New York State EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Knowledge > Skill > Opportunity

2021-2022 Receivership School Quarterly Report #2/Mid-Year Report
Report Period: October 16, 2021 to January 14, 2022 *(Due January 28, 2022)*

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

School Name	School BEDS Code	District	Lead Partner or EPO	
William C Keane Elementary School	530600010030	Schenectady City School District		

Superintendent	School Principal (If new, please attach resume)	Additional District Staff working on Program Oversight	Grade Configuration	High School Graduation Rate (If applicable, please provide the most recent graduation rate data available.):	Total Enrollment	% ELL	% SWD
Mr. Anibal Soler, Jr.	Ms. Kerri Messler **Appointment Date**: July 1, 2020	Dr. Shaun M. Mason Assistant Superintendent of Planning and Accountability Ms. Michele Hogan Assistant Director of Planning and Accountability Joseph DiCaprio Executive Director of Elementary Schools	PK-5		293	0	15.70% (46 Students)

Updated September 14, 2021

New York State
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Knowledge > Skill > Opportunity

Executive Summary
Please provide a *plain-language summary* of this completed report and related continuation plan(s) with a focus on the implementation of key strategies, engaging the community, and enacting Receivership. The summary should be written in terms easily understood by the community-at-large. Please avoid terms and acronyms that are unfamiliar to the public and limit the summary to *no more than 500 words*.
The lead key strategy for our continuation plan is our use of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). This is a protected time for teachers to analyze data, study student work, share best practices, and reflect and refine their teaching. In addition to the 30 minutes at the end of each day (Monday through Thursday), our teachers also engage in Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycles every six weeks by grade-level teams. In partnership with the Office of Accountability, our teachers study data visualizations to determine if their working theory about an instructional practice needs to be adjusted, adapted, or abandoned. During this quarter, we held two of these (PDSA) sessions for our staff. In these sessions, teachers study the impact of an instructional practice to determine if it's working or not, for whom it is working (or not), they set new goals, and gather feedback on those SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, Time-bound) goals. We have evidence that this practice is working in our school turnaround efforts as evidenced by our growth this quarter.

Through Professional Learning Communities, data cycles, and walkthroughs, our administrative team is able to provide teachers with clear, actionable feedback on how their work is supporting our instructional vision. This quarter, teachers were part of revamping our walkthrough tool so that we could focus our work in 4 key areas (i.e., alignment to the curriculum, clear objectives, checking for understanding related to the objective, and student engagement). We recognize that we have more work to do around quality feedback and will continue to focus on this area in quarter 3.

We have hosted more parent events this quarter and have increased our utilization of ParentSquare as a two- way communication tool to gather feedback and adjust how we engage with parents, in what formats, and topics that are of interest to our families. We continue to introduce new features from ParentSquare and support more parents in utilization of this app as a primary communication tool. In this quarter, we have identified parents that are willing to volunteer for PTO (Parent-Teacher Organization) and we hosted our first PTO meeting (12/22). We have another meeting scheduled for February 1st.

Additionally, we know that a quality school facility is correlative to student outcomes. We know that our school environment communicates powerful messages to our students about how our staff values them and believes they are capable of excellence. We ensure that materials posted on our walls are reflective of our student population, that the walls capture what students are learning and why, how they are growing as learners, and goals and aspirations they have. We have launched our Student Council, elected officers, and have included them in leadership decisions for the building.   While we are improving our school climate as it relates to academic rigor and expectations, we have experienced some barriers related to our physical plant. We have identified staffing and communication within our maintenance department as a major concern and will continue to problem solve in quarter 3. |

Updated December 2021

Directions for Parts I, II, and III –

District and school staff should respond to the sections of this document by both analyzing and summarizing the key strategies that were implemented in the first quarter and include the process used to assess strategy impact on student learning outcomes.

This is an opportunity for district and school staff to provide a reflective outline of proposed actions, strategies, and process adaptations included in the school's 2021-2022 Continuation Plan with a focus on progress made through continuous and comprehensive planning, articulating explicit support of student social-emotional well-being, diversity, equity, inclusion, and active engagement. The District should ensure the key strategies address the needs of all learners, particularly the needs of subgroups of students and those at risk for not meeting state academic standards. District and school staff should consider the impact of identified key strategies on student learning, and connection with and alignment to diagnostic review feedback to ensure long-term sustainable growth.

New York State
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Knowledge > Skill > Opportunity

Part I –Lead Strategies for Improvement

Lead Strategies for School Improvement		
Identify 3-4 of the core lead strategies that are central to the school's improvement plan and outline the progress made applying each strategy. Lead strategies are key levers for improvement that are identified based on trends in student performance data to serve as overarching approaches for implementing strategically focused action plans for achieving demonstrable improvement.		
Quarterly Report #2/Mid-Year Report with Reflection on Lead Strategies Utilized during October 16, 2021 -January 14, 2022		
Identify the lead strategies that guided the school's improvement work during the reporting period, including any that were discontinued.	Status (R/Y/G)	For each lead strategy, outline how the strategy helped achieve progress toward this year's demonstrable improvement targets.
1. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)	*(green)*	Our professional learning communities meet Monday-Thursday from 2:15-2:45. Teams were meeting in separate spaces in the building but this quarter we moved K-2 and 3-5 into 2 rooms. Teachers asked for this change so that they could engage in vertical conversations when needed. They also realized there were more thought partners in the room to engage with around a problem of practice. COVID did have an impact on the PLCs as we experienced many more absences among staffing this quarter. Additionally, we did ask PLCs to meet virtually for two weeks, after the holidays - due to the high transmission rate we were seeing among staff. In order to help shape PLC discussions, teachers are utilizing their goals in the plan, do, study, act (PDSA) cycles. In these meetings that occur every 6 weeks (10/21, 12/3, 1/21, 3/11, 5/6), teachers identify a problem of practice, establish baseline data, set a goal for the next 6 weeks and progress monitor towards that goal.
2. Regular individualized **feedback** to teachers/students regarding where they are in attainment of the instructional vision.	*(yellow)*	We continued to engage teachers in our vision work and refine our mission and purpose at Keane Elementary School. Our leadership team has recently created a bulletin board that captures the "vibe" of Keane Elementary School. This is a place for staff and students to share how the building "feels" on a regular basis. We know that feelings about the safety and care of our building impacts student learning and this is one of the ways we are gathering this data from our students and staff. Administrators visit all classrooms weekly and have reserved faculty meeting time for teachers to collaborate, reflect, and provide feedback on the implementation of the curriculum (i,e, reading, ELA, and Math). Administrators have also worked closely with the reading/intervention team to refine and revamp caseloads aligned to specific evidence-based interventions based on benchmark and diagnostic data from our winter cycle. Administrators are engaging in professional development to align the vision of learning, high leverage practices, with rituals and routines/pedagogical practices in the new curriculum (i.e., Wit and Wisdom, Heggerty, Fundations, and Eureka Math).

Updated December 2021

New York State
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Knowledge > Skill > Opportunity

		Administrators attended all data meetings to ensure the goals teachers identified were data-informed, precise, and accurate, and able to be monitored weekly by the grade level PLC.
3. Community Engagement		We continue to see an increase in registered users in ParentSquare and this communication tool is helping us have two way communication with parents. We are seeing an increase in parents engaging in dialogue and feeling safe to share feedback with us on this platform. We utilize this feedback to make adjustments and sharpen our focus as we move forward. In addition to our work on ParentSquare, we held our first PTO (Parent- Teacher Organization) meeting on 12/22 where a family attended. We have also held two family events at Faith Evangelist Tabernacle Church and we've held several student and family events at Keane Elementary School. At each of these events, we are learning and growing to ensure responsiveness to our families and connectivity for busy families. We believe that creating engaging family and community events will increase school connectedness, school readiness, and engagement with our school.
4. School Climate Revitalization		We continue to reduce work orders submitted in our school management system and advocate for timely and thorough completion of jobs. The district office has partnered with us to ensure timely completion of jobs and follow through by district level teams. We have opened our Book Vending Machine for students. Students on our student council are developing clear criteria for winning a token (Positive Behavior Intervention and Support- PBIS) to the vending machine and are soliciting feedback from their classmates. The student council has also advocated for updates to our boys and girls bathrooms and has begun the election process for officer roles. We meet with our Anti-Racist Building Leadership Team (ARBLT) and Safety Team monthly to ensure a safe and productive learning environment for our students. Our student support team is fine tuning our response to behavior in our building and is in final draft mode for protocols for responding to students in crisis for our staff members and steps to remove a student from class, if necessary. While we are making gains on the climate of our building as it relates to academic expectations and rigor, we do have barriers that exist related to our physical plant specifically related to staffing and being a leased property.

