratings are in agreement under all indicators of the CNA rubric. * The data listed specifically measures each indicator in the CNA rubric.	Complete
Root Cause Analysis (rootcause? &year=2018-2019)	*Performance Challenges, Possible Root Causes and/or Strategies to Address specifically identify why the school is designated a categorized (Comprehensive or Targeted) school and the explanation clearly references data sources. *Strategies to address are directly linked to the Performance Challenge(s) and Possible Root Cause(s).	Complete
SMART Goals (sg-one? &year=2018-2019)	*Each goal is SMART - specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely. *The goal is linked to performance challenge(s), possible root cause(s), targeted subgroups and/or CNA. *Interim goals are SMART and demonstrate progress toward goal attainment. *The SMART goal addresses the targeted subgroups. *The CNA, data analysis results, possible root cause and SMART goal are all aligned. *Action steps follow a logical and chronological progression to implement SMART and interim goals. Action steps are specific and measurable, embedding accountability and data generation into the project plan. *Deadlines are appropriate, ambitious, and achievable. *Person(s) assigned to the step(s) can be held accountable for implementing the action step. *All funding amounts are targeted appropriately and researched. *The funding source follows budgetary guidelines.	Complete
Budget Summary (budgetsummary? &year=2018-2019)		
Confirmation (confirmation? &year=2018-2019)		District Certified

ASP Summary PDF (aspSummaryPDF?sipld=11404)



2018-2019

George L Catrambone

District: LONG BRANCH CITY

County: MONMOUTH

Team: NA

Level of Support: Level I
Targeted Subgroup

CDS: 252770300

Annual School Planning 2018-2019

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	Joy Daniels	Yes	Yes	Yes		
School Improvement	Laurie DeMuro	Yes	Yes	Yes		
School Counselor	Carlos Villacres	Yes	Yes	Yes		
School Counselor	Gabriela Stanziale	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Classroom Teacher	Katie Wachter	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Classroom Teacher	Laura Tracey	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Classroom Teacher	Maria Manzo	Yes	Yes	Yes		



2018-2019

Stakeholder Representative Title	Name	Comprehensive Analysis and Needs	Root Cause Analysis	Smart Goal Development	Signature	Date
Classroom Teacher	Alyson Stagich	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Classroom Teacher	Robert Luehman	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Classroom Teacher	Michele Morey	Yes	Yes	Yes		
ELL Teacher	Elizabeth Kaeli	Yes	Yes	Yes		
PLTW Teacher	Lisa Roesch	Yes	Yes	Yes		
PLTW Teacher	Kelly Stone	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Classroom Teacher	Kalliopi Papayiannis	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Parent	Mirveta Bektesevic	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Parent	Gricelda Espinosa	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Parent	Miguel Espinosa	Yes	Yes	Yes		



2018-2019

ASP Development Team Meetings

Date	Topic	Agenda Uploaded	Minutes Uploaded
09/28/2017	Comprehensive Data Analysis and Needs Assessment	Yes	Yes
10/25/2017	Comprehensive Data Analysis and Needs Assessment	Yes	Yes
11/29/2017	Comprehensive Data Analysis and Needs Assessment	Yes	Yes
12/14/2017	Root Cause Analysis	Yes	Yes
01/25/2018	Root Cause Analysis	Yes	Yes
02/22/2018	Root Cause Analysis	Yes	Yes
03/22/2018	Smart Goal Development	Yes	Yes
04/25/2018	Smart Goal Development	Yes	Yes



2018-2019

Data Analysis

PRIOR YEAR INTERVENTIONS				
Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area or Target Population	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this	Evidence of Effectiveness (identify the artifacts that support this outcome)

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area or Target Population	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this	Evidence of Effectiveness (Identify the artifacts that support this outcome)
<p>The Treasures McGraw-Hill Literacy Program has been used as the Core Reading program at the George L. Catrambone (GLC) Elementary School since 2013. 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 to greater impact the reading curriculum. Evidence based interventions are implemented to support students with low academic growth in reading.</p>	<p>All Students</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 Student Learning Standards and focus on specific skills. Students take a mid-year, Benchmark B, for teachers to assess growth and progress and after 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.</p>	<p>Data from LinkIt! Benchmark A, (September 2017) to LinkIt! Benchmark C, (June 2018) show there has been an increase on average test scores. Grade 2 students increased from an average score of 28.5% on Benchmark A, to 38.0% on Benchmark C (increase of 9.5%). Grade 3 students increased from an average score of 32.8% on Benchmark A, to 49.9% on Benchmark C (increase of 17.1%). Grade 4 students increased from an average score of 34.5% on Benchmark A, to 42.2% on Benchmark C (increase of 7.7%). Grade 5 students increased from an average score of 42.2% on Benchmark A, to 46.3% on Benchmark C (increase of 4.1%). Although there has been an increase in overall growth in all grades, this is still a low performance average for the test. Through the continued implementation of the literacy curriculum and increased PD supporting the use of data to drive instruction, we anticipate the trend of</p>



2018-2019

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area or Target Population	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this	Evidence of Effectiveness (Identify the artifacts that support this outcome)
				increased proficiency to continue.

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area or Target Population	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this	Evidence of Effectiveness (identify the artifacts that support this outcome)
<p>The Everyday Mathematics program is the core mathematics resource implemented at the GLC School. This is a research-based and field-tested program designed to develop students' 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 independently. Evidence based interventions are utilized to support students with low academic growth in math.</p>	<p>Mathematics-All students</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 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.</p>	<p>Student growth is measured using benchmark assessments to monitor individual, class and grade level progress. The proficiency ranges fluctuate between the assessments due to the content assessed making the growth on the average score a more telling indicator of overall grade level achievement. All grade levels increased their average score from Form A in September 2017 to Form C in May 2018. The LGP (LinkIt! Growth Profile) compares the amount of change (growth) in a student's Form C score relative to a peer cohort with the same Form A achievement level using 2016-2017 NJ Statewide normed data. Students are then identified by achievement levels based on whether they scored in the top-third (High LGP), middle-third (Typical LGP), or bottom third (Low LGP) of growth when compared to their cohort. In grades 1 and 2, 91% of students showed typical to high growth. 99% of total students</p>



2018-2019

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area or Target Population	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this	Evidence of Effectiveness (Identify the artifacts that support this outcome)
				<p>showed positive growth with an average of 46% growth from Form A to Form C. The average score on the Form A Benchmarks was 41% and increased to 87% average score on the Form C benchmarks. In grades 3-5, 79% of students showed typical to high growth. 98% of total students showed positive growth with an average of 41% growth from Form A to Form C. The average score on the Form A Benchmarks was 30% and increased to 71% average score on the Form C benchmarks.</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area or Target Population	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this	Evidence of Effectiveness (identify the artifacts that support this outcome)
<p>The Treasures McGraw-Hill Literacy Program has been used as the Core Reading program at the George L. Catrambone (GLC) Elementary School since 2013. 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 to greater impact the reading curriculum. Evidence based interventions are implemented to support students with low academic growth in reading.</p>	<p>All Students in grades 2-5</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Reading Comprehension Assessment 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 LexileA_J@ 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.</p>	<p>Data from September 2017 to June 2018 show an increase in the average reading lexile for students in Grades 2-5. From September 2017 to June 2018 Grade 2 students increased their lexile mean average from 116 to 346. Grade 3 students increased their lexile mean average from 356 to 515. Grade 4 students increased their lexile mean average from 496 to 579. Grade 5 students increased their lexile mean average from 683 to 770. 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>