Updated December 2021

New York State
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Knowledge > Skill > Opportunity

Part II – *Demonstrable Improvement Indicators-Level 1*

Level 1 Indicators			
Please list the school's Level 1 indicators and complete all columns below. This information should provide details about how lead strategies inform the implementation of specific strategies and action steps that support progress toward the Demonstrable Improvement Indicators.			
Quarterly Report #2 Reflection on Activities Completed for this Indicator during October 16, 2021- January 14, 2022			
Indicator	Status (R/Y/G)	Identify specific strategies and action steps implemented to support progress for each of the Demonstrable Improvement Indicators.	• Provide the specific data/evidence used to determine progress and impact on instruction, student learning, and achievement. • Describe how the data trends that emerged during this reporting period will inform future action steps. • Include a description of any adjustments made to the continuation plan along with the corresponding data used to inform the adjustment.
Indicator 39 3-8 Math All Students MGP *Progress Target:* 42.6		**Strategy 1, 2, 4** • PLCs • Math Interim - Baseline (1/10) • STAR Benchmarking (1/10)	**STAR Data:** Below are charts that reflect the performance of students on STAR Math for Fall 2019, Fall 2020 and Fall 2021 as well as Winter 2020, Winter 2021 and Winter 2022 .

Growth Analysis: STAR Math Grades 3-5 by Administration 21-22

STAR Administration	Fall 2021 n=151	Winter 2022 n=147	Growth
MIP Grades 3-5	84.77	86.05	+1.28
Percent Proficient Grades 3-5	17.22% (26 Students)	22.45% (33 Students)	+5.23
Percent Tested	86.09%	85.03%	

Updated December 2021

STAR Math Grades 3-5 by Fall Administration			
STAR Administration	Fall 2019 n=153	Fall 2020 n=164	Fall 2021 n=151
MIP Grades 3-5	145.75	117.07	84.77
Percent Proficient Grades 3-5	43.14% (64 Students)	31.71% (52 Students)	17.22% (26 Students)
Percent Tested	95.42%	85.98%	86.09%

STAR Math Grades 3-5 by Winter Administration			
STAR Administration	Winter 2020 n=153	Winter 2021 n=164	Winter 2022 n=147
MIP Grades 3-5	145.75	110.67	86.05
Percent Proficient Grades 3-5	41.83% (64 Students)	32.32% (53 Students)	22.45% (33 Students)
Percent Tested	95.42%	84.76%	85.03%

STAR Math Grades 3 by Fall Administration			
STAR Administration	Fall 2019 n=43	Fall 2020 n=56	Fall 2021 n=51
MIP Grades 3	143.02	103.57	87.25
Percent Proficient	44.19% (19 Students)	28.57% (16 Students)	21.57% (11 Students)

Grades 3			
Percent Tested	95.35%	80.36%	78.43%

STAR Math Grades 3 by Winter Administration			
STAR Administration	Winter 2020 n=43	Winter 2021 n=56	Winter 2022 n=49
MIP Grades 3	158.14	105.36	90.82
Percent Proficient Grades 3	46.51% (20 Students)	32.14% (18 Students)	26.53% (13 Students)
Percent Tested	100.00%	85.71%	83.67%

STAR Math Grades 4 by Fall Administration			
STAR Administration	Fall 2019 n=56	Fall 2020 n=48	Fall 2021 n=50
MIP Grades 4	149.11	131.25	75.00
Percent Proficient Grades 4	41.07% (23 Students)	37.50% (18 Students)	10.00% (5 Students)
Percent Tested	94.64%	91.67%	90.00%

Updated December 2021

STAR Math Grades 4 by Winter Administration			
STAR Administration	Winter 2020 n=56	Winter 2021 n=48	Winter 2022 n=50
MIP Grades 4	143.75	116.67	83.00
Percent Proficient Grades 4	41.07% (23 Students)	33.33% (16 Students)	22.00% (11 Students)
Percent Tested	94.64%	79.17%	84.00%

STAR Math Grades 5 by Fall Administration			
STAR Administration	Fall 2019 n=54	Fall 2020 n=60	Fall 2021 n=50
MIP Grades 5	144.44	118.33	92.00
Percent Proficient Grades 5	44.44% (24 Students)	30.00% (18 Students)	20.00% (10 Students)
Percent Tested	96.30%	86.67%	90.00%

STAR Math Grades 5 by Winter Administration			
STAR Administration	Winter 2021 n=54	Winter 2021 n=60	Winter 2022 n=48
MIP Grades 5	137.96	110.83	84.38
Percent Proficient	38.89% (21 Students)	31.67% (19 Students)	18.75% (9 Students)

Updated December 2021

Grades 5			
Percent Tested	92.59%	88.33%	87.50%

Math Interims:

Below are charts that reflect the performance of students on Math Interims in Winter 2019, Winter 2020 and Winter 2022. The Math Interims were not administered in the 2020-21 school year or the Fall of 2021-22 due to the Pandemic. The Math Interims are an internal assessment used to progress monitor students for the NYS Math Assessment in the Spring.

Math Interims Grades 3-5 by Winter Administration			
Math Interim Administration	Winter 2019 n=154	Winter 2020 n=159	Winter 2022 n=147
MIP Grades 3-5	86.04	85.53	32.31
Percent Proficient Grades 3-5	27.92% (43 Students)	26.42% (42 Students)	6.80% (10 Students)
Percent Tested	96.10%	97.48%	92.52%

Math Interims Grades 3 by Winter Administration			
Math Interim Administration	Winter 2019 n=43	Winter 2020 n=47	Winter 2022 n=49
MIP Grades 3	89.53	89.36	40.81
Percent Proficient Grades 3	30.23% (13 Students)	29.79% (14 Students)	10.20% (5 Students)
Percent Tested	100.00%	97.87%	91.84%

Math Interims Grades 4 by Winter Administration			
Math Interim Administration	Winter 2019 n=57	Winter 2020 n=59	Winter 2022 n=50
MIP Grades 4	83.33	85.59	26.00
Percent Proficient Grades 4	28.07% (16 Students)	23.73% (14 Students)	6.00% (3 Students)
Percent Tested	92.98%	100.00%	90.00%

Math Interims Grades 5 by Winter Administration			
Math Interim Administration	Winter 2019 n=54	Winter 2020 n=53	Winter 2022 n=48
MIP Grades 5	86.11	82.08	30.21
Percent Proficient Grades 5	25.93% (14 Students)	26.42% (14 Students)	4.17% (2 Students)
Percent Tested	96.30%	94.34%	95.83%

Trend:
While our trend overall has shown a decrease from last year to this year, we believe that this is indicative of instructional loss due to the COVID pandemic. As we compare our STAR Math data from fall 2021 to winter of 2022, we have noticed an increase of 7 students in grades 3-5 moving from below proficiency to at or above proficiency and an increase of 1.38 to our MIP.

New York State
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Knowledge › Skill › Opportunity

| | | | This STAR data is not exactly correlative to the Math State Assessment but it does help us to gauge movement within the school year.

Our interim data shows a significant decrease in proficiency from Winter of 2020 (before COVID) to Winter of 2022. We went from 42 students proficient to 10. While we have decreased significantly, our MIP is approximating our target of 42.6.

Adjustment to Continuation Plan:
The leadership in the building will continue to monitor data and shift personnel around as able to provide small group instructional work for students struggling to meet benchmark in math. |

Indicator 100

3-8 ELA All Students Core Subject PI

Progress Target: 84

Strategy 1, 2, 4
- PLCs
- Superintendent's Conference Day
  - ELA interim score norming
  - Grading Norming
- ELA Interim - Fall and Winter (12/31)
- LETRS/Heggerty - Fall and Winter (1/10)
- Data Day: 12/3 and 1/21

STAR Data:
Below are charts that reflect the performance of students on STAR Reading for Fall 2019, Fall 2020 and Fall 2021 as well as Winter 2020, Winter 2021 and Winter 2022 .