2018-2019

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area or Target Population	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this	Evidence of Effectiveness (Identify the artifacts that support this outcome)
<p>Strategy Lessons -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.</p> <p>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>All Students</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: Kindergarten: EOY score of 8. Grade 1: EOY score of 16. Grade 2: EOY score of 28. Grade 3: EOY score of 38. This guideline 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.</p>	<p>After analyzing DRA2 data, from October 2017 to June 2018. DRA2 data from the October 2017 to June 2018 show 25.9% of 1st grade students scored in the proficient range on the baseline DRA2 assessment and 52.6% of 1st grade students scored in the proficient range on the end of year DRA2 assessment (increase of 26.7%). In 2nd grade 53.7% of students scored in the proficient range on the baseline DRA2 assessment and 47.5% of students scored in the proficient range on the end of year DRA2 assessment (decrease of 6.2%). In 3rd grade 54.6% of students scored in the proficient range on the baseline DRA2 assessment and 52.5% of students scored in the proficient range on the end of year DRA2 assessment (decrease of 2.1%). Even though 96% of 1st through 3rd grade students increased in DRA2 level, the performance expectation from the baseline to end of year assessment resulted in a lower number of students scoring in</p>



2018-2019

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area or Target Population	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this	Evidence of Effectiveness (Identify the artifacts that support this outcome)
				<p>the proficient range in grades 2 and 3. The DRA will continued to be implemented with additional teacher PD focused on using data from the DRA2 Continuum to complete and implement targeted strategies identified on the DRA2 Focus for Instruction.</p>



2018-2019

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area or Target Population	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this	Evidence of Effectiveness (Identify the artifacts that support this outcome)
<p>After school Title I tutoring has been offered at GLC school for the last 4 years. The target population are students struggling in reading and math and performing far below grade level proficiency. The academic tutors work with a small group of students, on an average ratio of 8:1, to reinforce problematic skills. The program runs two days a week from 2:30-4:00. This year we utilized Moby Max online program as supplemental material to support students with low academic growth.</p>	<p>K-5 students recommended by classroom teachers and performing far below grade level proficiency.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Title I tutors worked in conjunction with homeroom teachers to track academic growth. The LinkIt! Benchmarks, SRI, and DRA, were measures used to track the progress of the students as they continued in the tutoring program. Teachers reviewed the results closely and found the standards that required additional practice. The MobyMax program could be tailored to the needs of the students. Although we liked the idea of utilizing a computer based program as supplemental academic material, we would be open to exploring others that may have a similar purpose.</p>	<p>After analyzing results, there was notable improvement in the students' performance on school wide assessments. In Kindergarten and 1st Grade, 7 students participated in Title I Tutoring, 7 out of 7 students increased on their DRA. In Grade 2, 6 students participated, 6 out of 6 increased on their DRA. In Grade 3, 15 students participated in tutoring, 11 out of them increased on their SRI. In Grade 4, 7 students participated, and 6 out of 7 increased on their SRI. Finally, in Grade 5, 18 students participated in tutoring, and 14 of them increased their SRI score. 83% of students improved on reading assessments! This data supports the idea that Title I Tutoring is an effective intervention for GLC students and will continue to assist others in the 2018-2019 school year.</p>



2018-2019

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area or Target Population	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this	Evidence of Effectiveness (identify the artifacts that support this outcome)
<p>Parent and community partnerships are a top priority at GLC school. It is an essential piece to the overall climate of the building to have families feel welcome and become involved in their child's academic process. In order to achieve this level of comfort, we offer many opportunities for parents to attend school wide events throughout the year. These events range from academic based, such as parent-teacher conferences, to simply having a fun filled family night out.</p>	<p>All Students and Families</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Administrators and teachers work together to plan and execute a variety of family functions at GLC school. In order to account for those in attendance, a sign-in sheet is primarily utilized. This allows us to track the events and those that result in a positive turn out for the school. During the 2017-2018 school year, we had 10 school-wide events in which parents were invited. They included; Back to School Night, ESSA Parent Information Session, Harvest Festival, Parent-Teacher Conferences, Grandparents Day, Literacy Night, Math Night, and several more. The sign-in sheets are used to find an average percentage of attendance and then compare percentages from the previous year. From here we can decide to keep or alter the scheduled events. Parents are also invited to complete a school climate survey. This survey provides feedback on areas such as Morale in the School Community and Parent Support and Engagement.</p>	<p>A trend we noticed in our Parent Involvement, is that many of the non-academic events hosted often have a higher percentage of attendance. For example a parent math event in Grade 2 generated only 5% of involvement in one class and 14% involvement in another. The Harvest Festival had about 30% of the whole school population in attendance. Although we are pleased that families are excited to participate in social activities, we find it necessary to shift our focus and plan additional academic-based opportunities for families. Having a greater number of academic functions per grade level can help achieve this goal. This will promote ways for parents and guardians to get more involved in their child's education.</p>



2018-2019

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area or Target Population	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this	Evidence of Effectiveness (Identify the artifacts that support this outcome)
<p>Guided Reading - Guided reading gives teachers the opportunity to observe students 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 teacher selects students to observe while they whisper read. The teacher listens closely and collects data based off observations and questioning. As students read, the teacher should prompt and coach as needed. Teacher 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>All</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: Kindergarten: EOY score of 8. Grade 1: EOY score of 16. Grade 2: EOY score of 28. Grade 3: EOY score of 38. This guideline 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.</p>	<p>The evidence of effectiveness of guided reading are evident through 3 data measures, the Diagnostic Reading Assessment, the Reading Inventory and the ELA Link it Benchmarks. From October 2017 to May 2018 the average 1st grade DRA score increased from a level 4 in to a level 14. The average 2nd grade DRA score increased from a level 14 to a level 23. The average 3rd grade DRA score increased from a level 24 to a level 35. 4th and 5th grade students were not all assessed using the DRA data, however 4th grade Lexile ranges as measured by the Reading Inventory assessment increased from an average score of 496 to an average Lexile of 579. 5th grade students increased from an average Lexile score of 683 to an average Lexile of 770.</p>



2018-2019

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area or Target Population	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this	Evidence of Effectiveness (Identify the artifacts that support this outcome)
ST Mathematics	Mathematics intervention for English Language Learners	Yes	An average of 23% of the ST Math syllabi for each grade level was completed. It was implemented in January 2018, so it is expected that this percentage will increase with a full year of implementation next year.	Students who were provided the appropriate amount of time on the program weekly showed significantly higher growth in the grade level standards as compared to their peers who did not spend the suggested time.



2018-2019

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT				
Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where possible)	Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends



2018-2019

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where possible)							Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
		Student Group	ELA	Math	Alg1	Alg2	Geo			
PARCC Baseline Performance	Consider comparing previous year's and current year's PARCC results in the noted subject areas.	Schoolwide	21.6 %	28.4%				Results from the Spring 2017 PARCC Assessment included the following for GLC school; There were 436 total valid scores in grades 3-5. In ELA, 93 students in grades 3-5 performed at a Level 4 and met or exceeded grade level expectations for the assessment. This is equivalent to 21.3% of students.	PARCC test results from Spring 2017 were reported in September 2017. During this time, teachers met by grade level and department to analyze scores and trends. Overall, in ELA there is an increase in the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations from grades 3-5.	
		White	32%	38.7%						
		Hispanic	16.9 %	26.3%						
		Black or African American	23.8 %	14.3%						
		Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	*	*						
		American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*						
		Two or More Races	*	*						
		Female	25.7 %	28.8%						
		Male	17.8 %	28%						
		Economically Disadvantaged Students	20.5 %	27.5%						
		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Students	37%	41.3%						
		Students with Disabilities	*	15.8%						
		Students without Disabilities	*	29%						
		English Learners	16.8 %	24.9%						
		Non-English Learners	27.8 %	33.1%						
		Homeless Students	*	*						
		Students in Foster Care	*	*						
		Military-Connected Students	*	*						
		Migrant Students	*	*						



2018-2019

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where possible)	Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
			<p>expectations, and 15.9% met expectations. In grade 3 Math 14.9% of students did not meet expectations, 63.8% of students partially met or are approaching expectations, and 21.3% met or exceeded grade level expectations.</p> <p>The following results were compiled for Grade 4: There were 152 valid scores. In ELA 17.8% of students did not meet expectations, 60.5% of students partially met or are approaching grade level expectations, and 21.7% met or exceeded expectations. In grade 4 Math, 10.6% of students did not meet expectations, 63.8% of students partially met or are approaching expectations, and 25.7% met or exceeded grade level expectations.</p> <p>In 5th grade 152 student scores were analyzed. Results showed: In ELA 15.1% of students did not meet expectations, 59.2% of students partially met or are approaching grade level expectations, and 25.6%</p>	<p>curriculum and interventions we hope to see an upward trend in students meeting grade level expectations.</p> <p>After school Evidence Statement analysis in mathematics, it can be seen that students in grades 3, 4, and 5 scored below the average percent correct by Evidence Statement in the state on all reported items. However, especially low scoring were items that reflect the domain of modeling and reasoning.</p> <p>As teachers looked closely at standards, it was clear to identify areas that students excel, as well as, areas of difficulty. Results were displayed in correlation with the Common Core State Standards. In Grade 3</p>



2018-2019

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where possible)	Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
			<p>met or exceeded expectations. In grade 5 Math, 9.8% of students did not meet expectations, 55.2% of students partially met or are approaching expectations, and 34.9% met or exceeded grade level PARCC expectations.</p>	<p>ELA, students excelled in the standard RL 3.2 (approx. 75%) which includes recounting stories, finding the central message, and using details to explain. The area of most difficulty was standard RL 3.9 (approx. 15%) comparing and contrasting themes, settings, and plots in literature. In Grade 3 Math, students scored highest in standard 3.G.2 (approx. 83%) which includes partitioning shapes into segments and representing parts in fractions. The standard with the lowest percentage was 3.C.6-2 (approx. 5%), Operations and Algebraic Thinking which includes solving multi-step problems.</p> <p>In Grade 4 ELA, students scored the highest percentage in standard RI 4.2 (approx.</p>



STATE OF NEW JERSEY
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

2018-2019

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where possible)	Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
				<p>70%), which involves finding the main idea and supporting details in informational text.</p> <p>Grade 4 students had difficulty with standard RL 4.7 (approx. 18%), making connections between a story and visual presentation of the text. In Grade 4 Math students excelled in standard 4.NF.7 (approx. 70%), comparing decimals. The area of most difficulty was standard 4.G.2 (approx. 2%), classifying two-dimensional figures.</p> <p>Finally, in Grade 5 ELA, students scored highest on standard L.5.5 (approx. 65%), understanding figurative language and word relationships. Students scored the lowest percentage on standard RI 5.9 (approx. 19%), which includes integrated information</p>



2018-2019

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where possible)	Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
				<p>from more than one text on the same topic. In Grade 5 math, the standard with the highest percentage was 5.NF.3-1 (approx. 82%) interpreting fractions, and the standard with the lowest percentage was 5.MD.2 (approx. 10%), creating a line plot from a data set.</p> <p>Analyzing the results as well as specific standards provides teachers with opportunities to focus on areas of more difficulty. Teachers typically look at the year prior for trends in scores, which drives teacher collaboration, lesson planning and instruction.</p>

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where possible)				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	Student growth and achievement can be analyzed by reviewing grade level proficiencies over a 3-year time frame. In looking at grades 3-5 as a whole, for ELA in 2014-2015, 15% of students were meeting or exceeding PARCC expectations. In 2015-2016 this increased to 16% of students. In 2016-2017, 21% of students were meeting or exceeding on the PARCC assessment. For grades 3-5 overall in Math, 20% were meeting expectations in 2014-15, 23% in 2015-16, and 28% in 2016-17. Here is a further breakdown of scores by grade level and subject over a 3 year period of time. In Grade 3 ELA student achievement increased from 8% in 2014-2015 to 16% in 2016-2017. In Grade 3 Math the percentage of students meeting expectations in 2014-15 was 19% and increased to 21% in 2016-17. Grade 4 ELA proficiency was	School-wide test results over a 3 year timeframe, indicate students are gradually increasing proficiency on the PARCC assessment. Each grade level and subject demonstrates higher percentage rates for those meeting and/or exceeding PARCC expectations. In comparison to the rest of the district, overall our school is slightly lower in proficiency percentages in Math. In 2016-2017 our overall percentage of students meeting expectations was 28% and the rest of the district was 32%. This trend remains consistent for ELA proficiency. Our school had an average of 21% meeting expectations in 2016-17 and the rest of the district had a 30% average of students meeting expectations. Although there have	
		Schoolwide	74	53			
		White	82	64.5			
		Hispanic	73	50			
		Black or African American	61	50			
		Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific	*	*			
		American Indian or Alaska Native					
		Two or More Races	*	*			
		Female					
		Male					
		Economically Disadvantaged	74	53			
		Non-Economically Disadvantaged					
		Students with Disabilities	71	35			
		Students without Disabilities					
		English Learners	77.5	52.5			
		Non-English Learners					
		Homeless Students					
		Students in Foster Care					
		Military-Connected Students					
		Migrant Students					



2018-2019

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where possible)	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		<p>at 18% in 2014-2015, dipped down to 13% in 2015-2016, then increased to 22% in 2016-2017, Grade 4 Math in 2014-2015 was at 19% then increased to 26% in 2016-17.</p> <p>The percentage of students meeting expectation in Grade 5 ELA was 21% in 2014-15 and increased to 26% in 2016-17. Grade 5 Math student percentages started at 22% in 2014-15 and increased to 35% in 2016-17.</p>	<p>been improvements in achievement and growth, there needs to be continued and persistent interventions utilizing our curriculum and quarterly assessments.</p>
			100% of students participate in Benchmark assessments.	There are no patterns established of non-participation on Benchmark assessments. Teachers provide ample time for completion of the test, as well as, make up dates for any absences.



Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where possible)					Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
		Grade	Cycle 1	Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Cycle 4		
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	K	0%	0%	0%	0%	Data from LinkIt! Benchmark A, (September 2017) to LinkIt! Benchmark C, (June 2018) show there has been an increase on average test scores. Grade 2 students increased from an average score of 28.5% on Benchmark A, to 38.0% on Benchmark C (increase of 9.5%). Grade 3 students increased from an average score of 32.8% on Benchmark A, to 49.9% on Benchmark C (increase of 17.1%). Grade 4 students increased from an average score of 34.5% on Benchmark A, to 42.2% on Benchmark C (increase of 7.7%). Grade 5 students increased from an average score of 42.2% on Benchmark A, to 46.3% on Benchmark C (increase of 4.1%).	During the 2016-2017 school year performance on Benchmark assessments were the following: From September (2016) to June (2017) students in Grade 1 increased their Math Benchmark by 40.7%. Students in Grade 2 increased their ELA Benchmark by 11.1% and Math Benchmark by 34.4%. In Grade 3 students increased their ELA scores by 16.6% and Math Benchmark by 33.9%. Students in Grade 4 increased their ELA scores by 6.1% and Math by 41.1%. In Grade 5 ELA Benchmark scores increased by 5.5% and Math Benchmark by 34.8%. In analyzing trends and Benchmark scores for the 2017-2018 year, we anticipate a consistent increase in average percentages per grade
		1	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		2	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		3	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		4	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		5	0%	0%	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%		



2018-2019

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where possible)	Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
				level and subject area. Final scores will be complete by June 2018.



2018-2019

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where possible)				Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends	
		Grade	Cycle 1	Cycle 2	Cycle 3			Cycle 4
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	K	0%	0%	0%	0%	According to the results from LinkIt! Benchmark A (September 2017) to LinkIt! Benchmark B (December 2017) there has been an increase in each grade level for overall performance on the assessments. Grade 1 students increased from an average score of 44.4% to 73.7%. Grade 2 students increased from an average score of 34.6% to 61.5%. Grade 3 students increased from an average score of 28.6% to 45%. Grade 4 students increased from an average score of 30.5% to 48%. Grade 5 students increased from an average score of 31.5% to 57.6%. Grade 6 students increased from an average score of 34.5% to 35.5%. Grade 7 students increased from 42.2% to 48.8%. The Benchmark C analysis will be complete in June 2018.	Student growth is measured using benchmark assessments to monitor individual, class and grade level progress. The proficiency ranges fluctuate between the assessments due to the content assessed making the growth on the average score a more telling indicator of overall grade level achievement. All grade levels increased their average score from Form A in September 2017 to Form C in May 2018. The LGP (LinkIt! Growth Profile) compares the amount of change (growth) in a student's score relative to a peer cohort with the same Form A achievement level using 2016-2017 NJ Statewide normed data. Students are then identified by achievement levels based on whether they
		1	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		2	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		3	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		4	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		5	0%	0%	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%		