Growth Analysis: STAR Reading Grades 3-5 by Administration 21-22			
STAR Administration	Fall 2021 n=151	Winter 2022 n=147	Growth
MIP Grades 3-5	101.32	104.42	**+3.1**
Percent Proficient Grades 3-5	19.87% (30 Students)	26.53% (39 Students)	**6.66%**
Percent Tested	90.07%	90.48%	

Updated December 2021

New York State EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Knowledge > Skill > Opportunity

STAR Reading Grades 3-5 by Fall Administration			
STAR Administration	Fall 2019 n=153	Fall 2020 n=164	Fall 2021 n=151
MIP Grades 3-5	142.48	125	101.32
Percent Proficient Grades 3-5	37.91% (58 Students)	34.15% (56 students)	19.87% (30 Students)
Percent Tested	97.39%	87.80%	90.07%

STAR Reading Grades 3-5 by Winter Administration			
STAR Administration	Winter 2020 n=153	Winter 2021 n=164	Winter 2022 n=147
MIP Grades 3-5	145.42	114.63	104.42
Percent Proficient Grades 3-5	41.18 (63 Students)	26.83% (44 Students)	26.53% (39 Students)
Percent Tested	96.08%	95.12%	90.48%

STAR Reading Grade 3 Fall Administration			
STAR Administration	Fall 2019 n=43	Fall 2020 n=56	Fall 2021 n=51
MIP Grades 3	141.86	116.07	115.69
Percent Proficient	37.21% (16 Students)	28.57% (16 Students)	27.45% (14 Students)

Grades 3			
Percent Tested	97.67%	78.57%	88.24%

STAR Reading Grades 3 Winter Administration			
STAR Administration	Winter 2020 n=43	Winter 2021 n=56	Winter 2022 n=49
MIP Grades 3	150.00	91.07	118.37
Percent Proficient Grades 3	44.19% (19 Students)	21.43% (12 Students)	36.73% (18 Students)
Percent Tested	100.00%	91.07%	91.84%

STAR Reading Grade 4 Fall Administration			
STAR Administration	Fall 2019 n=56	Fall 2020 n=48	Fall 2021 n=50
MIP Grades 4	135.71	118.75	87.00
Percent Proficient Grades 4	39.29% (22 Students)	33.33% (16 Students)	10.00% (5 Students)
Percent Tested	96.43%	95.83%	92.00%

STAR Reading Grades 4 Winter Administration			
STAR Administration	Winter 2020 n=56	Winter 2021 n=48	Winter 2022 n=50
MIP Grades 4	150.00	129.17	82.00
Percent Proficient Grades 4	42.86% (24 Students)	29.17% (14 Students)	16.00%(8 Students)
Percent Tested	94.64%	97.92%	86.00%

STAR Reading Grade 5 Fall Administration			
STAR Administration	Fall 2019 n=54	Fall 2020 N=60	Fall 2021 n=50
MIP Grades 5	150	138.33	101
Percent Proficient Grades 5	37.04% (20 Students)	40.00% (24 Students)	22.00% (11 Students)
Percent Tested	98.15%	90.00%	90.00%

STAR Reading Grades 5 Winter Administration			
STAR Administration	Winter 2020 n=54	Winter 2021 n=60	Winter 2022 n=48
MIP Grades 5	137.04	125.00	113.54

Percent Proficient Grades 5	37.04% (20 Students)	30.00% (18 Students)	27.08% (13 Students)
Percent Tested	94.44%	96.67%	93.75%

_____

ELA Interim Data:

Below are charts that reflect the performance of students on ELA Interims for Fall 2018, Fall 2019 and Fall 2021 as well as Winter 2019, Winter 2020 and Winter 2022 . The ELA Interims were not administered in the 2020-21 school year due to the Pandemic. The ELA Interims are an internal assessment used to progress monitor students for the NYS ELA Assessment in the Spring.

Growth Analysis: ELA Interims Grades 3-5 by Administration 21-22			
ELA Administration	Fall 2021 n=161	Winter 2022 n=148	Growth
MIP Grades 3-5	27.01	39.53	**+12.54**
Percent Proficient Grades 3-5	2.48% (4 Students)	7.43% (11 Students)	**+4.95%**
Percent Tested	90.68%	91.89%	

ELA Interims Grades 3-5 by Fall Administration			
ELA Administration	Fall 2018 n=174	Fall 2019 n=153	Fall 2021 n=161
MIP Grades 3-5	43.97	45.10	27.01

New York State
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Knowledge > Skill > Opportunity

			4.60% (8 Students)	5.23% (8 Students)	2.48% (4 Students)
		Percent Proficient Grades 3-5	4.60% (8 Students)	5.23% (8 Students)	2.48% (4 Students)
		Percent Tested	92.53%	90.20%	90.68%

ELA Interims Grades 3-5 by Winter Administration		
ELA Administration	Winter 2019 n=174	Winter 2020 n=161	Winter 2022 n=148
MIP Grades 3-5	57.47	61.80	39.53
Percent Proficient Grades 3-5	10.34 % (18 Students)	14.91% (24 Students)	7.43% (11 Students)
Percent Tested	90.80%	95.03%	91.89%

ELA Interims Grades 3 by Fall Administration		
ELA Administration	Fall 2018 n=59	Fall 2019 n=45	Fall 2021 n=56
MIP Grades 3	40.68	28.89	39.29
Percent Proficient Grades 3	1.69% (1 Student)	0.00% (0 students)	3.57% (2 Students)
Percent Tested	89.83%	84.44%	87.50%

Updated December 2021

ELA Interims Grades 3 by Winter Administration			
ELA Administration	Winter 2019 n=59	Winter 2020 n=46	Winter 2022 n=49
MIP Grades 3	49.15	36.96	26.53
Percent Proficient Grades 3	11.86% (7 Students)	6.52% (3 Students)	4.08% (2 Students)
Percent Tested	89.83%	97.83%	95.92%

ELA Interims Grades 4 by Fall Administration			
ELA Administration	Fall 2018 n=52	Fall 2019 n=55	Fall 2021 n=55
MIP Grades 4	48.08	60.00	17.27
Percent Proficient Grades 4	1.92% (1 Student)	9.09% (5 Students)	1.81% (1 Student)
Percent Tested	96.15%	92.73%	90.90%

ELA Interims Grades 4 by Winter Administration			
ELA Administration	Winter 2019 n=52	Winter 2020 n=60	Winter 2022 n=50
MIP Grades 4	55.77	67.50	27.00
Percent Proficient	7.69% (4 Students)	13.33% (8 Students)	8.00% (4 Students)

Updated December 2021

Grades 4			
Percent Tested	92.31%	91.67%	86.00%

ELA Interims Grades 5 by Fall Administration			
ELA Administration	Fall 2018 n=63	Fall 2019 n=53	Fall 2021 n=50
MIP Grades 5	43.65	43.40	24.00
Percent Proficient Grades 5	9.52%(6 Students)	5.66% (3 Students)	2.00% (1 Student)
Percent Tested	92.06%	94.45%	94.00%

ELA Interims Grades 5 by Winter Administration			
ELA Administration	Winter 2019 n=63	Winter 2020 n=55	Winter 2022 n=49
MIP Grades 5	66.67	76.36	65.31
Percent Proficient Grades 4	11.11% (7 Students)	23.64% (13 Students)	10.20% (5 Students)
Percent Tested	90.48%	96.36%	93.88%

New York State
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Knowledge › Skill › Opportunity

PDSA (Plan Do Study Act) Cycle and PLC (Professional Learning Community) Data

Grade Level	SMART Goal
K	By March 11, 80% of the students will demonstrate mastery of the components in the narrative rubric.
1	By March 11, 80% of the students will demonstrate mastery of the components of the speaking and listening rubric from Wit and Wisdom.
2	By March 11, 80% of the students will demonstrate mastery on single and double digit computation in math.
3	By March 11, 80% of the students will utilize the 5 steps to answer a short response question and score mastery on the rubric.
4	By March 11, 80% of the students will answer a short response question that includes 7 steps and score mastery on that rubric.
5	By March 11, 80% of the students will write a theme based short response and score mastery on the rubric.