2018-2019

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where possible)	Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
				<p>scored in the top-third (High LGP), middle-third (Typical LGP), or bottom third (Low LGP) of growth when compared to their cohort. In grades 1 and 2, 91% of students showed typical to high growth. 99% of total students showed positive growth with an average of 46% growth from Form A to Form C. The average score on the Form A Benchmarks was 41% and increased to 87% average score on the Form C benchmarks. In grades 3-5, 79% of students showed typical to high growth. 98% of total students showed positive growth with an average of 41% growth from Form A to Form C. The average score on the Form A Benchmarks was 30% and increased to 71% average score on the Form C benchmarks.</p>



2018-2019

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where possible)	Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
-------------	---------------------	---	---	-----------------------

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where possible)	Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
ACCESS for ELL's	<p>Student performance of English Language Learners. (Grades K-12)</p> <p>*Identify patterns by grade level</p>		<p>ACCESS testing assessing listening, speaking, reading, and writing for ELL students. The highest score that can be achieved is a 6.0. The following results were identified for ACCESS testing: In Grade 1, 99 students took the test with average scores of 4.6 in Listening, 4.4 in Speaking, 2.8 in Reading, and 3.0 in Writing. In Grade 2, 66 students took the test with average scores of 5.2 in Listening, 3.0 in Speaking, 3.3 in Reading, and 3.3 in Writing. In Grade 3, 64 students took the test with average scores of 4.0 in Listening, 3.0 in Speaking, 3.2 in Reading, and 3.1 in Writing. In Grade 4, 32 students took the test with average scores of 3.8 in Listening, 2.3 in Speaking, 2.7 in Reading, and 3.1 in Writing. In Grade 5, 20 students took the test with average scores of 5.2 in Listening, 2.9 in Speaking, 3.4 in Reading, and 3.2 in Writing.</p>	<p>Trends by grade level include a decrease in the number of students taking the assessment from First Grade to Fifth Grade. The writing score appears to stay consistent per grade level. The listening, speaking, and reading scores are slightly lower from 3rd grade to 4th grade.</p> <p>In reviewing scores from the previous school year (2015-2016) The overall average per grade level is lower. In 2016 Grade 1 had an overall average of 3.3 and it remained at 3.3 in 2017. Grade 2 had an overall average of 4.0 in 2016 and the average in 2017 was 3.2. In Grade 3 the average was 4.4 in 2016 and 3.1 in 2017. In Grade 4 the average was 4.2 in 2016 and 2.9 in 2017. In Grade 5 the average</p>



2018-2019

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where possible)	Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
				<p>was 3.8 in 2016 and 3.4 in 2017. According to the WIDA ACCESS informational website, the assessment was altered from 2016 to 2017 to meet the higher demands necessary for ELL students to have college and career readiness.</p>

CLIMATE & CULTURE			
Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where possible)	Your Data (Provide any additional data)
Enrollment	Number of students enrolled in your building *Identify overall enrollment trends *Identify enrollment by grade and subgroup	Overall YTD Student Enrollment Average	0
		Subgroup 1 YTD Student Enrollment Average	0
		Subgroup 2 YTD Student Enrollment Average	0
			There are currently 882 registered students at GLC Elementary School. 438 are male students and 444 are female students. There are 523 Hispanic students, 307 White students, 104 Black students, 9 Asian students, and 2 American Indian/Alaskan students. Each grade level has the following enrollment: Kindergarten 62, First grade 176 students, Second grade 164 students, Third grade 170 students, Fourth grade 147 students, and Fifth grade 163 students.
			Student enrollment does fluctuate throughout the year depending on delayed entries. Some students fall into multiple categories with race/ethnicity, which is why the total exceeds 882 students.

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where possible)			Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
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	0.00%	With 882 registered students, the average attendance rate for the school is 95%. The average attendance rate per grade level is as follows: Kindergarten 93.9%, First grade 94.6%, Second grade 94.5%, Third grade 95.9%, Fourth grade 95.7%, and Fifth grade 95.7%.	Students participate in grade level competitions to promote attendance throughout the school year. This motivates students to be present in school and work together to achieve a grade level goal. Students with poor attendance records are contacted by school counselors via mail, phone calls, and in-person meetings. This parent contact helps to inform of the total number of absences and if the student is in danger of chronic absenteeism.	
		Subgroup 1 YTD Student	0.00%			
		Subgroup 2 YTD Student Attendance Average	0.00%			

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where possible)		Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
Chronic Absenteeism (Students)	<p>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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Identify patterns by grade *Identify patterns by teacher *Identify interventions 	Overall YTD Chronic Absenteeism	0.00%	<p>Currently there are 27 students categorized as chronically absent. The breakdown per grade level is as follows: Kindergarten 2 students, First grade 4 students, Second grade 10 students, Third grade 2 students, Fourth grade 3 students, and Fifth grade 6 students. Kindergarten - 4 Chronic Absent. #Total Students 62. 4/62= 6.45% Grade Level Chronic Absent Rate</p> <p>1st Grade - 5 Chronic Absent. #Total Students 179. 5/179= 2.79% Grade Level Chronic Absent Rate</p> <p>2nd Grade - 16 Chronic Absent. #Total Students 164. 16/164= 9.74% Grade Level Chronic Absent Rate</p> <p>3rd Grade - 5 Chronic Absent. #Total Students 171. 5/171= 2.92% Grade Level Chronic Absent Rate</p> <p>4th Grade - 4 Chronic Absent. #Total Students 149. 4/149= 2.68% Grade Level Chronic Absent Rate</p> <p>5th Grade - 9 Chronic Absent. #Total Students 165. 9/165= 5.45% Grade Level Chronic Absent Rate</p>	<p>In the beginning of the year, a school-wide letter is sent home to all parents in reference the importance of attendance. This letter explains the necessity for students to be present and how attendance impacts learning. Chronically absent students are contacted by school counselors via mail, phone calls, and in-person meetings. The school principal will also participate in scheduled meetings to further explain the value of positive attendance. Counselors and principals work together to troubleshoot reasons for chronic absenteeism case-by-case.</p>
		Subgroup 1 YTD Chronic Absenteeism	0.00%		
		Subgroup 2 YTD Chronic Absenteeism	0.00%		



2018-2019

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where possible)		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	0.00%	<p>There are 85 staff members at GLC school. Staff attendance is at 94.5% for the year as of May 2018. According to the staff attendance report, 536 sick days have been used this school year. Which is 75.9% of the total days missed. There were 69 Urgent Business/Other days used which was 9.8% of the total days missed.</p>	<p>Other areas that were calculated in the days missed were family illness, floating holidays, unpaid, and exchange days.</p>

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where possible)		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	0.00%	According to our discipline there have been 41 In-School Suspensions (ISS) and 5 Out-of-School Suspensions (OSS). In reference to ISS the following numbers are per grade level: Kindergarten 1 case, First grade 2 cases, Second grade 7 cases, Third grade 8 cases, Fourth grade 6 cases, and Fifth grade 17 cases. In reference to OSS there were 2 suspensions in fourth grade and 3 suspensions in fifth grade. The report also showed incidents in which corrective action was taken. There were 24 additional incidents this year: 2 in Kindergarten, 6 in first grade, 5 in second grade, 3 in third grade, 7 in fourth grade, and 1 in fifth grade.	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. OSS is primarily given to students for physical altercations. Some interventions used to decrease behavior issues include PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports) with the use of incentives. "Bee Bucks" are used to reward students for acts of kindness and promoting the six pillars of character: Trustworthiness, Respect, Responsibility, Fairness, Caring, and Citizenship.
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	0.00%				
Student Suspension YTD Average - Out of School for Subgroup 1	0.00%				
Student Suspension YTD Average - Out of School for Subgroup 2	0.00%				



2018-2019

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where possible)	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			



2018-2019

COLLEGE & CAREER READINESS

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where possible)				Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
		Student Group	5 Year Rate	4 Year Rate			
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)	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							



2018-2019

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where possible)	Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
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.			