Trends:
As we focus on the ELA interim data, which is relatively predictive of our ELA State Exam performance (~75%), we are seeing a 12.54 increase in our MIP points and 7 more children have reached proficiency at this point in the year. This is a positive growth trend but our MIP is set at 84 and we know we have quite a ways to go with our performance on the ELA State exam.

Adjustment to Continuation Plan:
At this time, we do not see a need to adjust our continuation plan. Teachers will continue meeting in their Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and analyze their data related to

Updated December 2021

			the most recent Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycle. Our teachers in grades 3, 4, and 5 have identified a SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, Time-Bound) goal related to the ELA State Exam as determined by the data analysis on 1/21.

Indicator 110

3-8 Math All Students Core Subject PI

Progress Target: 58.3

Strategy 1, 2, 4
- PLCs
- Math Interim - Baseline (1/10)
- STAR Benchmarking (1/10)

STAR Math Data:

Below are charts that reflect the performance of students on STAR Math for Fall 2019, Fall 2020 and Fall 2021 as well as Winter 2020, Winter 2021 and Winter 2022 .

STAR Math Grades 3-5 by Administration 21-22			
STAR Administration	Fall 2021 n=151	Winter 2022 n=147	Growth
MIP Grades 3-5	84.77	86.05	**+1.28**
Percent Proficient Grades 3-5	17.22% (26 Students)	22.45% (33 Students)	**5.23%**
Percent Tested	86.09%	85.03%	

STAR Math Grades 3-5 by Fall Administration			
STAR Administration	Fall 2019 n=153	Fall 2020 n=164	Fall 2021 n=151
MIP Grades 3-5	145.75	117.07	84.77
Percent Proficient Grades 3-5	43.14% (64 Students)	31.71% (52 Students)	17.22% (26 Students)
Percent Tested	95.42%	85.98%	86.09%

Updated December 2021

STAR Math Grades 3-5 by Winter Administration			
STAR Administration	Winter 2020 n=153	Winter 2021 n=164	Winter 2022 n=147
MIP Grades 3-5	145.75	110.67	86.05
Percent Proficient Grades 3-5	41.83% (64 Students)	32.32% (53 Students)	22.45% (33 Students)
Percent Tested	95.42%	84.76%	85.03%

STAR Math Grades 3 by Fall Administration			
STAR Administration	Fall 2019 n=43	Fall 2020 n=56	Fall 2021 n=51
MIP Grades 3	143.02	103.57	87.25
Percent Proficient Grades 3	44.19% (19 Students)	28.57% (16 Students)	21.57% (11 Students)
Percent Tested	95.35%	80.36%	78.43%

STAR Math Grades 3 by Winter Administration			
STAR Administration	Winter 2020 n=43	Winter 2021 n=56	Winter 2022 n=49
MIP Grades 3	158.14	105.36	90.82

Updated December 2021

	46.51% (20 Students)	32.14% (18 Students)	26.53% (13 Students)
Percent Proficient Grades 3			
Percent Tested	100.00%	85.71%	83.67%

STAR Math Grades 4 by Fall Administration			
STAR Administration	Fall 2019 n=56	Fall 2020 n=48	Fall 2021 n=50
MIP Grades 4	149.11	131.25	75.00
Percent Proficient Grades 4	41.07% (23 Students)	37.50% (18 Students)	10.00% (5 Students)
Percent Tested	94.64%	91.67%	90.00%

STAR Math Grades 4 by Winter Administration			
STAR Administration	Winter 2020 n=56	Winter 2021 n=48	Winter 2022 n=50
MIP Grades 4	143.75	116.67	83.00
Percent Proficient Grades 4	41.07% (23 Students)	33.33% (16 Students)	22.00% (11 Students)
Percent Tested	94.64%	79.17%	84.00%

Updated December 2021

New York State
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Knowledge › Skill › Opportunity

STAR Math Grades 5 by Fall Administration			
STAR Administration	Fall 2019 n=54	Fall 2020 n=60	Fall 2021 n=50
MIP Grades 5	144.44	118.33	92.00
Percent Proficient Grades 5	44.44% (24 Students)	30.00% (18 Students)	20.00% (10 Students)
Percent Tested	96.30%	86.67%	90.00%

STAR Math Grades 5 by Winter Administration			
STAR Administration	Winter 2021 n=54	Winter 2021 n=60	Winter 2022 n=48
MIP Grades 5	137.96	110.83	84.38
Percent Proficient Grades 5	38.89% (21 Students)	31.67% (19 Students)	18.75% (9 Students)
Percent Tested	92.59%	88.33%	87.50%

_____

Math Interim Data:

Below are charts that reflect the performance of students on Math Interims in the Winter 2019, Winter 2020 and Winter 2022 . The Math Interims were not administered in the 2020-21 school year or the Fall of 2021-22 due to the Pandemic. The Math Interims are an internal assessment used to progress monitor students for the NYS Math Assessment in the Spring.

Updated December 2021

Math Interims Grades 3-5 by Winter Administration			
Math Interim Administration	Winter 2019 n=154	Winter 2020 n=159	Winter 2022 n=147
MIP Grades 3-5	86.04	85.53	32.31
Percent Proficient Grades 3-5	27.92% (43 Students)	26.42% (42 Students)	6.80% (10 Students)
Percent Tested	96.10%	97.48%	92.52%

Math Interims Grades 3 by Winter Administration			
Math Interim Administration	Winter 2019 n=43	Winter 2020 n=47	Winter 2022 n=49
MIP Grades 3	89.53	89.36	40.81
Percent Proficient Grades 3	30.23% (13 Students)	29.79% (14 Students)	10.20% (5 Students)
Percent Tested	100.00%	97.87%	91.84%

Math Interims Grades 4 by Winter Administration			
Math Interim Administration	Winter 2019 n=57	Winter 2020 n=59	Winter 2022 n=50
MIP Grades 4	83.33	85.59	26.00

Percent Proficient Grades 4	28.07% (16 Students)	23.73% (14 Students)	6.00% (3 Students)
Percent Tested	92.98%	100.00%	90.00%

Math Interims Grades 5 by Winter Administration			
Math Interim Administration	Winter 2019 n=54	Winter 2020 n=53	Winter 2022 n=48
MIP Grades 5	86.11	82.08	30.21
Percent Proficient Grades 5	25.93% (14 Students)	26.42% (14 Students)	4.17% (2 Students)
Percent Tested	96.30%	94.34%	95.83%

Trend:

While our trend overall has shown a decrease from last year to this year, we believe that this is indicative of instructional loss due to the COVID pandemic. As we compare our STAR Math data from fall 2021 to winter of 2022, we have noticed an increase of 7 students in grades 3-5 moving from below proficiency to at, or above proficiency and an increase of 1.38 to our MIP. This STAR data is not exactly correlative to the Math State Assessment but it does help us to know movement within the school year.

Our interim data shows a significant decrease in proficiency from Winter of 2020 (before COVID) to Winter of 2022. We went from 42 students proficient to 10. While we have decreased significantly, our MIP is approximating our target of 58.3.

			Adjustment to Continuation Plan: The leadership in the building will continue to monitor data and shift personnel around as able to provide small group instructional work for students struggling to meet benchmark in math.

Indicator 150

Grades 4 and 8 Science All Students Core Subject PI

Progress Target: 176.9

Strategy 1, 2, 4
- PLCs
- Grade 4 - Baseline Assessment
- Science Kit/Lab
- Wit and Wisdom ELA Curriculum with Science Focused Modules

Science Pre-Test Data:
4th Grade Teachers administered a Science pre-test to gather baseline data. There were a total of 48 students enrolled in 4th Grade at the time of the pre-Test. During the time of the assessment two students moved, four students were absent and one refused the test. The data below consists of the 41 students that completed the test.

There are two parts to the test, Part 1 is out of 30 points and Part 2 is out of 15 points for an overall of 45 points. Each question is awarded 1 point.

The chart below depicts the average score and percent score:

Average Score and Percent Score Analysis			
Science Pre-Test	**Part 1 (30 points)**	**Part 2 (15 points)**	**Overall (45 points)**
Average Score	12.76	4.61	17.37
Average Percent Score	42.52%	26.25%	38.59%

Science Pre-Test Part 1	
Range	**Total Number of Students**
0-10 Points	16

11-20 Points	22
21-30 Points	3

Science Pre-Test Part 2	
Range	**Total Number of Students**
0-5 Points	23
6-10 Points	15
11-15 Points	3

Science Pre-Test Overall Score	
Range	**Total Number of Students**
0-5	**2**
6-10	**8**
11-15	**10**
16-20	**7**
21-25	**8**
26-30	**3**
31-35	**2**

Updated December 2021

36-40	1
41-45	0

Trends:
In the administration of our science baseline assessment, we recognized that over half of the students struggled to reach proficiency on the multiple choice section of the science assessment, and almost 75% of the students struggled to reach proficiency on the short response section of the science assessment.

Adjustment to Continuation Plan:
While there is no adjustment of the continuation plan, 4th grade teachers recognize the need to increase time on Science content, vocabulary, and test-taking skills. Teachers will weave Science content where possible in ELA (non-fiction) to support the development of vocabulary and content knowledge.

Indicator 160 EM Chronic Absenteeism - All Students *Progress Target: 15%*		**Strategy 2,3, 4** ● Coding system in IC developed ● Admin Para Follow Up ● ParentSquare link to IC	Attendance is taken in our student information system. Teachers take attendance in the am and pm every day. **Attendance Data:**

Chronic Absenteeism (October 16, 2021 to January 14, 2022) Missed 10% of more of School Overall Chronic Absenteeism: PK-5: 21.65% (64 Students); K-5: 22.43% (61 Students)							
Grade Level	PK	K	1st Grade	2nd Grade	3rd Grade	4th Grade	5th Grade
CA	10.53% (2)	20.41% (10)	37.50% (15)	22.22% (8)	14.29% (7)	16.00% (8)	27.08% (13)

Updated December 2021

Chronic Absenteeism Status (October 16,2021 to January 14, 2022)
Students missed 18 or more days of school
Overall Unrecoverable Chronic Absenteeism Status PK-5: 18.90% (55 Students);
K-5: 18.38% (50 Students)

Grade Level	PK	K	1st Grade	2nd Grade	3rd Grade	4th Grade	5th Grade
18+	26.32% (5)	22.45% (11)	12.20% (5)	16.67% (6)	20.41% (10)	21.57% (11)	14.58% (7)

Percent in Attendance (October 16, 2021 to January 14, 2022
Overall Percent in Attendance PK-5: 77.17%; K-5: 77.50%

Grade Level	PK	K	1st Grade	2nd Grade	3rd Grade	4th Grade	5th Grade
Percent in Attendance	72.49%	75.54%	83.28%	78.00%	76.47%	73.31%	79.71%

Perfect Attendance:
6 Students had Perfect Attendance from 10/16 to 1/14

COVID Impact:
From October 16th to January 14th, William C. Keane has tracked 29 positive cases resulting in 207 quaratines. Another 228 were out due to awaiting test results and not returning to school.

Updated December 2021

			From January 3rd to January 14th, we saw an increase in absences primarily due to COVID. Our overall student rate in attendance for January 3rd to January 7th was 71.31% for grades PK through 5 and January 10th to January 14th the overall student rate in attendance was 57.94%. **ParentSquare:** In partnership with ParentSquare and the Office of Planning and Accountability we have created an automated system to obtain notes from parents/families to help us determine why students are not in the building. This, in turn, helps us to properly document absences so that we can track data and determine trends for our next quarterly report. **Trends:** While we have seen a decrease in the number of students on path to become chronically absent (161 students to 64 students) we have seen a dramatic increase in the students that are "unrecoverable" as they have missed more than 18 days this year (from 3 to 55 students) The largest number of students in the unrecoverable area are in grades 3 and 4. Our percent in attendance daily rate has also decreased from an average in quarter 1 of 83% to an average in quarter 2 of 76%. We have also significantly decreased the number of students with perfect attendance from 50 to 6. This impact, in all areas related to attendance, are primarily COVID related. As a result, we have begun a coding system in our attendance dashboard to help us refine our data to capture clearer trends. **Adjustment to Continuation Plan:** At this time, we are not making changes to our continuation plan. We would like to disaggregate our collected data, after this next quarter to make informed changes and adjustments, if needed.

Updated December 2021

NYS ED .gov

New York State
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Knowledge > Skill > Opportunity

Part III – *Demonstrable Improvement Indicators-Level 2*

Level 2 Indicators
Please list the school's Level 2 indicators and complete all columns below. This information should provide details about how lead strategies will inform the implementation of specific strategies and actions that will support progress toward the Demonstrable Improvement Indicators.

		Quarterly Report #2 Reflection on Activities Completed for this Indicator during October 16, 2021 to January 14, 2022	
Indicator	**Status (R/Y/G)**	**What specific strategies and action steps were implemented to support progress for each of the Demonstrable Improvement Indicators?**	• Provide the specific data/evidence used to determine progress and impact on instruction, student learning, and achievement. • Describe how the data trends that emerged during this reporting period will inform future action steps. • Include a description of any adjustments made to the continuation plan along with the corresponding data used to inform the adjustment.
Indicator 6 Family and Community Engagement (DTSDE Tenet 6) ***Progress Target:*** 67% of the Tenet 6 Phase 2 indicators are common across the school and at least six Tenet 6 Phase 3 indicators are common across the school. *In addition, the school must also have 90% of the Phase 1 indicators common across the school.	(green)	**Strategy 3** ● ParentSquare Updates ● Parent Forums - Events at Faith Deliverance Tabernacle Church ● Trunk or Treat ● Restorative Justice Specialist Begins (11/1) - 1 day per week ● Gingerbread House Event ● Student Council Begins 12/16 ● Book Vending Machine	**Data:** *Tenet 6 Self Reflection -Family and Community Engagement:* Phase 1: Phase 2: Phase 3:

Data:

Tenet 6 Self Reflection -Family and Community Engagement:

Phase 1:

Year	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22 (October)	2021-22 (January)
Percentage Met	89.5% (17/19)	94.74% (18/19)	94.74% (18/19)	100% (19/19)

Phase 2:

Year	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22 (October)	2021-22 (January)
Percentage Met	88% (22/25)	96% (24/25)	96% (24/25)	96% (24/25)

Phase 3:

Year	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22 (October)	2021-22 (January)
Percentage Met	68.7% (11/16)	87.5% (14/16)	87.5% (14/16)	87.5% (14/16)

Utilization of ParentSquare App for Communication:
We officially launched ParentSquare in September 2021. This app allows us to post messages, send emails/texts from administrators to families and from teachers to families. Families are also able to dialogue/interact with posts.

Data:

ParentSquare by Month	September 2021	October 2021	November 2021	December 2021
Number of Unregistered Users of ParentSquare	271	161	138	120

Communication	September 2021	October 2021	November 2021	December 2021
Email	33%	56%	56%	56%
Text message	65%	44%	44%	44%
ParentSquare App	26%	33%	34%	36%

Direct Message Usage by Month	September 2021	October 2021	November 2021	December 2021
Actual of Numbers per Month	893	1617	2090	1694
Posts by Teacher/Building	40	97	100	78

William C. Keane Elementary School has begun the implementation of a Parent Engagement Room. There are five computers set up for parents and families to use in this space.

Parent Events:
- Trunk or Treat - 100+ families
- Gingerbread House Event - 75 in person, 50 online stream
- Listen and Learn at Faith Evangelist Tabernacle Church
    - 12/16/21 - 15 in attendance
    - 1/6/22 - 6 in attendance, Live Stream - 82 views
- Grow Your Own Program - Schenectady Residents supported through gaining Associates, Bachelors, and Masters degree in education field. Live Stream - 35 views

Book Vending Machine - 85 views Video

Student Council - Meets Weekly
- 16 members (grades 3, 4, 5)
- Elections held for President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer (1/21)

Trends: There continues to be a rise in registered users of ParentSquare from month to month. With feedback we had received from parents, the school now posts upcoming

			calendar alerts for events for parents/students to give families the opportunities to mark their calendars to attend our school events and monthly informational parent forums. We have hosted several parent engagement sessions and with each session, we learn more about what families are interested in and support/resources/communication they would like moving forward. We host these sessions in person, while also live streaming them (and recording them) so parents can watch sessions as their schedules allow. **Adjustment to Continuation Plan:** At this time, we do not need to adjust our Continuation plan. The community engagement component of our continuation plan will support our efforts in this area. We are working with families to build and strengthen a stronger communication system to support our families needs. We will continue to explore the best methods for communicating with our families .
Indicator 46 3-8 ELA Black Level 2 and above Gap with non-Black Students *Progress Target:* 19		**Strategy 1, 2, 4** ● PLCs ● ELA Interim - Fall and Winter (12/31) ● LETRS/Heggerty - Fall and Winter (1/10) ● Data Day: 12/3 and 1/21	**STAR Data:** Below are charts that compare the gap between Black or African American students versus non-Black or African American students on STAR Reading, for both the Fall and Winter Administrations.