2018-2019

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		This year (2017-2018) only 1 staff member is currently on a CAP. That is only 1.2% of our total staff members. Last year (2016-2017) 3 staff members were on a CAP, which was 3.5% of our total staff.	Through the use of Professional Learning Communities (PLC), Professional Development (PD) opportunities, and classroom observations there has been a decrease in the number of staff members on a CAP.



2018-2019

< Other Indicators - NO DATA >



2018-2019

NJ School Needs Assessment

Component	Indicator Descriptor Level	Overall Strengths Summary	Areas of Focus Summary	
School-Based Activities in Support of Instruction and Program	1	Meetings are conducted to develop the school mission with a focus on the students overall achievement.	Continue to maintain a Level 3 rating in this component. Teachers can plan and share their instructional methods cross grade levels to see a more lateral vision of academic achievement.	
	A			3-Developed
	B			3-Developed
	C			3-Developed
	D			3-Developed
	E			3-Developed
	F			3-Developed
	A			3-Developed
	B			3-Developed
	C			3-Developed
D	3-Developed			
A	3-Developed			
B	3-Developed			
C	3-Developed			
D	3-Developed			
A	3-Developed			
B	3-Developed			
C	3-Developed			
Average	3.00			
School-based Activities in Support of Fiscal	1	Meetings are conducted throughout the school year to discuss resources, needs, and availability.	Continue to maintain a Level 3 and 4 rating for this component. Teachers can have additional discussion with administrators about resource needs during the school year when circumstances change or develop with students.	
	A			3-Developed
	B			4-Well Developed
	C			4-Well Developed
Average	3.67			

Component	Indicator Descriptor Level	Overall Strengths Summary	Areas of Focus Summary		
School-based Activities in Support of Governance	1	Administration meets with teachers during Professional Learning Community (PLC) and faculty meetings to review the school's mission and focus. This is usually conducted in the beginning of the school year.	Continue to maintain a Level 3 rating in this component. Teachers may want to revisit the mission and focus periodically during the year aside from just the beginning.		
	A			3-Developed	
	B			3-Developed	
	2			A	3-Developed
	B			3-Developed	
	3			A	3-Developed
	B			3-Developed	
	C			3-Developed	
	D			4-Well Developed	
	Average			3.13	
School-based Activities in Support of Operations	1	Administrators facilitate meetings to discuss and review school climate, positive relationships in the school environment, and goals to maintain a safe school. This occurs during PLC and faculty meetings.	Continue to maintain a Level 3 rating in this component. Allow for additional time to review factors that contribute to a positive school environment, especially safety in the school to promote awareness among teachers and students.		
	A			3-Developed	
	B			3-Developed	
	2			A	3-Developed
	B			3-Developed	
	C			3-Developed	
	3			A	4-Well Developed
	B			3-Developed	
	4			A	3-Developed
	B			3-Developed	
Average	3.11				



2018-2019

Component	Indicator Descriptor Level	Overall Strengths Summary	Areas of Focus Summary		
School-based Activities in Support of Personnel	1	Various professional development days are built into our district calendar. At this time, teachers have opportunities to interact with school leaders and colleagues. New teachers attend "new teacher meetings" several times throughout the year.	Continue to maintain a Level 3 rating in this component. Continue to give a choice of selection for PD to promote interest and effective participation for staff.		
	A			3-Developed	
	B			3-Developed	
	2			A	3-Developed
	B			4-Well Developed	
	C			3-Developed	
	D			3-Developed	
Average	3.17				



2018-2019

Root Cause Analysis

Area of Focus for SMART Goals	Performance Challenge	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?)

2018-2019

Area of Focus for SMART Goals	Performance Challenge	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?)
<p>Instruction & Program ELA</p>	<p>According to the results from LinkIt! Benchmark B (December 2017) students have an average score of the following: Grade 2 students have an average of 33.4%. Grade 3 students have an average score of 40%. Grade 4 students have an average score of 35.5%. Grade 5 students have an average of 48.8%. Although there has been an increase in overall growth, there is still a low performance average for the test.</p> <p>The results of the SRI from March (2018) have indicated an increase in the average reading lexile for Grades 2-5. Grade 2 students are reading at an average level of 297. Grade 3 students students are reading at an average level of 474. Grade 4 student are reading at an average level of 569. Grade 5 students are reading at an average level of 749. The results have shown overall growth in reading level for students in Grade 2-5, however, the majority of students are still performing below grade level.</p> <p>After analyzing DRA-2 data, for October (2017) and January (2018) results have indicated the following level of proficiencies per grade</p>	<p>Although there have been gradual improvements in reading proficiency, many students begin the year performing below grade level standards. 55% of students at GLC are currently in an EL program or out of the program for less than one year. Lack of teacher PD supporting effective instructional practices supporting this population foundational reading skills have yielded lower than average growth in literacy proficiency.</p>	<p>All Students</p>	<p>1 Continue to track and analyze Benchmark, SRI, DRA-2, and PARCC data to identify low performing content areas and provided PD supporting the components of phonological awareness and ways to help young children learn to read.</p> <p>2 Continue to track and analyze Benchmark, SRI, DRA-2, and PARCC data to identify low performing content areas and provided PD supporting the components of phonological awareness and ways to help young children learn to read.</p> <p>3 Provide PD 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.</p>



2018-2019

Area of Focus for SMART Goals	Performance Challenge	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?)
	<p>level: In Kindergarten 86% of students scored at a proficient DRA level for Mid Year testing. In 1st Grade 47% of students were proficient on the Mid Year assessment. In 2nd grade 56% of students scored at a proficient level. In 3rd grade 51% of students were proficient. The ELL students taking the DRA-2 88% of students scored at a Below Basic DRA level.</p> <p>All 3 reading assessments have displayed growth, however low level overall proficiency for the school in ELA.</p>			

Area of Focus for SMART Goals	Performance Challenge	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?)
<p>Instruction & Program Math</p> <p>Based on the results from LinkIt! Benchmark B (December 2017) there has been an increase in each grade level for overall performance on the assessment. Grade 1 students scored an average of 73.7%. Grade 2 students scored an average of 61.5%. Grade 3 students scored an average of 45%. Grade 4 students scored an average of 48%. Grade 5 students scored an average of 57.6%. Although there has been an increase in overall growth on the Math Benchmarks, there is still a low performance average for the test.</p> <p>Results from the Spring 2017 PARCC Assessment included the following for GLC school; In grade 3 only 21.3% met or exceeded grade level expectations. In grade 4 only 25.7% met or exceeded grade level expectations. In grade 5 only 34.9% met or exceeded grade level PARCC expectations. There have been gradual improvements of math scores over a three year period, however, the school still performs at a low proficiency level.</p>		<p>Similar to ELA, there have been gradual improvements of performance, many students begin the year performing below grade level standards. PARCC results show that in Grade 3 the standard with the lowest percentage was 3.C.6-2 (approx. 5%), Operations and Algebraic Thinking which includes solving multi-step problems. In Grade 4 the skill of most difficulty was standard 4.G.2 (approx. 2%), classifying two-dimensional figures. In Grade 5 math the standard with the lowest percentage was 5.MD.2 (approx. 10%), creating a line plot from a data set. Through the use of interventions such as purchased curriculum, unit tests, and benchmarks teachers will need to continue to monitor academic growth by analyzing Student Learning Standards (SLS). In addition to this, a large population (336 students) of the school are English Language Learners (ELLs) which make achieving grade level goals challenging as students adapt to the school and expectations.</p>	All Students	<p>1 Continue to implement purchased curriculum and monitor growth with SLS standards.</p> <p>2 Continue to track and analyze Benchmark data to identify low performing skill areas.</p> <p>3 Provide PD 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.</p>