STAR Reading Grades 3-5 by Fall Administration: Black Gap with non-Black Student		
Recorded Group	**MIP**	**Percent Proficient**
Black or African American Students n=45	87.78	15.56% (7 students)
Non-Black or African American Students n=106	107.08	21.70% (23 Students)
GAP	**19.30**	**6.14%**

Updated December 2021

New York State EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Knowledge › Skill › Opportunity

STAR Reading Grades 3-5 by Winter Administration: Black Gap with non-Black Student		
Recorded Group	**MIP**	**Percent Proficient**
Black or African American Students n=44	76.14	20.45% (9 Students)
Non-Black or African American Students n=103	116.50	29.13% (30 Students)
GAP	**40.36**	**8.68%**

Grade 3 STAR Reading by Grade Level and Fall Administration: Black Gap with non-Black Student		
Recorded Group	**MIP**	**Percent Proficient**
Black or African American Students n=9	111.11	0.00% (0 Students)
Non-Black or African American Students n=42	116.67	33.33% (14 Students)
GAP	**5.56**	**33.33%**

Grade 3 STAR Reading by Grade Level and Winter Administration: Black Gap with non-Black Student		
Recorded Group	**MIP**	**Percent Proficient**
Black or African American Students n=8	75	25.00% (2 Students)

Updated December 2021

Non-Black or African American Students n=41	126.83	39.02% (16 Students)
GAP	**51.83**	**14.02%**

Grade 4 STAR Reading by Grade Level and Fall Administration: Black Gap with non-Black Student		
Recorded Group	MIP	Percent Proficient
Black or African American n=14	85.71	14.29% (2 Students)
Non-Black or African American Students n=36	87.5	8.33% (3 Students
GAP	**1.78**	**5.95%**

Grade 4 STAR Reading by Grade Level and Winter Administration: Black Gap with non-Black Student		
Recorded Group	MIP	Percent Proficient
Black or African American n=16	78.13	18.75% (3 Students)
Non-Black or African American Students n=34	83.82	14.71% (5 Students)
GAP	**5.69**	**4.04%**

Updated December 2021

New York State
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Knowledge > Skill > Opportunity

Grade 5 STAR Reading by Grade Level and Fall Administration: Black Gap with non-Black Student

Recorded Group	MIP	Percent Proficient
Black or African American n=22	79.55	22.73% (5 Students)
Non-Black or African American Students n=28	117.86	21.43% (6 Students)
GAP	**38.31**	**1.30%**

Grade 5 STAR Reading by Grade Level and Winter Administration: Black Gap with non-Black Student

Recorded Group	MIP	Percent Proficient
Black or African American n=20	75.00	20.00 %(4 Students)
Non-Black or African American Students n=28	141.07	32.14% (9 Students)
GAP	**66.07**	**12.14%**

ELA Interims:
Below are charts that compare the gap between Black or African American students versus non-Black or African American students on the ELA Interims, for both the Fall and Winter Administrations.

Growth Analysis: Grade 3-5 ELA Interim by Grade Level

ELA Interims	MIP	Percent Proficient

Fall Administration GAP	10.16	.69%
Winter Administration GAP	3.73	4.9%
Growth	**-6.43**	**+4.21**

Grade 3-5 ELA Interim by Grade Level and Fall Administration: Black Gap with non-Black Student		
Recorded Group	MIP	Percent Proficient
Black or African American n=46	21.74	2.17% (1 Student)
Non-Black or African American Students n=105	31.90	2.86% (3 Students)
GAP	**10.16**	**.69%**

Grade 3-5 ELA Interim by Grade Level and Winter Administration: Black Gap with non-Black Student		
Recorded Group	MIP	Percent Proficient
Black or African American n=46	36.96	10.87% (5 Students)
Non-Black or African American Students n=102	40.69	5.88% (6 Students)
GAP	**3.73**	**4.90%**

Updated December 2021

New York State EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Knowledge > Skill > Opportunity

Grade 3 ELA Interim by Grade Level and Fall Administration: Black Gap with non-Black Student		
Recorded Group	MIP	Percent Proficient
Black or African American n=8	25.00	0.00% (0 Students)
Non-Black or African American Students n=41	48.78	4.88% (2 Students)
GAP	**23.78**	**4.88%**

Grade 3 ELA Interim by Grade Level and Winter Administration: Black Gap with non-Black Student		
Recorded Group	MIP	Percent Proficient
Black or African American n=8	0.00	0.00% (0 Students)
Non-Black or African American Students n=41	31.71	4.88% (2 Students)
GAP	**31.71**	**4.88%**

Grade 4 ELA Interim by Grade Level and Fall Administration: Black Gap with non-Black Student		
Recorded Group	MIP	Percent Proficient

Black or African American n=17	17.65	0.00% (0 Students)
Non-Black or African American Students n=	18.06	2.78% (1 Student)
GAP	**.41**	**2.78%**

Grade 4 ELA Interim by Grade Level and Winter Administration: Black Gap with non-Black Student		
Recorded Group	**MIP**	**Percent Proficient**
Black or African American n=17	23.53	11.76% (2 Students)
Non-Black or African American Students n=33	28.79	6.06% (2 Students)
GAP	**5.26**	**5.7%**

Grade 5 ELA Interim by Grade Level and Fall Administration: Black Gap with non-Black Student		
Recorded Group	**MIP**	**Percent Proficient**
Black or African American n=21	23.81	4.76% (1 Student)
Non-Black or African American Students n=28	25.00	0.00% (0 Students)

GAP	1.19	4.76%

Grade 5 ELA Interim by Grade Level and Winter Administration: Black Gap with non-Black Student		
Recorded Group	MIP	Percent Proficient
Black or African American n=21	61.90	14.29% (3 Students)
Non-Black or African American Students n=28	67.86	7.14% (2 Students)
GAP	**5.96**	**7.15%**

Trends:
Our STAR assessment indicates an increase in proficiency, however, the MIP gap between Black and non-black students increased 21 progress points. The gap is largest in 3rd and 5th grade. When we look at our Interim assessments, which are more predictive, we have closed our gap by almost 7 progress points, however, grade 3 is still an area of focus - specifically because our MIP dropped but our proficiency remained the same. Our team recognizes that 2 students in grade 3 slipped from level 2 in the fall, to level 1s in the winter. Our data analysis at this granular level is necessary to ensure we are strategic about closing our gap.

Adjustment to Continuation Plan:
At this time, we will not make an adjustment to our continuation plan, however, we will continue to press our staff to disaggregate data by subgroup - specifically our Black subgroup.

Indicator 54

3-8 Math ED Level 2 and above Gap with non-ED Students

Progress Target: 25

Strategy 1, 2, 4
- PLCs
- Math Interim - Baseline (1/10)
- STAR Benchmarking (1/10)

STAR Data:

Below are charts that compare the gap between Economically Disadvantaged students versus non-disadvantaged students on STAR Math.