Area of Focus for SMART Goals	Performance Challenge	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?)
Operations - Climate & Culture	<p>Parent involvement at GLC school is high for non-academic events and much lower for academic events. We would like to see an increase in the number of attendees for content based events. We believe if parents become more knowledgeable about the academic goals for the students they can better assist at home in achieving them. We believe this would create a trend that would result in improvements in student achievement and growth.</p>	<p>There are several factors that may contribute to this challenge. Since GLC is the designated bilingual school, language barriers may be an issue for parents attending academic related events. Another factor may be the planning behind the events needs to shift focus towards content areas. Also, scheduling events at varied times to accommodate parent schedules may be helpful in generating more interest in academic functions.</p>	All Students/Families	<p>1 Invest in the In-Demand Interpreter System to have an alternative method to communicating with a parental audience.</p> <p>2 Design a virtual "PD for Parents" event in various academics and languages. This can be shared through YouTube and parents can explore appropriate content areas of interest at their leisure.</p> <p>3 Plan additional academic events per grade level throughout the school year to accommodate parent needs and promote visitation to the classrooms.</p>
No option for the fourth SMART Goal was selected on the Root Cause page.				<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p>



2018-2019

SMART Goal 1

In order to achieve a higher level of schoolwide proficiency in ELA it is important to create grade level goals. It is anticipated that during the 2018-2019 school year 20% of students in each grade will increase proficiency by 10% on ELA Benchmark assessments from September-June. This is equivalent to about 18 students in Kindergarten, 36 students in Grade 1, 34 students in Grade 2, 34 students in Grade 3, 30 students in Grade 4, and 32 students in Grade 5. Overall about 180 students schoolwide will increase proficiency which will contribute to schoolwide growth in ELA.

Performance

According to the results from LinkIt! Benchmark B (December 2017) students have an average score of the following: Grade 2 students have an average of 33.4%. Grade 3 students have an average score of 40%. Grade 4 students have an average score of 35.5%. Grade 5 students have an average of 48.8%. Although there has been an increase in overall growth, there is still a low performance average for the test.

The results of the SRI from March (2018) have indicated an increase in the average reading lexile for Grades 2-5. Grade 2 students are reading at an average level of 297. Grade 3 students are reading at an average level of 474. Grade 4 student are reading at an average level of 569. Grade 5 students are reading at an average level of 749. The results have shown overall growth in reading level for students in Grade 2-5, however, the majority of students are still performing below grade level.

After analyzing DRA-2 data, for October (2017) and January (2018) results have indicated the following level of proficiencies per grade level: In Kindergarten 86% of students scored at a proficient DRA level for Mid Year testing. In 1st Grade 47% of students were proficient on the Mid Year assessment. In 2nd grade 56% of students scored at a proficient level. In 3rd grade 51% of students were proficient. The ELL students taking the DRA-2 88% of students scored at a Below Basic DRA level.

All 3 reading assessments have displayed growth, however low level overall proficiency for the school in ELA.

Target Population: All Students

**Interim Goals
SMART Goal 1**

End of Cycle	Interim Goal	Source(s) of Evidence
Nov 15	<p>In September 2018, teachers will use previous year assessments to analyze student scores and academic levels. This will include Benchmark, DRA-2, SRI, and PARCC data. Teachers will identify approximately 3-4 students to utilize in their SGO that will attain 10% growth on their Benchmark assessments during the 2018-2019 school year. At the end of Marking Period 1 (November 2018) teachers will re-evaluate the students with current grade level data accumulated during the first 3 months of school.</p>	<p>The following sources will be used to evaluate our ELA Smart Goal: 2017-2018 school year ELA Assessment Data, 2018-2019 Linkit Benchmark Data, 2018-2019 DRA-2 Data, 2018-2019 SRI Data, Treasures Weekly Assessments, Treasures Weekly Tests, Treasures Unit Tests, SLS Standards</p>
Feb 15	<p>By the end of Marking Period 2, teachers will have administered mid-year benchmarks to students. They will analyze data and review goals set in the beginning of the school year. This will allow time to determine if teachers are on track for attaining ELA goals and make adjustments accordingly. At this point there should be approximately 3% growth on benchmark assessments. Teachers can modify SGO target scores if necessary.</p>	<p>The following sources will be used to evaluate our ELA Smart Goal: 2018-2019 Linkit Benchmark Data, 2018-2019 DRA-2 Data, 2018-2019 SRI Data, Treasures Weekly Assessments, Treasures Weekly Tests, Treasures Unit Tests, SLS Standards</p>
Apr 15:	<p>By the end of Marking Period 3, teachers will analyze current 2018-2019 data and review goals set in the beginning of the school year for targeted students. This will allow time to determine if teachers are on track for attaining ELA goals and make adjustments accordingly. At this point there should be approximately 7% growth on ELA assessments.</p>	<p>The following sources will be used to evaluate our ELA Smart Goal: 2018-2019 Linkit Benchmark Data, 2018-2019 DRA-2 Data, 2018-2019 SRI Data, Treasures Weekly Assessments, Treasures Weekly Tests, Treasures Unit Tests, SLS Standards</p>
Jul 1	<p>In order to achieve a higher level of schoolwide proficiency in ELA it is important to create grade level goals. It is anticipated that during the 2018-2019 school year 20% of students in each grade will increase proficiency by 10% on ELA Benchmark assessments from September-June. This is equivalent to about 18 students in Kindergarten, 36 students in Grade 1, 34 students in Grade 2, 34 students in Grade 3, 30 students in Grade 4, and 32 students in Grade 5. Overall about 180 students schoolwide will increase proficiency which will contribute to schoolwide growth in ELA.</p>	<p>The following sources will be used to evaluate our ELA Smart Goal: 2018-2019 Linkit Benchmark Data, 2018-2019 DRA-2 Data, 2018-2019 SRI Data, Treasures Weekly Assessments, Treasures Weekly Tests, Treasures Unit Tests, SLS Standards</p>



2018-2019

Action Steps
SMART Goal 1

Step Number	Strategy	Action Steps	Start Date	End Date	Assigned To
1	1	Analyze 2017-2018 LinkIt! Data from prior year assessments. This will assist in initial reading level placement.	9/6/18	10/31/18	
2	1	Once initial Fall 2018 Benchmark A, SRI, and DRA-2 assessments are complete, utilize results to compare to previous year scores. Identify students for SGO.	9/6/18	10/31/18	
3	1	During scheduled PLC time, create grade level attainable goals on identified standards for first and second quarter.	9/6/18	10/31/18	
4	1	Identify students eligible for Title I tutoring placement with teacher input and criteria set by ESSA Improvement Leader and stakeholders.	9/6/18	10/31/18	
5	1	Continuous progress monitoring of students using Treasures weekly tests, Treasures unit assessments, SLS for appropriate grade levels.	9/6/18	10/31/18	
6	2	Analyze results from Benchmark B and compare to initial test score. Locate areas of deficiency and continuously track progress.	11/1/18	1/31/19	
7	2	Review SLS grade level goals from September 2018 and monitor progress. Are we on track for attaining our goal?	11/1/18	1/31/19	
8	2	Title I tutors and homeroom teachers should check in and identify progress and/or inconsistencies in student achievement.	11/1/18	1/31/19	
9	2	Continuous progress monitoring of students using SRI, DRA-2, Treasures weekly tests, Treasures unit assessments, SLS for appropriate grade levels.	11/1/18	1/31/19	



2018-2019

Step Number	Strategy	Action Steps	Start Date	End Date	Assigned To
10	2	Use formal observations to evaluate lessons as well as suggest how grade level and independent goals can be met. Offer suggestions and new interventions.	11/1/18	1/31/19	
11	2	Review SGO and check progress. Are there any adjustments that need to be made?	2/1/19	4/1/19	
12	2	During scheduled PLC time, collaborate on lesson planning. Identify what is and what is not working in classroom instruction. How can things improve?	2/1/19	4/1/19	
13	2	Title I tutors and homeroom teachers should check in and identify progress and/or inconsistencies in student achievement.	2/1/19	4/1/19	
14	2	Continuous progress monitoring of students using SRI, DRA-2, Treasures weekly tests, Treasures unit assessments, SLS for appropriate grade levels.	2/1/19	4/1/19	
15	3	During scheduled PLC time, evaluate grade level progress. How are grade level goals being met?	4/2/19	6/18/19	
16	3	Continue to use data to monitor and differentiate instruction.	4/2/19	6/18/19	
17	3	Analyze results from Benchmark C, SRI, DRA-2, Treasures assessments. Make full year comparison.	4/2/19	6/18/19	



2018-2019

Budget Items

SMART Goal 1

Corresponding Action Step	Resource / Description	Funding Category / Object Code	Funding Requested	Funding Source
1	The district blends its Title 1 funds and this is accomplished by a 520-930 budget line in the ESEA application. The ASP does not provide a 520-930 line so this information cannot be represented in the submitted ASP. For purposes of submission only, the school is entering \$1 to represent the total amount of blended Title 1 money. Total amount blended equals \$1,642,803 in the ESEA application.	FACILITIES - Buildings / 400-720	\$1	Federal Title I (School Allocation)



2018-2019

SMART Goal 2

In order to achieve a higher level of schoolwide proficiency in Mathematics it is important to create grade level goals. It is anticipated that during the 2018-2019 school year 20% of students in each grade will increase proficiency by 20% on Math Benchmark assessments from September-June. This is equivalent to about 18 students in Kindergarten, 36 students in Grade 1, 34 students in Grade 2, 34 students in Grade 3, 30 students in Grade 4, and 32 students in Grade 5. Overall about 180 students schoolwide will increase proficiency which will contribute to schoolwide growth in Mathematics.

Performance

Based on the results from LinkIt! Benchmark B (December 2017) there has been an increase in each grade level for overall performance on the assessment. Grade 1 students scored an average of 73.7%. Grade 2 students scored an average of 61.5%. Grade 3 students scored an average of 45%. Grade 4 students scored an average of 48%. Grade 5 students scored an average of 57.6%. Although there has been an increase in overall growth on the Math Benchmarks, there is still a low performance average for the test.

Results from the Spring 2017 PARCC Assessment included the following for GLC school; In grade 3 only 21.3% met or exceeded grade level expectations. In grade 4 only 25.7% met or exceeded grade level expectations. In grade 5 only 34.9% met or exceeded grade level PARCC expectations. There have been gradual improvements of math scores over a three year period, however, the school still performs at a low proficiency level.

Target Population: All Students

Interim Goals SMART Goal 2

End of Cycle	Interim Goal	Source(s) of Evidence

End of Cycle	Interim Goal	Source(s) of Evidence
Nov 15	<p>In September 2018, teachers will use previous year assessments to analyze student scores and academic levels. This will include Benchmark, Unit Assessments, and PARCC data. Teachers will identify approximately 3-4 students to utilize in their SGO that will attain 20% growth on their Benchmark assessments during the 2018-2019 school year. At the end of Marking Period 1 (November 2018) teachers will re-evaluate the students with current grade level data accumulated during the first 3 months of school.</p>	<p>The following sources will be used to evaluate our Math Smart Goal: 2017-2018 school year Math Assessment Data, 2018-2019 Linkit Benchmark Data, 2018-2019 Everyday Math Unit Assessments, Everyday Math Cumulative Assessments, SLS Standards.</p>
Feb 15	<p>By the end of Marking Period 2, teachers will have administered mid-year benchmarks to students. They will analyze data and review goals set in the beginning of the school year. This will allow time to determine if teachers are on track for attaining Math goals and make adjustments accordingly. At this point there should be approximately 7% growth on benchmark assessments for targeted students. Teachers can modify SGO target scores if necessary.</p>	<p>The following sources will be used to evaluate our Math Smart Goal: 2018-2019 Linkit Benchmark Data, 2018-2019 Everyday Math Unit Assessments, Everyday Math Cumulative Assessments, SLS Standards.</p>
Apr 15:	<p>By the end of Marking Period 3, teachers will analyze current 2018-2019 data and review goals set in the beginning of the school year for targeted students. This will allow time to determine if teachers are on track for attaining Math goals and make adjustments accordingly. At this point there should be approximately 13% growth on Math assessments.</p>	<p>The following sources will be used to evaluate our Math Smart Goal: 2018-2019 Linkit Benchmark Data, 2018-2019 Everyday Math Unit Assessments, Everyday Math Cumulative Assessments, SLS Standards.</p>
Jul 1	<p>In order to achieve a higher level of schoolwide proficiency in Mathematics it is important to create grade level goals. It is anticipated that during the 2018-2019 school year 20% of students in each grade will increase proficiency by 20% on Math Benchmark assessments from September-June. This is equivalent to about 18 students in Kindergarten, 36 students in Grade 1, 34 students in Grade 2, 34 students in Grade 3, 30 students in Grade 4, and 32 students in Grade 5. Overall about 180 students schoolwide will increase proficiency which will contribute to schoolwide growth in Mathematics.</p>	<p>The following sources will be used to evaluate our Math Smart Goal: 2018-2019 Linkit Benchmark Data, 2018-2019 Everyday Math Unit Assessments, Everyday Math Cumulative Assessments, SLS Standards.</p>



2018-2019

Action Steps

SMART Goal 2

Step Number	Strategy	Action Steps	Start Date	End Date	Assigned To
1	1	Analyze 2017-2018 LinkIt! Data from prior year assessments. This will assist in initial math level.	9/6/18	10/31/18	
2	1	Once initial Fall 2018 Benchmark A, utilize results to compare to previous year scores. Identify students for SGO.	9/6/18	10/31/18	
3	1	During scheduled PLC time, create grade level attainable goals on identified standards for first and second quarter.	9/6/18	10/31/18	
4	1	Identify students eligible for Title I tutoring placement with teacher input and criteria set by ESSA Improvement Leader and stakeholders.	9/6/18	10/31/18	
5	1	Continuous progress monitoring of students using Everyday Math Unit assessments, cumulative test, and SLS for appropriate grade levels.	9/6/18	10/31/18	
6	2	Analyze results from Benchmark B and compare to initial test score. Locate areas of deficiency and continuously track progress.	11/1/18	1/31/19	
7	2	Review SLS grade level goals from September 2018 and monitor progress. Are we on track for attaining our goal?	11/1/18	1/31/19	
8	2	Title I tutors and homeroom teachers should check in and identify progress and/or inconsistencies in student achievement.	11/1/18	1/31/19	
9	2	Use formal observations to evaluate lessons as well as suggest how grade level and independent goals can be met. Offer suggestions and new interventions.	11/1/18	1/31/19	
10	3	Review SGO and check progress. Are there any adjustments that need to be made?	2/1/19	4/1/19	
11	3	Continuous progress monitoring of students using Everyday Math Unit assessments, cumulative test, and SLS for appropriate grade levels.	2/1/19	4/1/19	



2018-2019

Step Number	Strategy	Action Steps	Start Date	End Date	Assigned To
12	3	During scheduled PLC time, collaborate on lesson planning. Identify what is and what is not working in classroom instruction. How can things improve?	2/1/19	4/1/19	
13	3	Title I tutors and homeroom teachers should check in and identify progress and/or inconsistencies in student achievement.	2/1/19	4/1/19	
14	3	During scheduled PLC time, evaluate grade level progress. How are grade level goals being met?	4/2/19	6/18/19	
15	3	Continuous progress monitoring of students using Everyday Math Unit assessments, cumulative test, and SLS for appropriate grade levels.	4/2/19	6/18/19	
16	3	Use formal observations to evaluate lessons as well as suggest how grade level and independent goals can be met. Offer suggestions and new interventions.	4/2/19	6/18/19	
17	3	Analyze results from Benchmark C. Make full year comparison.	4/2/19	6/18/19	

Budget Items

SMART Goal 2

Corresponding Action Step	Resource / Description	Funding Category / Object Code	Funding Requested	Funding Source
1	The district blends its Title 1 funds and this is accomplished by a 520-930 budget line in the ESEA application. The ASP does not provide a 520-930 line so this information cannot be represented in the submitted ASP. For purposes of submission only, the school is entering \$1 to represent the total amount of blended Title 1 money. Total amount blended equals \$1,642,803 in the ESEA application.	FACILITIES - Buildings / 400-720	\$1	Federal Title I (School Allocation)



STATE OF NEW JERSEY
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

2018-2019

George L. Catrambone (ID 11404)
LONG BRANCH CITY

06/29/2018

Page 58 of 68



2018-2019

SMART Goal 3

During the 2018-2019 school year, we would like to boost our parent involvement for academic events. Our goal is to provide additional opportunities for parents to get involved and informed in their child's education. This will require planning additional grade level events. We would like to obtain 30% of parent involvement in a grade level academic function. This equals approximately 20 parents in Kindergarten, 50 parents in First grade, 50 parents in Second grade, 50 parents in Third grade, 45 parents in Fourth grade, and 50 parents in Fifth grade. We would like to achieve this by adding 6 educational events (one per grade level) to our school calendar.