Growth Analysis: Grade 3-5 STAR Math by Grade Level		
Growth	**MIP**	**Percent Proficient**
Fall Administration GAP	**53.02**	**7.13%**
Winter Administration GAP	**31.28**	**9.73%**
Growth	**21.74**	**2.60%**

STAR Math Grades 3-5 by Fall Administration: ED Gap with non-ED Students		
Recorded Group	**MIP**	**Percent Proficient**
ED Students n=106	66.98	15.09% (16 students)
Non-ED Students n=45	120	22.22% (10 students)
GAP	**53.02**	**7.13%**

STAR Math Grades 3-5 by Winter Administration: ED Gap with non-ED Students		
Recorded Group	**MIP**	**Percent Proficient**
ED Students n=110	78.18	20.00% (22 Students)

Non-ED Students n=37	109.46	29.73% (11 Students)
GAP	**31.28**	**9.73%**

STAR Math Grade 3 by Fall Administration: ED Gap with non-ED Students		
Recorded Group	**MIP**	**Percent Proficient**
ED Students n=38	72.37	18.42% (7 students)
Non-ED Students n=13	123.08	30.77% (4 students)
GAP	**50.71**	**12.35%**

STAR Math Grade 3 by Winter Administration: ED Gap with non-ED Students		
Recorded Group	**MIP**	**Percent Proficient**
ED Students n=37	91.89	27.03% (10 Students)
Non-ED Students n=12	87.5	25.00% (3 Students)
GAP	**4.39**	**2.03%**

STAR Math Grade 4 by Fall Administration: ED Gap with non-ED Students		
Recorded Group	**MIP**	**Percent Proficient**
ED Students n=38	57.89	10.53% (4 students)

New York State
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Knowledge > Skill > Opportunity

	MIP	Percent Proficient
Non-ED Students n=12	112.50	8.33% (1 student)
GAP	**54.61**	**2.19%**

STAR Math Grade 4 by Winter Administration: ED Gap with non-ED Students		
Recorded Group	**MIP**	**Percent Proficient**
ED Students n=40	72.5	20.00% (8 Students)
Non-ED Students n=10	125	30.00% (3 Students)
GAP	**52.5**	**10.00%**

STAR Math Grade 5 by Fall Administration: ED Gap with non-ED Students		
Recorded Group	**MIP**	**Percent Proficient**
ED Students n=30	71.67	16.67% (5 students)
Non-ED Students n=20	122.5	25.00% (5 students)
GAP	**50.83**	**8.33%**

STAR Math Grade 5 by Winter Administration: ED Gap with non-ED Students		
Recorded Group	**MIP**	**Percent Proficient**
ED Students n=33	69.70	12.12% (4 Students)

Non-ED Students n=15	116.67	33.33% (5 Students)
GAP	**46.97**	**21.21%**

Math Interims:

Below are charts that compare the gap between Economically Disadvantaged students versus non-disadvantaged students on Math Interims.

Math Interims Grade 3-5 by Winter Administration: ED Gap with non-ED Students		
Recorded Group	**MIP**	**Percent Proficient**
ED Students n=110	30.91	6.36% (7 Students)
Non-ED Students n=37	36.49	8.11% (3 Students)
GAP	**5.58**	**1.75%**

Math Interims Grade 3 by Winter Administration: ED Gap with non-ED Students		
Recorded Group	**MIP**	**Percent Proficient**
ED Students n=37	39.19	10.81% (4 Students)
Non-ED Students n=12	45.83	8.33% (1 Student)
GAP	**6.64**	**2.48%**

Math Interims Grade 4 by Winter Administration: ED Gap with non-ED Students

Recorded Group	MIP	Percent Proficient
ED Students n=40	22.5	2.50% (1 Student)
Non-ED Students n=10	40.00	20.00% (2 Students)
GAP	17.5	17.50%

Math Interims Grade 5 by Winter Administration: ED Gap with non-ED Students		
Recorded Group	MIP	Percent Proficient
ED Students n=33	31.82	6.06% (2 Students)
Non-ED Students n=15	26.67	0.00% (0 Students)
GAP	5.15	6.06%

Trends:
As we look at the gap that exists between our economically disadvantaged students and our non-economically disadvantaged students, we notice that we are closing the gap. According to our STAR assessment our gap went from 53.02 to 31.28. While this is significant, our target is 25 so we know we have more work to do to ensure equitable access to our Math content. Our Math interim has a much lower gap that exists. In our winter administration our gap is 5.58 for 3-5. After a deeper analysis, our largest gap is in grade 4 with a 17.5 point gap. This will be an area of focus for our 4th grade teachers moving forward - ensuring that our math curriculum in 4th grade is meeting the needs of our economically disadvantaged population.
Adjustment to Continuation Plan:

			At this time we are not planning an adjustment to our continuation plan, rather pushing teams to disaggregate data and reflect on for whom the math curriculum is benefitting and who it is not.
Indicator 94 Providing 200 hours of quality Extended Day Learning Time (ELT) **Progress Target:** See the ELT Implementation Rubric.		**Strategy 3, 4** ● 21st Century ● Tutoring at 21st Century ● Before School Tutoring ● Gingerbread House	**Data:** **21st Century:** The 21st Century After School Program started October 12, 2021. The Program is in-person this year at William C. Keane Elementary School. As of January 14th, 2022, we have a total of 75 students enrolled in the After School Program. At the beginning of December there were 77 students enrolled, but during November, two students left the District and were unenrolled from the Program. From September 9th to October 15th students are enrolled in the program from grades 3 through 5 and students have had the opportunity to engage in 12 hours of programming. From October 16th to January 14th students had the opportunity to engage in 171 hours of programming. For a total of 193 hours of Extended Learning Time for grades three through five. **After School Tutoring:** We have 9 tutors, and 1 sub working our after school program - in addition to their staffing. ● 8 of the 9 tutors are teachers and 1 is a teaching assistant. ● We currently have about 50 students enrolled to receive this support weekly. Tutoring groups run daily, for 30 minute sessions and students are grouped based on LETRS assessment data. ● Most teachers are working on Fundations, but some are doing a book club, and extra help with homework/reviewing skills as requested by the students.

			Trends:
			Our after school, extended day programming is strong. Our after school team works closely with our classroom teachers to ensure that academic programming is meeting the needs of our students. This quarter, we added teacher tutors to our after school programming, providing strategic instruction, an additional dose of targeted literacy instruction. **Adjustment to Continuation Plan:** At this time we will not adjust our continuation plan in this area.
Indicator 102 3-8 ELA Black Core Subject PI *Progress Target:* 62.5		**Strategy 1, 2, 4** ● PLCs ● ELA Interim - Fall and Winter (12/31) ● LETRS/Heggerty - Fall and Winter (1/10) ● Data Day: 12/3 and 1/21	**STAR Data:** Below are charts that reflect the performance of our Black or African American students on STAR Reading Administration for Fall 2019, Fall 2020, and Fall 2021 as well as the Winter 2020, Winter 2021 and Winter 2022. Testing for Winter 2022 was extended to January 28, 2022 due to COVID reasons.

Growth Analysis: STAR Math Grades 3-5 by Administration 21-22

STAR Administration	Fall 2021 n=45	Winter 2022 n=44	Growth
MIP Grades 3-5	87.78	76.14	**-11.64**
Percent Proficient Grades 3-5	15.56% (7 students)	20.45% (9 Students)	**+4.89% (2 Students)**
Percent Tested	93.33%	88.64%	

STAR Reading Grades 3-5 by Fall Administration for Black or African American Recorded Group

STAR Administration	Fall 2019 n=63	Fall 2020 n=59	Fall 2021 n=45

New York State
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Knowledge › Skill › Opportunity

MIP Grades 3-5	108.73	115.25	87.78
Percent Proficient Grades 3-5	23.81% (15 Students)	30.51%(18 Students)	15.56% (7 students)
Percent Tested	96.83%	88.14%	93.33%

STAR Reading Grades 3-5 by Winter Administration for Black or African American Recorded Group			
STAR Administration	Winter 2020 n=43	Winter 2021 n=45	Winter 2022 n=44
MIP Grades 3-5	106.98	75.56	76.14
Percent Proficient Grades 3-5	27.91% (12 Students)	13.3% (6 Students)	20.45% (9 Students)
Percent Tested	97.67%	93.33%	88.64%

STAR Reading Grades 3 by Fall Administration for Black or African American Recorded Group			
STAR Administration	Fall 2019 n=20	Fall 2020 n=17	Fall 2021 n=9
MIP Grades 3	92.5	114.71	111.11
Percent Proficient Grades 3	15.00% (3 Students)	29.41% (5 students)	0.00% (0 Students)
Percent Tested	100%	88.24%	77.78%

STAR Reading Grades 3 by Winter Administration for Black or African American Recorded Group			
STAR Administration	Winter 2020 n=12	Winter 2021 n=16	Winter 2022 n=8
MIP Grades 3	100	71.88	75.00
Percent Proficient Grades 3	33.33% (4 Students)	18.75% (3 Students)	25.00% (2 Students)
Percent Tested	100.00%	93.75%	87.50%