Performance

Parent Involvement at GLC school is high for non-academic events and much lower for academic events. We would like to see an increase in the number of attendees for content based events. We believe if parents become more knowledgeable about the academic goals for the students they can better assist at home in achieving them. We believe this would create a trend that would result in improvements in student achievement and growth.

Target Population: All Students/Families

Interim Goals SMART Goal 3

End of Cycle	Interim Goal	Source(s) of Evidence
Nov 15	By the end of Marking Period 1, Kindergarten and First Grade teachers will each plan and complete an academic, parent involvement event. This event will target educational goals and encourage parent/child communication and interaction.	Sign-In Sheets, Parent surveys, Feedback forms, PLC planning time for teachers, Social media posts

End of Cycle	Interim Goal	Source(s) of Evidence
Feb 15	By the end of Marking Period 2, Second and Third grade teachers will each plan and complete an academic, parent involvement event. This event will target educational goals and encourage parent/child communication and interaction.	Sign-In Sheets, Parent surveys, Feedback forms, PLC planning time for teachers, Social media posts
Apr 15:	By the end of Marking Period 3, Fourth and Fifth grade teachers will each plan and complete an academic, parent involvement event. This event will target educational goals and encourage parent/child communication and interaction.	Sign-In Sheets, Parent surveys, Feedback forms, PLC planning time for teachers, Social media posts
Jul 1	During the 2018-2019 school year, we would like to boost our parent involvement for academic events. Our goal is to provide additional opportunities for parents to get involved and informed in their child's education. This will require planning additional grade level events. We would like to obtain 30% of parent involvement in a grade level academic function. This equals approximately 20 parents in Kindergarten, 50 parents in First grade, 50 parents in Second grade, 50 parents in Third grade, 45 parents in Fourth grade, and 50 parents in Fifth grade. We would like to achieve this by adding 6 educational events (one per grade level) to our school calendar.	Sign-In Sheets, Parent surveys, Feedback forms, PLC planning time for teachers, Social media posts to invite and promote parent involvement events.

Action Steps

SMART Goal 3

Step Number	Strategy	Action Steps	Start Date	End Date	Assigned To
1	1	During scheduled PLC time, plan academic parent involvement events for grades K and 1.	9/6/18	10/31/18	
2	1	Social media posts to invite and promote parent involvement events, flyers home in multiple languages.	9/6/18	10/31/18	
3	1	Sign-In Sheets, Parent surveys, Feedback forms, to analyze success of event.	9/6/18	10/31/18	

Step Number	Strategy	Action Steps	Start Date	End Date	Assigned To
4	2	During scheduled PLC time, plan academic parent involvement events for grades 2 and 3	11/1/18	1/31/19	
5	2	Social media posts to invite and promote parent involvement events, flyers home in multiple languages.	11/1/18	1/31/19	
6	2	Sign-In Sheets, Parent surveys, Feedback forms, to analyze success of event.	11/1/18	1/31/19	
7	3	During scheduled PLC time, plan academic parent involvement events for grades 4 and 5	2/1/19	4/1/19	
8	3	Social media posts to invite and promote parent involvement events, flyers home in multiple languages.	2/1/19	4/1/19	
9	3	Sign-In Sheets, Parent surveys, Feedback forms, to analyze success of event.	2/1/19	4/1/19	
10	3	Evaluate success and changes needed for parent involvement.	4/2/19	6/18/19	

Budget Items

SMART Goal 3

Corresponding Action Step	Resource / Description	Funding Category / Object Code	Funding Requested	Funding Source
1	The district blends its Title 1 funds and this is accomplished by a 520-930 budget line in the ESEA application. The ASP does not provide a 520-930 line so this information cannot be represented in the submitted ASP. For purposes of submission only, the school is entering \$1 to represent the total amount of blended Title 1 money. Total amount blended equals \$1,642,803 in the ESEA application.	FACILITIES - Buildings / 400-720	\$1	Federal Title I (School Allocation)



2018-2019

SMART Goal 4

Performance

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 >



2018-2019

< SMART Goal 4 - Budget Items: NO DATA >



2018-2019

Budget Summary

Budget Category	Sub Category	Function & Object Code	State/Local Budget for School	Federal Title I (Priority/Focus Intervention)	Federal Title I (School Allocation)	Other Federal Funds Allocated to School	SIA (If Applicable) Allocated to School	TOTAL
INSTRUCTION	Personnel Services - Salaries	100-100	0	0	0	0	0	0
INSTRUCTION	Purchased Professional & Technical Services	100-300	0	0	0	0	0	0
INSTRUCTION	Other Purchased Services	100-500	0	0	0	0	0	0
INSTRUCTION	Supplies & Materials	100-600	0	0	0	0	0	0
INSTRUCTION	Other Objects	100-800	0	0	0	0	0	0
INSTRUCTION	Sub-total		0	0	0	0	0	0
SUPPORT SERVICES	Personnel Services - Salaries	200-100	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUPPORT SERVICES	Personnel Services - Employee Benefits	200-200	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUPPORT SERVICES	Purchased Professional & Technical Services	200-300	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUPPORT SERVICES	Purchased Property Services	200-400	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUPPORT SERVICES	Other Purchased Services	200-500	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUPPORT SERVICES	Travel	200-580	0	0	0	0	0	0



2018-2019

Budget Category	Sub Category	Function & Object Code	State/Local Budget for School	Federal Title I (Priority/Focus Intervention)	Federal Title I (School Allocation)	Other Federal Funds Allocated to School	SIA (If Applicable) Allocated to School	TOTAL
SUPPORT SERVICES	Supplies & Materials	200-600	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUPPORT SERVICES	Other Objects	200-800	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUPPORT SERVICES	Indirect Costs	200-860	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUPPORT SERVICES	Sub-total		0	0	0	0	0	0
FACILITIES	Buildings	400-720	0	0	3	0	0	3
FACILITIES	Instructional Equipment	400-731	0	0	0	0	0	0
FACILITIES	Noninstructional Equipment	400-732	0	0	0	0	0	0
FACILITIES	Sub-total		0	0	3	0	0	3
Total Cost			0	0	3	0	0	3



2018-2019

Overview of Total Title 1 Expenditures

	Federal Title 1 (Priority/Focus Interventions Reserve)	Federal Title 1 (School allocation) Total	TOTAL
Included in SMART Goal Pages	0	3	3
Other Title 1 Expenditures	0	0	0
Total	0	3	3



2018-2019

Confirmation Page

x	The results of the Comprehensive Data Analysis and Needs Assessment are included in the designated tabs. For Level II and III schools, the Comprehensive Data Analysis and Needs Assessment process should be completed in collaboration and with the concurrence of your Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) Team.
x	The Annual School Plan includes no more than four (4), SMART goals. For Level III schools, a SMART goal must be developed for ELA, Math and two options of highest school need.
	Instruction & Program ELA
	Instruction & Program Math
	Operations - Climate & Culture
	No option for the fourth SMART Goal was selected on the Root Cause page.
	For Level II and III schools, the Annual School Plan includes interventions that address the performance of the targeted lowest-
	The Budget Summary includes all planned expenditures, as identified within the 'Budget Items' section of the SMART goal pages.
x	This plan has been reviewed by the District Superintendent and all purchases and uses of funds (all Title I, other federal, SIA and state/local) have been reviewed and approved by the District Business Administrator, Title I Coordinator or other designated

Completed By: Christopher Volpe

Date: 2018-06-28



2018-2019

Certification Page

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.
---	--

Certified By: Roberta Freeman

Title: Chief Academic Officer

Date: 2018-06-29