STAR Reading Grades 4 by Fall Administration for Black or African American Recorded Group			
STAR Administration	Fall 2019 n=22	Fall 2020 n=19	Fall 2021 n=14
MIP Grades 4	118.18	100	85.71
Percent Proficient Grades 4	36.36% (8 Students)	21.05% (4 Students)	14.29% (2 Students)
Percent Tested	95.45%	96.74%	100%

STAR Reading Grades 4 by Winter Administration for Black or African American Recorded Group			
STAR Administration	Winter 2020	Winter 2021	Winter 2022

	n=17	n=11	n=16
MIP Grades 4	126.47	63.64	78.13
Percent Proficient Grades 4	29.41% (5 Students)	0.00(0 Students)	18.75% (3 Students)
Percent Tested	94.12%	90.91%	81.25%

STAR Reading Grades 5 by Fall Administration for Black or African American Recorded Group			
STAR Administration	Fall 2019 n=21	Fall 2020 n=23	Fall 2021 n=22
MIP Grades 5	114.29	128.26	79.55
Percent Proficient Grades 5	19.05% (4 Students)	39.13% (9 Students)	22.73% (5 Students)
Percent Tested	95.24%	82.61%	95.45%

STAR Reading Grades 5 by Winter Administration for Black or African American Recorded Group			
STAR Administration	Winter 2020 n=14	Winter 2021 n=18	Winter 2022 n=20
MIP Grades 5	89.29	86.11	75.00
Percent Proficient Grades 5	21.43% (3 Students)	16.64% (3 Students)	20.00% (4 Students)

Percent Tested	100.00%	94.44%	95.00%

ELA Interims:
Below are charts that reflect the performance of students on ELA Interims for Fall 2018, Fall 2019 and Fall 2021 along with Winter 2019, Winter 2020 and Winter 2022 . The ELA Interims were not administered in the 2020-21 school year due to the Pandemic. The ELA Interims are an internal assessment used to progress monitor students for the NYS ELA Assessment in the Spring.

Growth Analysis: ELA Interims Grades 3-5 by Fall Administration for Black or African American Recorded Group			
ELA Interim Administration	Fall 2021 n=46	Winter 2022 n=46	Growth:
MIP Grades 3-5	21.74	36.96	**+15.22**
Percent Proficient Grades 3-5	2.17% (1 Student)	10.87 (5 Students)	**+8.7%**
Percent Tested	95.65%	89.13%	

ELA Interims Grades 3-5 by Fall Administration for Black or African American Recorded Group			
ELA Interim Administration	Fall 2018 n=40	Fall 2019 n=44	Fall 2021 n=46
MIP Grades 3-5	27.5	25.00	21.74
Percent Proficient	2.50% (1 Student)	2.27% (1 Student)	2.17% (1 Student)

Grades 3-5			
Percent Tested	87.50%	86.36%	95.65%

ELA Interims Grades 3-5 by Winter Administration for Black or African American Recorded Group			
ELA Interim Administration	Winter 2019 n=40	Winter 2020 n=45	Winter 2022 n=46
MIP Grades 3-5	30	26.67	36.96
Percent Proficient Grades 3-5	7.50% (3 Students)	2.22% (1 Student)	10.87 (5 Students)
Percent Tested	77.50%	97.78%	89.13%

ELA Interims Grades 3 by Fall Administration for Black or African American Recorded Group			
ELA Interim Administration	Fall 2018 n=18	Fall 2020 n=12	Fall 2021 n=8
MIP Grades 3	27.78	25.00	25.00
Percent Proficient Grades 3	0.00% (0 Students)	0.00% (0 Students)	0.00% (0 Students)
Percent Tested	83.33%	91.67%	87.50%

Updated December 2021

New York State EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Knowledge > Skill > Opportunity

ELA Interims Grades 3 by Winter Administration for Black or African American Recorded Group			
ELA Interim Administration	Winter 2019 n=18	Winter 2020 n=12	Winter 2022 n=8
MIP Grades 3	27.78	8.33	0.00
Percent Proficient Grades 3	5.56% (1 Student)	0.00% (0 Students)	0.00% (0 Students)
Percent Tested	72.22%	100.00%	87.50%

ELA Interims Grades 4 by Fall Administration for Black or African American Recorded Group			
ELA Interim Administration	Fall 2018 n=13	Fall 2019 n=18	Fall 2021 n=17
MIP Grades 4	27.78	33.33	17.65
Percent Proficient Grades 4	0.00% (0 Students)	0.00% (0 Students)	0.00% (0 Students)
Percent Tested	83.33%	83.33%	100.00%

ELA Interims Grades 4 by Winter Administration for Black or African American Recorded Group			
ELA Interim Administration	Winter 2019 n=13	Winter 2020 n=19	Winter 2022 n=17

Updated December 2021

	Fall 2018	Fall 2019	Fall 2021
MIP Grades 4	30.77	36.84	23.53
Percent Proficient Grades 4	7.69% (1 Student)	0.00% (0 Students)	11.76% (2 Students)
Percent Tested	84.62%	94.74%	82.35%

ELA Interims Grades 5 by Fall Administration for Black or African American Recorded Group			
ELA Interim Administration	Fall 2018 n=9	Fall 2019 n=14	Fall 2021 n=21
MIP Grades 5	33.33	14.29	23.81
Percent Proficient Grades 5	11.11% (1 Student)	7.14%(1 Student)	4.76% (1 Student)
Percent Tested	77.78%	85.71%	95.24%

ELA Interims Grades 5 by Winter Administration for Black or African American Recorded Group			
ELA Interim Administration	Winter 2019 n=9	Winter 2020 n=14	Winter 2022 n=21
MIP Grades 5	33.33	28.57	61.90
Percent Proficient Grades 5	11.11% (1 Student)	7.14% (1 Student)	14.29% (3 Students)

Percent Tested	77.78%	100.00%	95.24%

Trends:
For Black performance, our STAR assessments indicate a decrease in our MIP from 87.78 to 76.15 but an increase in our number of Black students proficient from 7 to 9. As we further examine grade level data, we saw upward movement in grades 3 and 4 but a decrease in grade 5. As we analyze our ELA interim data, we have increased our MIP from 21.74 to 36.96 and we have moved from 1 student proficient to 5 students proficient however, we still have much more growth to our target to do, as our target is 62.5.

Adjustment to Continuation Plan:
At this time we will not make any adjustments to our continuation plan.

Part IV – *Community Engagement Team (CET)*

Community Engagement Team (CET) *The role of the Community Engagement Team is to be active thought partners in contributing to and supporting the development of recommendations for school improvement through public engagement. Recommendations made by the CET, including how the school community was engaged to seek input/feedback to guide implementation of the school's improvement plan, should be addressed in response to the prompts below.*	
Report Out of 2021-22 CET Plan Implementation	
• List the categories of stakeholders that have participated as members this reporting period. • Include any changes made to the CET's membership since the development of the 2021-2022 continuation plan. Include the role/title of any new members.	Describe how recommendations made by the CET during this reporting period were used to inform implementation of the school's improvement plan.
Kerri Messler - Principal Abby Turcotte - Instructional Supervisor Al Tompkins - Parent Liaison Coordinator Ameera Crellin - Social Worker Charito Haines - Grade 2 Teacher Elin Mattfeld - Student Support Teacher Johan Matthews - Parent Linda Garrigan - Grade 1 Teacher Louise DiFabbio - Boys and Girls Club Michele Hogan - Assistant Director of Planning and Accountability Michelle Steinbeiser - Grade K teacher Natalie Cable - Data Manager Melissa Hughes - Parent	Met January 25, 2022. Feedback: - share data among tutors in the after school program to ensure precision in interventions. - explore other schools to determine success they are experiencing with attendance as this is an area of significant need for Keane. - look at funding sources to determine if there is a need to shift monies to support attendance interventions at Tier 2 and 3. - Continue to disaggregate data by subgroup. - Explore accuracy of demographic codes in Infinite Campus

Part V - *Receivership Powers*

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

Part VI – *Assurance and Attestation*

By signing below, I attest to the fact that the information in this Receivership Quarterly Report is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge; and that all requirements with regard to public hearings and the Community Engagement Teams, as per Commissioners Regulation §100.19 have been met.

Name of Receiver (Print): _____

Signature of Receiver: _____

Date: _____

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

Updated December 2021

Name of CET Representative (Print):

Signature of CET Representative:

Title of CET Representative:

Date: