

Gloucester City Middle School

District: GLOUCESTER CITY

County: CAMDEN

Team: NA

School Identification: NA

Targeted Subgroup

CDS: 071770300

Annual School Planning 2021-2022

ASP Development Team Members

Stakeholder Representative Title	Name	Comprehensive Analysis and Needs	Root Cause Analysis	Smart Goal Development	Signature	Date
Superintendent	Sean Gorman	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Assistant Superintendent	Kimberley Chiodi	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Supervisor of Special Services	Eliza Rawley	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Principal	Jennifer Holmstrom	Yes	No	No		
Vice Principal	Norell Gurcik	Yes	No	No		
Guidance Department	Kristen Charles	Yes	No	Yes		
Instructional Supervisor	Steven Jakubowski	Yes	Yes	No		
Parent	Giselle Kelly	Yes	No	No		

Stakeholder Representative Title	Name	Comprehensive Analysis and Needs	Root Cause Analysis	Smart Goal Development	Signature	Date
Community	Donna Bangle	Yes	No	No		

ASP Development Team Meetings

Date	Topic	Agenda Uploaded	Minutes Uploaded
09/22/2020	Prior Year Evaluation, Comprehensive Data Analysis and Needs Assessment	Yes	Yes
11/17/2020	Priority Performance Needs and Root Cause Analysis	Yes	Yes
01/26/2021	Smart Goal Development	Yes	Yes
05/11/2021	Comprehensive Data Analysis and Needs Assessment, Smart Goal Development	Yes	Yes

Evaluation of Prior Year Interventions and Data Analysis



PRIOR YEAR INTERVENTIONS

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
Academic Remediation (After School Program)	ELA	Grades 4-8	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Grade 4 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (29%) to Cycle 2 (30%). Scores increased by 7% from Cycle 2 (30%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(29%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 8%.</p> <p>Grade 5 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores decreased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores remained the same from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(37%).</p> <p>Grade 6 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 3% from Cycle 1 (30%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(30%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 7%.</p> <p>Grade 7 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 2 (36%). Scores increased by 10%</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
						<p>from Cycle 2 (36%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(35%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 11%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (38%) to Cycle 2 (46%). Scores increased by 11% from Cycle 2 (46%) to Cycle 3 (57%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(38%) to Cycle 3(57%) by 19%.</p>



Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
Academic Remediation (After School Program)	Math	Grades 4 to 8	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Grade 4 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (41%). Scores increased by 2% from Cycle 2 (41%) to Cycle 3 (43%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(43%) by 6%.</p> <p>Grade 5 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 14% from Cycle 1 (31%) to Cycle 2 (45%). Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 2 (45%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(31%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 15%.</p> <p>Grade 6 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores decreased by 1% from Cycle 1 (32%) to Cycle 2 (31%). Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 2 (31%) to Cycle 3 (39%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(32%) to Cycle 3(39%) by 7%.</p> <p>Grade 7 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 7% from Cycle 1 (38%) to Cycle 2 (45%). Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 2 (45%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(38%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 8%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores</p>



Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
						<p>increased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (41%). Scores increased by 2% from Cycle 2 (41%) to Cycle 3 (43%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(43%) by 6%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Algebra Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 2 (43%). Scores increased by 17% from Cycle 2 (43%) to Cycle 3 (60%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(35%) to Cycle 3(60%) by 25%.</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
My Math (grades 4 & 5)	Math	Grades 4 and 5	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Grade 4 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (41%). Scores increased by 2% from Cycle 2 (41%) to Cycle 3 (43%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(43%) by 6%.</p> <p>Grade 5 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 14% from Cycle 1 (31%) to Cycle 2 (45%). Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 2 (45%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(31%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 15%.</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
Go Math (grades 6-8)	Math	Grades 6-8	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Grade 6 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores decreased by 1% from Cycle 1 (32%) to Cycle 2 (31%). Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 2 (31%) to Cycle 3 (39%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(32%) to Cycle 3(39%) by 7%.</p> <p>Grade 7 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 7% from Cycle 1 (38%) to Cycle 2 (45%). Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 2 (45%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(38%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 8%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (41%). Scores increased by 2% from Cycle 2 (41%) to Cycle 3 (43%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(43%) by 6%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Algebra Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 2 (43%). Scores increased by 17% from Cycle 2 (43%) to Cycle 3 (60%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(35%) to Cycle 3(60%) by 25%.</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
IXL	Math	Grades 4-8	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Grade 4 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (41%). Scores increased by 2% from Cycle 2 (41%) to Cycle 3 (43%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(43%) by 6%.</p> <p>Grade 5 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 14% from Cycle 1 (31%) to Cycle 2 (45%). Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 2 (45%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(31%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 15%.</p> <p>Grade 6 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores decreased by 1% from Cycle 1 (32%) to Cycle 2 (31%). Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 2 (31%) to Cycle 3 (39%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(32%) to Cycle 3(39%) by 7%.</p> <p>Grade 7 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 7% from Cycle 1 (38%) to Cycle 2 (45%). Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 2 (45%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(38%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 8%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
						<p>increased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (41%). Scores increased by 2% from Cycle 2 (41%) to Cycle 3 (43%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(43%) by 6%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Algebra Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 2 (43%). Scores increased by 17% from Cycle 2 (43%) to Cycle 3 (60%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(35%) to Cycle 3(60%) by 25%.</p>



Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
Wilson Reading	ELA	Grades 4-8	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Grade 4 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (29%) to Cycle 2 (30%). Scores increased by 7% from Cycle 2 (30%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(29%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 8%.</p> <p>Grade 5 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores decreased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores remained the same from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(37%).</p> <p>Grade 6 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 3% from Cycle 1 (30%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(30%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 7%.</p> <p>Grade 7 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 2 (36%). Scores increased by 10% from Cycle 2 (36%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(35%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 11%.</p>



Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
						Grade 8 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (38%) to Cycle 2 (46%). Scores increased by 11% from Cycle 2 (46%) to Cycle 3 (57%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(38%) to Cycle 3(57%) by 19%.
"Journeys" (Houghton Mifflin Grades 4,5)	ELA	Grades 4 and 5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Grade 4 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (29%) to Cycle 2 (30%). Scores increased by 7% from Cycle 2 (30%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(29%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 8%. Grade 5 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores decreased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores remained the same from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(37%).

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
Lexia	ELA	Grades 4-8	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Grade 4 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (29%) to Cycle 2 (30%). Scores increased by 7% from Cycle 2 (30%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(29%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 8%.</p> <p>Grade 5 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores decreased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores remained the same from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(37%).</p> <p>Grade 6 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 3% from Cycle 1 (30%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(30%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 7%.</p> <p>Grade 7 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 2 (36%). Scores increased by 10% from Cycle 2 (36%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(35%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 11%.</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
						<p>Grade 8 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (38%) to Cycle 2 (46%). Scores increased by 11% from Cycle 2 (46%) to Cycle 3 (57%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(38%) to Cycle 3(57%) by 19%.</p>



Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
Freckle	Cross Curricular	Grades 4-8	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Grade 4 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (29%) to Cycle 2 (30%). Scores increased by 7% from Cycle 2 (30%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(29%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 8%.</p> <p>Grade 5 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores decreased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores remained the same from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(37%).</p> <p>Grade 6 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 3% from Cycle 1 (30%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(30%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 7%.</p> <p>Grade 7 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 2 (36%). Scores increased by 10% from Cycle 2 (36%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(35%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 11%.</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
						<p>Grade 8 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (38%) to Cycle 2 (46%). Scores increased by 11% from Cycle 2 (46%) to Cycle 3 (57%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(38%) to Cycle 3(57%) by 19%.</p> <p>Grade 4 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (41%). Scores increased by 2% from Cycle 2 (41%) to Cycle 3 (43%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(43%) by 6%.</p> <p>Grade 5 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 14% from Cycle 1 (31%) to Cycle 2 (45%). Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 2 (45%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(31%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 15%.</p> <p>Grade 6 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores decreased by 1% from Cycle 1 (32%) to Cycle 2 (31%). Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 2 (31%) to Cycle 3 (39%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(32%) to Cycle 3(39%) by 7%.</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
						<p>Grade 7 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 7% from Cycle 1 (38%) to Cycle 2 (45%). Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 2 (45%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(38%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 8%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (41%). Scores increased by 2% from Cycle 2 (41%) to Cycle 3 (43%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(43%) by 6%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Algebra Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 2 (43%). Scores increased by 17% from Cycle 2 (43%) to Cycle 3 (60%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(35%) to Cycle 3(60%) by 25%.</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
Acquire Instructional Licenses: Adobe, Kami and instructional supplies/materials to use in class including on-line and paper resources.	Cross Curricular	Grades 4-8	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Grade 4 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (29%) to Cycle 2 (30%). Scores increased by 7% from Cycle 2 (30%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(29%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 8%.</p> <p>Grade 5 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores decreased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores remained the same from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(37%).</p> <p>Grade 6 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 3% from Cycle 1 (30%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(30%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 7%.</p> <p>Grade 7 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 2 (36%). Scores increased by 10% from Cycle 2 (36%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(35%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 11%.</p>



Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
						<p>Grade 8 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (38%) to Cycle 2 (46%). Scores increased by 11% from Cycle 2 (46%) to Cycle 3 (57%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(38%) to Cycle 3(57%) by 19%.</p> <p>Grade 4 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (41%). Scores increased by 2% from Cycle 2 (41%) to Cycle 3 (43%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(43%) by 6%.</p> <p>Grade 5 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 14% from Cycle 1 (31%) to Cycle 2 (45%). Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 2 (45%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(31%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 15%.</p> <p>Grade 6 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores decreased by 1% from Cycle 1 (32%) to Cycle 2 (31%). Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 2 (31%) to Cycle 3 (39%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(32%) to Cycle 3(39%) by 7%.</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
						<p>Grade 7 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 7% from Cycle 1 (38%) to Cycle 2 (45%). Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 2 (45%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(38%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 8%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (41%). Scores increased by 2% from Cycle 2 (41%) to Cycle 3 (43%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(43%) by 6%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Algebra Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 2 (43%). Scores increased by 17% from Cycle 2 (43%) to Cycle 3 (60%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(35%) to Cycle 3(60%) by 25%.</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
Acquire devices: 1-1 Technology Initiative to overcome the Digital Divide (Tablets)	Cross Curricular	Grades 4-8	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Grade 4 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (29%) to Cycle 2 (30%). Scores increased by 7% from Cycle 2 (30%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(29%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 8%.</p> <p>Grade 5 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores decreased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores remained the same from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(37%).</p> <p>Grade 6 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 3% from Cycle 1 (30%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(30%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 7%.</p> <p>Grade 7 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 2 (36%). Scores increased by 10% from Cycle 2 (36%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(35%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 11%.</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
						<p>Grade 8 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (38%) to Cycle 2 (46%). Scores increased by 11% from Cycle 2 (46%) to Cycle 3 (57%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(38%) to Cycle 3(57%) by 19%.</p> <p>Grade 4 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (41%). Scores increased by 2% from Cycle 2 (41%) to Cycle 3 (43%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(43%) by 6%.</p> <p>Grade 5 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 14% from Cycle 1 (31%) to Cycle 2 (45%). Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 2 (45%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(31%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 15%.</p> <p>Grade 6 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores decreased by 1% from Cycle 1 (32%) to Cycle 2 (31%). Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 2 (31%) to Cycle 3 (39%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(32%) to Cycle 3(39%) by 7%.</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
						<p>Grade 7 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 7% from Cycle 1 (38%) to Cycle 2 (45%). Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 2 (45%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(38%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 8%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (41%). Scores increased by 2% from Cycle 2 (41%) to Cycle 3 (43%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(43%) by 6%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Algebra Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 2 (43%). Scores increased by 17% from Cycle 2 (43%) to Cycle 3 (60%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(35%) to Cycle 3(60%) by 25%.</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
Professional Development	Cross Curriculum	Grades 4-8	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Grade 4 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (29%) to Cycle 2 (30%). Scores increased by 7% from Cycle 2 (30%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(29%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 8%.</p> <p>Grade 5 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores decreased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores remained the same from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(37%).</p> <p>Grade 6 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 3% from Cycle 1 (30%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(30%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 7%.</p> <p>Grade 7 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 2 (36%). Scores increased by 10% from Cycle 2 (36%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(35%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 11%.</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
						<p>Grade 8 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (38%) to Cycle 2 (46%). Scores increased by 11% from Cycle 2 (46%) to Cycle 3 (57%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(38%) to Cycle 3(57%) by 19%.</p> <p>Grade 4 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (41%). Scores increased by 2% from Cycle 2 (41%) to Cycle 3 (43%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(43%) by 6%.</p> <p>Grade 5 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 14% from Cycle 1 (31%) to Cycle 2 (45%). Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 2 (45%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(31%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 15%.</p> <p>Grade 6 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores decreased by 1% from Cycle 1 (32%) to Cycle 2 (31%). Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 2 (31%) to Cycle 3 (39%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(32%) to Cycle 3(39%) by 7%.</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
						<p>Grade 7 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 7% from Cycle 1 (38%) to Cycle 2 (45%). Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 2 (45%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(38%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 8%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (41%). Scores increased by 2% from Cycle 2 (41%) to Cycle 3 (43%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(43%) by 6%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Algebra Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 2 (43%). Scores increased by 17% from Cycle 2 (43%) to Cycle 3 (60%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(35%) to Cycle 3(60%) by 25%.</p>



Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
Parent Involvement	Cross Curricular	Grades 4-8	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Grade 4 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (29%) to Cycle 2 (30%). Scores increased by 7% from Cycle 2 (30%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(29%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 8%.</p> <p>Grade 5 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores decreased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores remained the same from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(37%).</p> <p>Grade 6 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 3% from Cycle 1 (30%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(30%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 7%.</p> <p>Grade 7 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 2 (36%). Scores increased by 10% from Cycle 2 (36%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(35%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 11%.</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
						<p>Grade 8 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (38%) to Cycle 2 (46%). Scores increased by 11% from Cycle 2 (46%) to Cycle 3 (57%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(38%) to Cycle 3(57%) by 19%.</p> <p>Grade 4 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (41%). Scores increased by 2% from Cycle 2 (41%) to Cycle 3 (43%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(43%) by 6%.</p> <p>Grade 5 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 14% from Cycle 1 (31%) to Cycle 2 (45%). Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 2 (45%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(31%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 15%.</p> <p>Grade 6 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores decreased by 1% from Cycle 1 (32%) to Cycle 2 (31%). Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 2 (31%) to Cycle 3 (39%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(32%) to Cycle 3(39%) by 7%.</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
						<p>Grade 7 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 7% from Cycle 1 (38%) to Cycle 2 (45%). Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 2 (45%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(38%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 8%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (41%). Scores increased by 2% from Cycle 2 (41%) to Cycle 3 (43%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(43%) by 6%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Algebra Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 2 (43%). Scores increased by 17% from Cycle 2 (43%) to Cycle 3 (60%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(35%) to Cycle 3(60%) by 25%.</p>



Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
IXL	ELA	Grades 4-8	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Grade 4 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (29%) to Cycle 2 (30%). Scores increased by 7% from Cycle 2 (30%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(29%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 8%.</p> <p>Grade 5 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores decreased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores remained the same from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(37%).</p> <p>Grade 6 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 3% from Cycle 1 (30%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(30%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 7%.</p> <p>Grade 7 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 2 (36%). Scores increased by 10% from Cycle 2 (36%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(35%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 11%.</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
						<p>Grade 8 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (38%) to Cycle 2 (46%). Scores increased by 11% from Cycle 2 (46%) to Cycle 3 (57%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(38%) to Cycle 3(57%) by 19%.</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
StudySync	ELA	Grades 6-8	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Grade 6 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 3% from Cycle 1 (30%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(30%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 7%.</p> <p>Grade 7 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 2 (36%). Scores increased by 10% from Cycle 2 (36%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(35%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 11%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (38%) to Cycle 2 (46%). Scores increased by 11% from Cycle 2 (46%) to Cycle 3 (57%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(38%) to Cycle 3(57%) by 19%.</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
Classworks	ELA	Grades 4-8	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Grade 4 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (29%) to Cycle 2 (30%). Scores increased by 7% from Cycle 2 (30%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(29%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 8%.</p> <p>Grade 5 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores decreased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores remained the same from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(37%).</p> <p>Grade 6 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 3% from Cycle 1 (30%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(30%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 7%.</p> <p>Grade 7 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 2 (36%). Scores increased by 10% from Cycle 2 (36%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(35%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 11%.</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
						<p>Grade 8 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (38%) to Cycle 2 (46%). Scores increased by 11% from Cycle 2 (46%) to Cycle 3 (57%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(38%) to Cycle 3(57%) by 19%.</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
Classworks	Math	Grades 4-8	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Grade 4 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (41%). Scores increased by 2% from Cycle 2 (41%) to Cycle 3 (43%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(43%) by 6%.</p> <p>Grade 5 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 14% from Cycle 1 (31%) to Cycle 2 (45%). Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 2 (45%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(31%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 15%.</p> <p>Grade 6 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores decreased by 1% from Cycle 1 (32%) to Cycle 2 (31%). Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 2 (31%) to Cycle 3 (39%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(32%) to Cycle 3(39%) by 7%.</p> <p>Grade 7 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 7% from Cycle 1 (38%) to Cycle 2 (45%). Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 2 (45%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(38%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 8%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores</p>

Analysis of Key Interventions	Content Area	Target Populations	Was this key intervention implemented as planned?	Do you plan to continue with this intervention?	Do you have evidence this intervention was effective?	Measurable Outcomes (state the data that supports the continuation of this intervention)
						<p>increased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (41%). Scores increased by 2% from Cycle 2 (41%) to Cycle 3 (43%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(43%) by 6%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Algebra Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 2 (43%). Scores increased by 17% from Cycle 2 (43%) to Cycle 3 (60%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(35%) to Cycle 3(60%) by 25%.</p>

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data						Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
NJSLA Proficiency*	Consider comparing previous year's and current year's NJSLA results in the noted subject areas. <a 253="" 293"="" 344="" 444="" href="http://www.nj.gov/education/schools/achievement/target='_blank'>Link to website with access to reports. </td> <td data-bbox=">Student Group	ELA	Math	Alg1	Alg2	Geo	<p>Grade 4 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (29%) to Cycle 2 (30%). Scores increased by 7% from Cycle 2 (30%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(29%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 8%.</p> <p>Grade 5 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores decreased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores remained the same from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(37%).</p> <p>Grade 6 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 3% from Cycle 1 (30%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(30%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 7%.</p> <p>Grade 7 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle</p>	Due to Covid-19, the state of NJ excused our students from completing the NJSLA. The data included here is from our standard aligned benchmark.	
		Schoolwide	46.6 %	29.7%	77%				
		White	48%	30%	76%				
		Hispanic	46.5 %	27.9%	*				
		Black or African American	30.8 %	17.9%	*				
		Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	*	*	*				
		American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*					
		Two or More Races							
		Female	54.8 %	32.1%	82%				
		Male	39.4 %	27.6%	72%				
		Economically Disadvantaged Students	40%	23.3%	73%				
		Non-Economically Disadvantaged Students	55.2 %	38.2%	80%				
		Students with Disabilities	12.8 %	*					
		Students without Disabilities	54.6 %	*	77%				
		English Learners	*	*					
		Non-English Learners	*	*	77%				
Homeless Students	20%	16%							
Students in Foster Care	*	*							

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data						Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
		Student Group	ELA	Math	Alg1	Alg2	Geo	<p>2 (36%). Scores increased by 10% from Cycle 2 (36%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(35%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 11%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (38%) to Cycle 2 (46%). Scores increased by 11% from Cycle 2 (46%) to Cycle 3 (57%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(38%) to Cycle 3(57%) by 19%.</p> <p>Grade 4 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (41%). Scores increased by 2% from Cycle 2 (41%) to Cycle 3 (43%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(43%) by 6%.</p> <p>Grade 5 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 14% from Cycle 1 (31%) to Cycle 2 (45%). Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 2 (45%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(31%) to Cycle</p>	
		Military-Connected Students	*	*					
		Migrant Students							

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data	Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
			<p>3(46%) by 15%. Grade 6 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores decreased by 1% from Cycle 1 (32%) to Cycle 2 (31%). Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 2 (31%) to Cycle 3 (39%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(32%) to Cycle 3(39%) by 7%.</p> <p>Grade 7 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 7% from Cycle 1 (38%) to Cycle 2 (45%). Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 2 (45%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(38%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 8%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (41%). Scores increased by 2% from Cycle 2 (41%) to Cycle 3 (43%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(43%) by 6%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Algebra Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 2 (43%). Scores increased by 17%</p>	

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data	Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
			<p>from Cycle 2 (43%) to Cycle 3 (60%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 3(60%) by 25%.</p> <p>69% of students in grades 4-8 are low income.</p> <p>17.6% (159) of students in grades 4-8 carry an IEP.</p> <p>In the entire student population, at Gloucester City Middle School grades 4-8, there are 902 students. 69% of that population is low income. 1.7% are LEP. 159 students have IEPs. That is 17.6% of the entire population. There are 11 students in Gloucester City Middle School that are homeless. That has impacted their scores, especially with the circumstances surrounding Covid-19.</p>	

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data				Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
Science*	NJSLA Science Homepage, https://measinc-nj-science.com/	NJSLA-S				<p>In grade 4, 102 students completed the science assessment. 97% scored below grade level 3% scored on grade level 0% scored above grade level</p> <p>In grade 5, 99 students completed the science assessment. 82% scored below grade level 17% scored on grade level 1% scored below grade level</p> <p>In grade 6, 124 students completed the science assessment. 98% scored below grade level 2% scored on grade level</p> <p>In grade 7, 145 students completed the science assessment. 92% scored below grade level 6% scored on grade level 2% scored above grade level</p>	Due to Covid-19, the state of NJ excused our students from completing the NJSLA.
		Student Group	Grade 5	Grade 8	Grade 11		
		Schoolwide	17%	4%			
		White	20%	5%			
		Hispanic	17%	0%			
		Black or African	4%				
		Asian, Native					
		American Indian or	*	*			
		Two or More Races		*			
		Female	16%	0%			
		Male	17%	7%			
		Economically	9%	4%			
		Non-Economical	27%	4%			
Students with	0%	0%					

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data				Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
		Student Group	Grade 5	Grade 8	Grade 11		
		Students without	20%	5%			
		English Learners	*	*			
		Non-English	17%	4%			
		Homeless Students					
		Students in Foster Care		*			
		Military-Connected	*	*			
		Migrant Students	*	*			



Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data			Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
SGP*	Student growth on state assessments. (Grades 4-8) *Identify overall school wide growth performance by content. *Identify interaction between student proficiency level.	Student Group	ELA	Math	N/A	N/A
		Schoolwide	46%	42%		
		White	45%	42.5%		
		Hispanic	51%	44%		
		Black or African American	36%	30%		
		Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific	57%	49%		
		American Indian or Alaska Native	*	*		
		Two or More Races				
		Female	48%	42%		
		Male	43.5%	43%		
		Economically Disadvantaged	43%	37%		
		Non-Economically Disadvantaged				
		Students with Disabilities	37%	43%		
Students without Disabilities						

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data			Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
		Student Group	ELA	Math		
		English Learners	18.5%	68.5%		
		Non-English Learners				
		Homeless Students	25%	21.5%		
		Students in Foster Care	*	*		
		Military-Connected Students	*	*		
		Migrant Students				

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data					Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
Benchmark Assessment Participation*	Please list any cycles where the 95% participation rate was not met. Please provide explanation. *Identify patterns by subgroup *Identify patterns by grade	ELA					N/A	N/A
		Grade	Cycle 1	Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Cycle 4		
		K	0%	0%	0%	0%		
		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%				

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

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

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data					Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends		
Benchmark Assessment (Proficiency) ELA Rates*	Please share results of analysis of % passing, including YTD analysis by grades and subgroups. *Identify patterns by grade/subgroups *Identify patterns by chronic absenteeism *Identify patterns by students with chronic disciplinary infractions	Grade	Cycle 1	Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Cycle 4	Grade 4 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (29%) to Cycle 2 (30%). Scores increased by 7% from Cycle 2 (30%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(29%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 8%. Grade 5 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores decreased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores remained the same from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(37%). Grade 6 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 3% from Cycle 1 (30%) to Cycle 2 (33%). Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 2 (33%) to Cycle 3 (37%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(30%) to Cycle 3(37%) by 7%. Grade 7 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 2 (36%). Scores increased by 10% from Cycle 2 (36%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall	There is a continued need for Houghton Mifflin Harcourt "Journey's" Program. There is a continued need for "Wilson Reading" instruction. The introduction of "StudySync" as a literacy program has had a positive impact for our 6-8 grade students. Needs indicate that there are still learning gaps so the school is looking into piloting new programs.		
		K	0%	0%	0%	0%				
		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%						

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data	Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
			<p>scores increased from Cycle 1(35%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 11%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Link It! Benchmark ELA Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (38%) to Cycle 2 (46%). Scores increased by 11% from Cycle 2 (46%) to Cycle 3 (57%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(38%) to Cycle 3(57%) by 19%.</p>	

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data					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%	Grade 4 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (41%). Scores increased by 2% from Cycle 2 (41%) to Cycle 3 (43%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(43%) by 6%. Grade 5 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 14% from Cycle 1 (31%) to Cycle 2 (45%). Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 2 (45%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(31%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 15%. Grade 6 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores decreased by 1% from Cycle 1 (32%) to Cycle 2 (31%). Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 2 (31%) to Cycle 3 (39%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(32%) to Cycle 3(39%) by 7%. Grade 7 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 7% from Cycle 1 (38%) to Cycle 2 (45%). Scores increased by 1% from Cycle 2 (45%) to Cycle 3 (46%). Overall scores increased	There is a continued need for "MyMath" Program for grades 4-5. There is a continued need for "GoMath" Program for grades 6-8. Needs indicate that there are still learning gaps so the school is looking into piloting new programs.
		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%		

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data	Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
			<p>from Cycle 1(38%) to Cycle 3(46%) by 8%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 4% from Cycle 1 (37%) to Cycle 2 (41%). Scores increased by 2% from Cycle 2 (41%) to Cycle 3 (43%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1(37%) to Cycle 3(43%) by 6%.</p> <p>Grade 8 Algebra Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 2 (43%). Scores increased by 17% from Cycle 2 (43%) to Cycle 3 (60%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 3(60%) by 25%.</p>	

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data		Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
English Language Proficiency (ELP)*	Student progress to English Language Proficiency (Grades K-12).	Percent of English Learners Making Expected Growth to	-2%	<p>ACCESS for ELLs 2.0, 6 students tested in the Spring 2020 4-5 cluster. In grade 4, 6 students tested.</p> <p>1 student tested in the Bridging Level.</p> <p>5 students tested in the Reaching Level.</p> <p>5 students tested in the Spring 2020 6-8 cluster. In grade 6, 2 students tested.</p> <p>1 student tested in the Emerging Level.</p> <p>1 student tested in the Developing Level.</p> <p>In grade 7, 3 students tested.</p> <p>1 student tested in the Entering Level.</p> <p>2 students tested in the Developing Level.</p>	The following indicates the percentage of home languages: English 98.9%, Spanish 1%, and Mandarin 0.1%.

CLIMATE & CULTURE					
Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data		Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
Enrollment*	Number of students enrolled in your building *Identify overall enrollment trends *Identify enrollment by grade and subgroup	Overall YTD Student Enrollment Average	0	The enrollment of students in grades 4-8 on June 11, 2021 was 902.	69% of Gloucester City Middle School's students belong to the subgroup of economically disadvantaged students. The digital divide often affects economically disadvantaged students. They sometimes have less access to technology at home compared to other students. The number of free and reduced students was based on last year's percentages due to the under-reporting by many parents during the Covid-19 environment with free breakfast and lunch without any paperwork being filled out. This was discussed at an EWEG webinar held on 7.7.21 and moderated by Nancy Ballard.
		Subgroup 1 YTD Student Enrollment Average	0	The enrollment of students in grades 4-8 of Students with Disabilities on June 11, 2021 was 176.	
		Subgroup 2 YTD Student Enrollment Average	0	The enrollment of students in grades 4-8 with Limited English Proficiency on June 11, 2021 was 15.	

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data		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%	The attendance rate of students in grades 4-8 on June 11, 2021 was 89%.	The attendance rate was impacted due to the COVID-19 "virtual/hybrid" environment.
		Subgroup 1 YTD Student	0.00%	The attendance rate of students in grades 4-8 that are Economically Disadvantaged on June 11, 2021 was 87%.	
		Subgroup 2 YTD Student Attendance Average	0.00%	The attendance rate of students in grades 4-8 of Students with Disabilities on June 11, 2021 was 89%.	
				The attendance rate of students in grades 4-8 with Limited English Proficiency on June 11, 2021 was 85%.	

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data		Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
Chronic Absenteeism (Students)*	Chronic absenteeism is defined as the percentage of students who are absent 10% or more of the days between the start of school to the current date ("year to date") and includes both excused and unexcused absences. For chronic absenteeism for students in your building *Identify patterns by grade *Identify patterns by teacher *Identify interventions	Overall YTD Chronic Absenteeism	0.00%	In grades 4-8, the overall chronic absenteeism rate was 4.2%. 38 students out of 902 with at least 20 days absent as of June 11, 2021.	<p>The rates are the same for the subgroups and total population.</p> <p>In grades 4-8, the chronic absenteeism rate for Economically Disadvantaged students was 4.2% as of June 11, 2021. This is 18 students with at least 20 absences as of June 11, 2021.</p> <p>In grades 4-8, the chronic absenteeism rate for Students with Disabilities was 4.2% as of June 11, 2021. This is 7 students with at least 20 absences as of June 11, 2021.</p>
		Subgroup 1 YTD Chronic	0.00%		
		Subgroup 2 YTD Chronic Absenteeism	0.00%		
Attendance Rate (Staff)*	The average daily attendance for staff *Identify patterns by grade *Identify chronic absenteeism *Identify reasons for absenteeism	Staff Attendance YTD	0.00%	<p>Work Days 175 times 62 teachers is 10,850 total days</p> <p>Teacher Absence rate 5%</p> <p>Teacher Attendance rate 95%</p>	95% from September 1, 2020 to June 11, 2021.

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data		Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
Discipline*	The number of suspensions, expulsions, and incident reports *Identify types of incidents *Identify patterns by subgroup *Identify chronic offenders	Student Suspension YTD Average - In School	0.00%	In School Suspension student totals were 2 suspensions (0.22%).	Sept. 1, 2020 to June 11, 2021. Due to the global pandemic, the COVID learning environment changed the totals for all. One student had two Out of School Suspensions (economically disadvantaged & student with disability).
		Student Suspension YTD Average - In School for Subgroup 1	0.00%	In School Suspensions for Economically Disadvantaged students were 0 suspensions (0%).	
		Student Suspension YTD Average - In School for Subgroup 2	0.00%	In School Suspensions for Students with Disabilities were 0 suspensions(0%).	
		Student Suspension YTD Average - Out of School	0.00%	Out of School Suspension student totals were 8 suspensions(0.89%).	
		Student Suspension YTD Average - Out of School for Subgroup 1	0.00%	Out of School Suspensions for Economically Disadvantaged students were 4 suspensions(0.44%).	
		Student Suspension YTD Average - Out of School for Subgroup 2	0.00%	Out of School Suspensions for Students with Disabilities were 3 suspensions(0.33%).	
		Student Suspension YTD Average - Out of School for Subgroup 2	0.00%		

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data	Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
Climate & Culture Surveys	Results from surveys *Identify staff satisfaction and support *Identify perception of the environment *Identify perceptions of students *Identify perceptions of family		<p>A school climate survey was distributed to the staff in May 2021. A review of the responses of all staff members shows that their greatest success is interaction with the students at 52%, followed by clerical duties at 23%. 85% of staff members at Gloucester City Middle School had a favorable response when asked if they were committed to their jobs. When asked if they were provided with opportunities to correct weaknesses in their job performance, 48% had a positive response. 85% indicated that they were comfortable with the support that they received from peers and supervisors. 50% of staff had a positive response being able to share expertise with their colleagues.</p>	N/A



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

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Prepopulated Data		Your Data (Provide any additional data)	Observations / Trends
Post-Secondary Rates	% of students that enroll in post-secondary institution.			N/A	N/A
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			N/A	N/A
Algebra	Previous year's data provided. Please provide current year's data if possible.	# of 8th grade students enrolled in Algebra 1	36	Grade 8 Algebra Link It! Benchmark MATH Scores increased by 8% from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 2 (43%). Scores increased by 17% from Cycle 2 (43%) to Cycle 3 (60%). Overall scores increased from Cycle 1 (35%) to Cycle 3(60%) by 25%.	Due to Covid-19, the state of NJ excused our students from completing the NJSLA Algebra assessment. The data included here is from our standard aligned benchmark.
		% of students with a C or better			
		Count of students who took the Algebra section of PARCC	35		
		% of students who scored 4 or 5 on the PARCC assessment	77%		

EVALUATION INFORMATION

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where Possible)	Your Data (Provide only additional data)	Observations / Trends
Classroom Observations	<p>Teacher practice as measured on state-approved teacher practice instrument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Identify % of teachers on CAP in the previous school year *Identify instructional trends *Identify professional development needs 		<p>Five teachers at Gloucester City Middle School are currently on CAP for the 2020-2021 school year.</p>	<p>McREL's Teacher Evaluation System is used in the Gloucester City School District. The McREL system generates professional development for each teacher based on their evaluations. In addition, technology is a professional development goal for every teacher in the district.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -On-going training for both teachers and administrators in the McREL Teacher Evaluation System took place and there was increased teacher-administrator dialogue. -On-going training for both teachers and administrators focusing upon how to implement, assess, and recognize quality instruction took place. -PLCs were in place - Benchmark assessments for all content areas were

Data Source	Factors to Consider	Your Data (Prepopulated where Possible)	Your Data (Provide only additional data)	Observations / Trends
				<p>used for formulation of SGOs and to inform instruction.</p> <p>-Provide access to "OnCourse." Provide professional development on using the "On-Course" program for aligning curriculum and lesson plans to the NJSLS.</p>

< Other Indicators - NO DATA >

Process Questions and Growth and Reflection Tool

Component	Indicator Descriptor Level			Overall Strengths Summary	Areas of Focus Summary
Standards, Student Learning Objectives (SLOs), and Effective Instruction	1	A	3-Developing	Gloucester Middle School (GMS) is continuing to develop and has developed an effective component of Standards, Student Learning Objectives (SLOs), and Effective Instruction.	Areas that to be focused on include: PLC teams regularly address a set of guiding questions that focus on Student Learning; Consistently implement, revise, and reflect on SLOs as we deliver our units of study under the category of Standards and Learning Objectives. GMS needs to consistently use student data results to reflect on and revise all components to ensure tight alignment. Effective instruction should strive to have the most effective instructional elements are embedded into our units of study. Career Ready Practices could include assessing students to determine their progress in meeting t SLOs and use the data to drive changes in instruction and unit design. During the prior Covid -19 environment, all of these strategies were difficult to implement but our staff and faculty struggled and preserved to the utmost of their abilities.
	2	A	3-Developing		
	3	A	3-Developing		
	4	A	4-Sustaining		
	5	A	2-Emerging		
Assessment	1	A	3-Developing	Gloucester Middle School (GMS) has developed an effective Assessment component.	The areas of Summative, Pre-Assessments, and Formative Assessments all could benefit from active reflection and revision of unit instruction to better determine flexible groups and differentiated learning opportunities based on data analysis, especially due to the strain of administering and grading online assessments done when students were at full time remote learning.
	2	A	3-Developing		
	3	A	3-Developing		

Component	Indicator Descriptor Level		Overall Strengths Summary	Areas of Focus Summary
Professional Learning Community (PLC)	1	A	3-Developing	Collaborative Teams should strive to use the results of on-going analysis of assessment data to drive the work of our collaborative teams in achieving goals. Time with the school day to meet and/or observe colleagues is a worthy goal. Periodically assessing team adherence to the norms and consistently addressing violations of the norms to ensure that we are focused on student learning in an efficient and productive manner is a goal worthy to strive to. During the prior Covid -19 environment, all of these strategies were difficult to implement but our staff and faculty struggled and preserved to the utmost of their abilities.
	2	A	2-Emerging	
	3	A	3-Developing	
	4	A	3-Developing	

Component	Indicator Descriptor Level		Overall Strengths Summary	Areas of Focus Summary	
Culture	1	A	2-Emerging	Gloucester Middle School (GMS) has developed an effective Culture component.	Clear Expectations for Student Behavior and Social Emotional Learning can be solidified through ongoing professional development to parents, students, and faculty. The Physical Environment is of utmost importance and a solid, working relationship is being created and refined. Discipline related conversations should strive to reinforce SEL/CD goals under the category of Rules/Norms for students. A goal would be for all teachers to regularly differentiate instruction to all students. In the area of PIA, evaluation of the program/ practice should consistently be conducted to determine effectiveness, and this is an area that can be worked upon. The mission should be well communicated to all stakeholders in a regular manner in order to promote a culture of learning. Professional, collegial relationships are a worthy goal so as not to have meetings in parking lots that cause dissension. Shared Leadership is a goal because higher levels of student learning can be sustained over time since they are not dependent upon a single or small group of leaders. Data collection can be improved upon is student data is used to determine effectiveness. Measurable Goals are specific and can be used to analyze school climate data which can be attained systematically throughout the school year.
	2	A	2-Emerging		
	3	A	3-Developing		
	4	A	3-Developing		
	5	A	3-Developing		
	6	A	2-Emerging		
	7	A	3-Developing		
	8	A	2-Emerging		
	9	A	4-Sustaining		
	10	A	3-Developing		
	11	A	3-Developing		
	12	A	3-Developing		
	13	A	3-Developing		
	14	A	3-Developing		

Component	Indicator Descriptor Level		Overall Strengths Summary	Areas of Focus Summary
Teacher and Principal Effectiveness	1	A 2-Emerging	Gloucester Middle School (GMS) has developed an effective Teacher and Principal component.	Working more effectively in teams and using meaningful feedback are attainable goals that can be worked on during the school year using research based frameworks with proper professional development. During the prior Covid -19 environment, all of these strategies were difficult to implement but our staff and faculty struggled and preserved to the utmost of their abilities.



Priority Performance Needs and Root Cause Analysis

Area of Focus for SMART Goals	Priority Performance Need	Possible Root Causes (Based upon the CNA and data analysis, what factors are most likely to have contributed to this	Targeted Subgroup (s)	Strategies to Address Challenge (What does the root cause imply for next steps in improvement planning?)
-------------------------------	---------------------------	--	-----------------------	--



Area of Focus for SMART Goals	Priority Performance Need	Possible Root Causes (Based upon the CNA and data analysis, what factors are most likely to have contributed to this	Targeted Subgroup (s)	Strategies to Address Challenge (What does the root cause imply for next steps in improvement planning?)	
Effective Instruction	Some students continue to be challenged in reading comprehension, decoding, analyzing text and text dependent questioning as measured by state assessments, benchmarks and reading and writing data cluster analysis. ELA skills need to be strengthened, in particular with the circumstances surrounding COVID-19 and the learning gaps widening. Some Students enter the school homeless and need to be provided supplies and materials etc as determined by a needs assessment of homeless students.	<p>1. COVID-19 and the surrounding circumstances required students had to endure various transitions throughout the school year. They were forced to learn from numerous learning models (hybrid, in person and remote) and be prepared to switch from one to the other without notice. Education, as we once knew it, fundamentally changed with little notice. Students' learning was undoubtedly hindered.</p> <p>2. 69% of Gloucester City Middle School's students belong to the subgroup of economically disadvantaged students. The digital divide often affects economically disadvantaged students. They sometimes have less access to technology at home compared to other students. This factor combined with the circumstances surrounding COVID-19, as noted above, has widened the achievement gap.</p> <p>3. Not to mention, some students are classified as homeless.</p> <p>4. The student mobility rate for the district is 25%. When students move in and out of the district, it affects the continuity of instruction and can result in skills gaps.</p>	All Populations	1	Provide Remediation to address skill gaps. (i.e. Summer WIN (WHAT I NEED) Program, tutoring and small group.
				2	Acquire resources: (1) Technology to overcome the Digital Divide (2) Materials to use in class including on-line and consumables (Novels, Wilson, Benchmark Advance, StudySync, Classworks, Peardeck, Freckle, Studies Weekly, Albert, KAMI) (3) ELA Professional Development for staff including using the OnCourse program for aligning curriculum and lesson plans to the NJSLs.
				3	Provide ELA professional development for staff including using the On-Course program for aligning curriculum and lesson plans to the NJSLs. When possible, reduce the instructional staff-student ratio. Provide materials, supplies etc to homeless students as determined by needs assessment.



Area of Focus for SMART Goals	Priority Performance Need	Possible Root Causes (Based upon the CNA and data analysis, what factors are most likely to have contributed to this	Targeted Subgroup (s)	Strategies to Address Challenge (What does the root cause imply for next steps in improvement planning?)	
Effective Instruction	Some students exhibit a lack of proficiency in problem solving, number sense and have other gaps in necessary mathematical skills. This has been measured by state assessments, pre and post benchmarks, mid-term and final grades. Math skills need to be strengthened, in particular with the circumstances surrounding COVID-19 and the learning gaps widening especially in math related subjects such as Science and Technology. Some Students enter the school homeless and need to be provided supplies and materials etc as determined by a needs assessment of homeless students.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> COVID-19 and the surrounding circumstances required students had to endure various transitions throughout the school year. They were forced to learn from numerous learning models (hybrid, in person and remote) and be prepared to switch from one to the other without notice. Education, as we once knew it, fundamentally changed with little notice. Students' learning was undoubtedly hindered. 69% of Gloucester City Middle School's students belong to the subgroup of economically disadvantaged students. The digital divide often affects economically disadvantaged students. They sometimes have less access to technology at home compared to other students. This factor combined with the circumstances surrounding COVID-19, as noted above, has widened the achievement gap. Not to mention, some students are classified as homeless. The student mobility rate for the district is 25%. When students move in and out of the district, it affects the continuity of instruction and can result in skills gaps. 	All Populations	1	Provide Remediation to address skill gaps. (i.e. Summer WIN (WHAT I NEED) Program, tutoring and small group.
				2	<p>Begin to actively search for new Math programs and pilot various ones that can target our students' needs.</p> <p>Acquire resources: (1) 1-1 Technology Initiative to overcome the Digital Divide (2) Materials to use in class including on-line and consumables (My Math, Go Math, IXL, Classworks, Peardeck, LinkIt!, Albert, KAMI) (3) Mathematics professional development for staff including using the On-Course program for aligning curriculum and lesson plans to the NJSLS.</p>



Area of Focus for SMART Goals	Priority Performance Need	Possible Root Causes (Based upon the CNA and data analysis, what factors are most likely to have contributed to this	Targeted Subgroup (s)	Strategies to Address Challenge (What does the root cause imply for next steps in improvement planning?)
				<p>3 Provide mathematical professional development for staff including using the On-Course program for aligning curriculum and lesson plans to the NJSLs. When possible, reduce the instructional staff-student ratio. Provide materials, supplies etc to homeless students as determined by needs assessment.</p>



Area of Focus for SMART Goals	Priority Performance Need	Possible Root Causes (Based upon the CNA and data analysis, what factors are most likely to have contributed to this	Targeted Subgroup (s)	Strategies to Address Challenge (What does the root cause imply for next steps in improvement planning?)	
Effective Instruction	Student achievement across the curriculum is below grade level for some students due to skill gaps. This is evidenced by student data from previous years' SGOs, state assessments, pre and post benchmarks and teacher request for training. COVID-19 highlighted these gaps and made them evermore present. There is a need for professional development in differentiated instruction, increased student engagement and formative assessments. Some Students enter the school homeless and need to be provided supplies and materials etc as determined by a needs assessment of homeless students.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. COVID-19 and the surrounding circumstances required students had to endure various transitions throughout the school year. They were forced to learn from numerous learning models (hybrid, in person and remote) and be prepared to switch from one to the other without notice. Education, as we once knew it, fundamentally changed with little notice. Students' learning was undoubtedly hindered. 2. 69% of Gloucester City Middle School's students belong to the subgroup of economically disadvantaged students. The digital divide often affects economically disadvantaged students. They sometimes have less access to technology at home compared to other students. This factor combined with the circumstances surrounding COVID-19, as noted above, has widened the achievement gap. 3. Not to mention, some students are classified as homeless. 4. The student mobility rate for the district is 25%. When students move in and out of the district, it affects the continuity of instruction and can result in skills gaps. 	All Populations	1	Provide Remediation to address skill gaps. (i.e. Summer WIN (WHAT I NEED) Program, tutoring and small group.
				2	Acquire resources: (1) Technology to overcome the Digital Divide (2) Materials to use in class including on-line and consumables (Novels, Wilson, Benchmark Advance, StudySync, Classworks, Peardeck, Freckle, IXL, Studies Weekly, Albert, KAMI, AVID) (3) ELA Professional Development for staff including using the OnCourse program for aligning curriculum and lesson plans to the NJSLs.
				3	Provide professional development for staff including using the On-Course program for aligning curriculum and lesson plans to the NJSLs. When possible, reduce the instructional staff-student ratio. Provide materials, supplies etc to homeless students as determined by needs assessment.

Area of Focus for SMART Goals	Priority Performance Need	Possible Root Causes (Based upon the CNA and data analysis, what factors are most likely to have contributed to this	Targeted Subgroup (s)	Strategies to Address Challenge (What does the root cause imply for next steps in improvement planning?)	
Climate and Culture, including Social and Emotional Learning	Student learning and social emotional well being is imperative to creating a positive school environment. There must be a support system in the school building and home-school collaboration. Once again COVID-19 highlighted the need more than ever to provide resources for parents to assist in student achievement, as well as hone in on our students' social and emotional learning.	<p>1. COVID-19 and the surrounding circumstances required students had to endure various transitions throughout the school year. They were forced to learn from numerous learning models (hybrid, in person and remote) and be prepared to switch from one to the other without notice. Education, as we once knew it, fundamentally changed with little notice. Students' learning was undoubtedly hindered.</p> <p>2. 69% of Gloucester City Middle School's students belong to the subgroup of economically disadvantaged students. The digital divide often affects economically disadvantaged students. They sometimes have less access to technology at home compared to other students. This factor combined with the circumstances surrounding COVID-19, as noted above, has widened the achievement gap.</p> <p>3. Not to mention, some students are classified as homeless.</p> <p>4. The student mobility rate for the district is 25%. When students move in and out of the district, it affects the continuity of instruction and can result in skills gaps.</p>	All Populations	1	Develop a SEL curriculum and onboard a SEL program (7Mindsets)
				2	Parent involvement activities including workshops.
				3	Extra supports for students (homeless students, English Language Learners, students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students) will be provided as individual needs are known.

SMART Goal 1

By June 30, 2022, there will be a 3% increase in the number of students in grade 8 who demonstrate increased literacy skills as measured by Linkit Benchmarking and/or state assessment.

Priority Performance Some students continue to be challenged in reading comprehension, decoding, analyzing text and text dependent questioning as measured by state assessments, benchmarks and reading and writing data cluster analysis. ELA skills need to be strengthened, in particular with the circumstances surrounding COVID-19 and the learning gaps widening. Some Students enter the school homeless and need to be provided supplies and materials etc as determined by a needs assessment of homeless students.

Strategy 1: Provide Remediation to address skill gaps. (i.e. Summer WIN(WHAT I NEED) Program, tutoring and small group.

Strategy 2: Acquire resources: (1)
Technology to overcome the
Digital Divide (2) Materials to use
in class including on-line and consumables
(Novels, Wilson, Benchmark Advance, StudySync, Classworks, Peardeck, Freckle, Studies Weekly, Albert, KAMI) (3) ELA
Professional Development for staff including using the OnCourse program for aligning curriculum and lesson plans to the NJSL.

Strategy 3: Provide ELA professional development for staff including using the On-Course program for aligning curriculum and lesson plans to the NJSL. When possible, reduce the instructional staff-student ratio. Provide materials, supplies etc to homeless students as determined by needs assessment.

Target Population: All Populations

Interim Goals

SMART Goal 1

End of Cycle	Interim Goal	Source(s) of Evidence
Nov 15	By November 15, 2021, there will be a 1% increase in the number of students in grades 8 who demonstrate increased literacy skills as measured by Linkit Benchmarking and/or state assessment	Classworks, Wilson Reading, Linkit Benchmarking
Feb 15	By February 15, 2022, there will be a 2% increase in the number of students in grades 8 who demonstrate increased literacy skills as measured by Linkit Benchmarking and/or state assessment	Classworks, Wilson Reading, Linkit Benchmarking
Apr 15	By April 15, 2022, there will be a 2.5% increase in the number of students in grades 8 who demonstrate increased literacy skills as measured by Linkit Benchmarking and/or state assessment.	Classworks, Wilson Reading, Linkit Benchmarking
Jul 1	By June 30, 2022, there will be a 3% increase in the number of students in grade 8 who demonstrate increased literacy skills as measured by Linkit Benchmarking and/or state assessment.	Classworks, Wilson Reading, Linkit Benchmarking, State assessments, benchmarks and reading and writing data cluster analysis.

Action Steps

SMART Goal 1

Step Number	Strategy	Action Steps	Start Date	End Date	Assigned To
1	1	Provide remediation to address skill gaps: (1) Analyze data to identify targeted students. (2) Plan program and select resources (3) Hire Staff (4) Notify parents (5) Acquire program materials/resources	7/1/21	6/30/22	Assistant Superintendent and GMS Administration
2	2	Acquire Resources: (1) Contract with provider for 1-1 Technology initiative (Devices) (2) Acquire resources (3) Provide training and professional development.	7/1/21	6/30/22	Assistant Superintendent and GMS Administration

Step Number	Strategy	Action Steps	Start Date	End Date	Assigned To
3	2	Acquire Resources/Materials to use in class including on-line and consumables (Novels, Wilson, Journeys) as well as instructional licenses (Classworks, Kami, etc.)	7/1/21	6/30/22	Assistant Superintendent and GMS Administration
4	2	ELA Professional Development: (1) Plan professional development (2) Contract with providers and/or assign in-house presenters (3) Acquire subscription to On-Course program for aligning curriculum and lesson plans to the NJSL	7/1/21	6/30/22	Assistant Superintendent and GMS Administration
5	2	Assessment: (1) Plan assessments (2) Contract with online providers (3) Provide training (3) Benchmark three times/year using the provider format (4) Survey teachers regarding effectiveness.	7/1/21	6/30/22	Assistant Superintendent and GMS Administration
6	2	Acquire Non Instructional Supplies	7/1/21	6/30/22	Assistant Superintendent and GMS Administration
7	3	Provide supplies and materials etc to homeless students as determined by needs assessment	7/1/21	6/30/22	Assistant Superintendent and GMS Administration

Budget Items

SMART Goal 1

Corresponding Action Step	Resource / Description	Funding Category / Object Code	Funding Requested	Funding Source
1	Staff Stipends enrichment program/remediation/tutoring/small group instruction	INSTRUCTION - Personnel Services - Salaries / 100-100	\$8,333	Federal Title I (School Allocation)

Corresponding Action Step	Resource / Description	Funding Category / Object Code	Funding Requested	Funding Source
1	Acquire Resources: Instructional Licenses including classworks, Freckle, IXL-ixl, PearDeck, Kami, studysyn and other programs associated with texts	INSTRUCTION - Supplies & Materials / 100-600	\$5,684	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
1	Acquire resources: District Supplies, materials, chromebooks	INSTRUCTION - Supplies & Materials / 100-600	\$666	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
7	Acquire resources: Supplies and Materials for homeless students	INSTRUCTION - Supplies & Materials / 100-600	\$333	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
3	Acquire resources and materials to use in class including on-line and resources (reading program/Benchmark Advance/StudySync) supplies for new teachers	INSTRUCTION - Supplies & Materials / 100-600	\$2,500	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
5	Instructional Supplies and Material for programs such as Albert, Novels, Inspire Science, Studies Weekly, student consumables, AVID materials, misc.	INSTRUCTION - Supplies & Materials / 100-600	\$53,873	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
1	Staff Stipends for Summer Training/ program for reading/AVID Secretarial	SUPPORT SERVICES - Personnel Services - Salaries / 200-100	\$2,221	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
1	Benefits ELA for Professional Development Wilson and secretarial	SUPPORT SERVICES - Personnel Services - Employee Benefits / 200-200	\$170	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
1	Benefits for Staff Stipends	SUPPORT SERVICES - Personnel Services - Employee Benefits / 200-200	\$639	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
4	ELA Professional Development: Contracted Services: Wilson, Educational Consultants, ELA Professional Development, other professional development related to Title I, Workshops etc	SUPPORT SERVICES - Purchased Professional & Technical Services / 200-300	\$1,777	Federal Title I (School Allocation)

Corresponding Action Step	Resource / Description	Funding Category / Object Code	Funding Requested	Funding Source
2	ELA staff stipends for Professional Development Training (Wilson)	SUPPORT SERVICES - Purchased Professional & Technical Services / 200-300	\$3,431	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
2	Conferences/Workshops/Misc/Travel	SUPPORT SERVICES - Other Purchased Services / 200-500	\$1,855	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
6	Non instructional supplies and materials, tablets for teachers, misc	SUPPORT SERVICES - Supplies & Materials / 200-600	\$555	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
6	Other Objects, Dues	SUPPORT SERVICES - Other Objects / 200-800	\$16	Federal Title I (School Allocation)

SMART Goal 2

By June 30, 2022, there will be a 3% increase in the number of student in grade 6 who demonstrate an understanding of number sense and problem solving as measured by state assessments and LinkIt benchmarks.

Priority Performance Some students exhibit a lack of proficiency in problem solving, number sense and have other gaps in necessary mathematical skills. This has been measured by state assessments, pre and post benchmarks, mid-term and final grades. Math skills need to be strengthened, in particular with the circumstances surrounding COVID-19 and the learning gaps widening especially in math related subjects such as Science and Technology. Some Students enter the school homeless and need to be provided supplies and materials etc as determined by a needs assessment of homeless students.

Strategy 1: Provide Remediation to address skill gaps. (i.e. Summer WIN(WHAT I NEED) Program, tutoring and small group.

Strategy 2: Begin to actively search for new Math programs and pilot various ones that can target our students' needs.

Acquire resources: (1) 1-1 Technology Initiative to overcome the Digital Divide (2) Materials to use in class including on-line and consumables (My Math, Go Math, IXL, Classworks, Peardeck, LinkIt!, Albert, KAMI) (3) Mathematics professional development for staff including using the On-Course program for aligning curriculum and lesson plans to the NJSLs.

Strategy 3: Provide mathematical professional development for staff including using the On-Course program for aligning curriculum and lesson plans to the NJSLs. When possible, reduce the instructional staff-student ratio. Provide materials, supplies etc to homeless students as determined by needs assessment.

Target Population: All Populations

Interim Goals

SMART Goal 2

End of Cycle	Interim Goal	Source(s) of Evidence
Nov 15	By June 30, 2021, there will be a 1% increase in the number of student in grade 6 who demonstrate an understanding of number sense and problem solving as measured by state assessments and LinkIt benchmarks.	Linkit Benchmarking and Classworks

End of Cycle	Interim Goal	Source(s) of Evidence
Feb 15	By February 15, 2022, there will be a 2% increase in the number of student in grade 6 who demonstrate an understanding of number sense and problem solving as measured by state assessments and LinkIt benchmarks	Linkit Benchmarking and Classworks
Apr 15	By April 15, 2022, there will be a 2.5% increase in the number of student in grade 6 who demonstrate an understanding of number sense and problem solving as measured by state assessments and LinkIt benchmarks.	Linkit Benchmarking and Classworks
Jul 1	By June 30, 2022, there will be a 3% increase in the number of student in grade 6 who demonstrate an understanding of number sense and problem solving as measured by state assessments and LinkIt benchmarks.	Linkit Benchmarking, Classworks and State Assessment

Action Steps

SMART Goal 2

Step Numbe	Strategy	Action Steps	Start Date	End Date	Assigned To
1	1	Provide remediation to address skill gaps: (1) Analyze data to identify targeted students. (2) Plan program and select resources (3) Hire Staff (4) Notify parents (5) Acquire program materials/resources	7/1/21	6/30/22	Assistant Superintendent and GMS Administration
2	2	Acquire Resources: (1) Contract with provider for 1-1 Technology initiative: Devices (2) Acquire resources (3) Provide training and professional development	7/1/21	6/30/22	Assistant Superintendent and GMS Administration
3	2	Acquire resources/materials to use in class including on-line and consumables (My Math, Go Math) as well as instructional licenses (IXL, Classworks, Kami etc.)	7/1/21	6/30/22	Assistant Superintendent and GMS Administration

Step Numbe	Strategy	Action Steps	Start Date	End Date	Assigned To
4	3	Some GMS teachers will attend STEM Professional training.	7/1/21	6/30/22	Assistant Superintendent and GMS Administration
5	2	Assessment: (1) Plan assessment (2) Contract with online providers (3) Provide training (3) Benchmark three times/year using the provider format (4) Survey teachers regarding effectiveness	7/1/21	6/30/22	Assistant Superintendent and GMS Administration
6	3	Math Professional Development: 1) Plan professional development (2) Contract with providers and/or assign inhouse presenters (3) Acquire subscription to On-Course program for aligning curriculum and lesson plans to the NJSLS	7/1/21	6/30/22	Assistant Superintendent and GMS Administration
7	2	Acquire non-instructional Supplies	7/1/21	6/30/22	Assistant Superintendent and GMS Administration

Budget Items

SMART Goal 2

Corresponding Action Step	Resource / Description	Funding Category / Object Code	Funding Requested	Funding Source
1	Staff Stipends Enrichment/Remediation/Tutoring	INSTRUCTION - Personnel Services - Salaries / 100-100	\$8,333	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
2	Acquire Resources: Instructional licenses (IXI, Classworks, Peardeck)	INSTRUCTION - Supplies & Materials / 100-600	\$5,684	Federal Title I (School Allocation)

Corresponding Action Step	Resource / Description	Funding Category / Object Code	Funding Requested	Funding Source
2	Acquires resources: District supplies and materials	INSTRUCTION - Supplies & Materials / 100-600	\$666	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
2	Aquire online resources and student supplies for STEAM programs and electives, and science and social studies, Freckle	INSTRUCTION - Supplies & Materials / 100-600	\$17,339	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
5	Supplies and materials through District for reading programs and new teachers, misc	INSTRUCTION - Supplies & Materials / 100-600	\$2,500	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
3	Acquire materials and supplies for new math program, Albert, Novels, Misc, Inspire Science, Studies Weekly, student consumables	INSTRUCTION - Supplies & Materials / 100-600	\$53,873	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
3	Acquire supplies and resources for special population-Homeless	INSTRUCTION - Supplies & Materials / 100-600	\$333	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
3	Stipends for Secretary, STEAM courses/summer training/reading program	SUPPORT SERVICES - Personnel Services - Salaries / 200-100	\$2,221	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
1	Benefits for line 100-100 stipends	SUPPORT SERVICES - Personnel Services - Employee Benefits / 200-200	\$170	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
1	Benefits for line 200-100 Stipends	SUPPORT SERVICES - Personnel Services - Employee Benefits / 200-200	\$637	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
6	Math Professional Development: Contracted Services, other professional development related to Title I	SUPPORT SERVICES - Purchased Professional & Technical Services / 200-300	\$1,777	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
4	Math/STEM Professional Development: Purchased Services Workshops	SUPPORT SERVICES - Other Purchased Services / 200-500	\$1,855	Federal Title I (School Allocation)

Corresponding Action Step	Resource / Description	Funding Category / Object Code	Funding Requested	Funding Source
7	Acquire non-instructional Supplies and materials	SUPPORT SERVICES - Supplies & Materials / 200-600	\$555	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
3	Other Objects: Dues	SUPPORT SERVICES - Other Objects / 200-800	\$16	Federal Title I (School Allocation)

SMART Goal 3

By June 30, 2022, at least 50% of the students in grades 8 will be able to apply their knowledge of their personal interest, strengths, and competencies to address skill gaps using individualized learning plans and technology tools. Progress will be measured by performance on in-house assessments and LinkIt benchmarks.

Priority Performance

Student achievement across the curriculum is below grade level for some students due to skill gaps. This is evidenced by student data from previous years' SGOs, state assessments, pre and post benchmarks and teacher request for training. COVID-19 highlighted these gaps and made them evermore present. There is a need for professional development in differentiated instruction, increased student engagement and formative assessments. Some Students enter the school homeless and need to be provided supplies and materials etc as determined by a needs assessment of homeless students.

Strategy 1: Provide Remediation to address skill gaps. (i.e. Summer WIN(WHAT I NEED) Program, tutoring and small group.

Strategy 2: Acquire resources: (1) Technology to overcome the Digital Divide (2) Materials to use in class including on-line and consumables (Novels, Wilson, Benchmark Advance, StudySync, Classworks, Peardeck, Freckle, IXL, Studies Weekly, Albert, KAMI, AVID) (3) ELA Professional Development for staff including using the OnCourse program for aligning curriculum and lesson plans to the NJSLS.

Strategy 3: Provide professional development for staff including using the On-Course program for aligning curriculum and lesson plans to the NJSLS. When possible, reduce the instructional staff-student ratio. Provide materials, supplies etc to homeless students as determined by needs assessment.

Target Population: All Populations

Interim Goals

SMART Goal 3

End of Cycle	Interim Goal	Source(s) of Evidence
Nov 15	By November 15, 2021, at least 20% of the students in grades 8 will be able to apply their knowledge of their personal interest, strengths, and competencies to address skill gaps using individualized learning plans and technology tools. Progress will be measured by performance on in-house assessments and LinkIt benchmarks.	LinkIt Benchmarking, Classworks and In-House Assessments
Feb 15	By February 15, 2022, at least 30% of the students in grades 8 will be able to apply their knowledge of their personal interest, strengths, and competencies to address skill gaps using individualized learning plans and technology tools. Progress will be measured by performance on in-house assessments and LinkIt benchmarks.	LinkIt Benchmarking, Classworks and In-House Assessments
Apr 15	By April 15, 2022 at least 40% of students in grades 8 will be able to apply their knowledge of their personal interest, strengths, and competencies to address skill gaps using individualized learning plans and technology tools. Progress will be measured by performance on in-house assessments and LinkIt benchmarks.	LinkIt Benchmarking, Classworks and In-House Assessments
Jul 1	By June 30, 2022, at least 50% of the students in grades 8 will be able to apply their knowledge of their personal interest, strengths, and competencies to address skill gaps using individualized learning plans and technology tools. Progress will be measured by performance on in-house assessments and LinkIt benchmarks.	LinkIt Benchmarking, Classworks and In-House Assessments

Action Steps

SMART Goal 3

Step Number	Strategy	Action Steps	Start Date	End Date	Assigned To



Step Numbe	Strategy	Action Steps	Start Date	End Date	Assigned To
1	1	Provide Remediation to address skill gaps: (1) Analyze data to identify targeted students. (2) Plan program and select resources (3) Hire Staff (4) Notify parents (5) Acquire program materials/resources	7/1/21	6/30/22	Assistant Superintendent and GMS Administration
2	2	Acquire Resources: (1) Contract with provider for 1-1 Technology initiative: Devices (2) Acquire resources (3) Provide training and professional development.	7/1/21	6/30/22	Assistant Superintendent and GMS Administration
3	2	Acquire Resources/Materials to use in class including "Inspire Science", on-line (instructional licenses) and consumables	7/1/21	6/30/22	Assistant Superintendent and GMS Administration
4	2	Professional Development: (1) Plan professional development (2) Contract with providers and/or assign inhouse presenters (3) Acquire subscription to On-Course program for aligning curriculum and lesson plans to the NJSLs (4) Some GMS teachers will attend STEM Professional training.	7/1/21	6/30/22	Assistant Superintendent and GMS Administration
5	2	Implement new STEAM Elective (Apex)	7/1/21	6/30/22	Assistant Superintendent and GMS Administration
6	3	Acquire needed non-instructional supplies	7/1/21	6/30/22	Assistant Superintendent and GMS Administration
7	3	Acquire resources for special populations- homeless	7/1/21	6/30/22	Assistant Superintendent and GMS Administration

Budget Items

SMART Goal 3

Corresponding Action Step	Resource / Description	Funding Category / Object Code	Funding Requested	Funding Source
1	Staff stipends including enrichment/remediation	INSTRUCTION - Personnel Services - Salaries / 100-100	\$8,334	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
2	Acquire District resources: instructional licenses: IXL, Adobe, Kami, Peardeck, classworks, Albert and other programs associated with texts, misc.	INSTRUCTION - Supplies & Materials / 100-600	\$5,684	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
3	Acquire resources and materials to use in class including online and consumables including "Inspire Science" and others, new math program, misc student consumables and supplies, novels, Studies Weekly	INSTRUCTION - Supplies & Materials / 100-600	\$53,873	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
5	Implement STEAM Elective such as APEX or similar STEM/tech programs or other STEAM elective, Freckle Science, Social Studies	INSTRUCTION - Supplies & Materials / 100-600	\$17,339	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
2	Acquire other district supplies such as chromebooks, supplies etc	INSTRUCTION - Supplies & Materials / 100-600	\$668	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
3	Acquire supplies and materials from District such as reading programs and supplies for new teachers, misc. items as needed	INSTRUCTION - Supplies & Materials / 100-600	\$2,500	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
7	Acquire instructional supplies for special population: homeless students	INSTRUCTION - Supplies & Materials / 100-600	\$333	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
1	Benefits for line 100-100	SUPPORT SERVICES - Personnel Services - Salaries / 200-100	\$637	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
1	Benefits for line 200-100	SUPPORT SERVICES - Personnel Services - Employee Benefits / 200-200	\$170	Federal Title I (School Allocation)

Corresponding Action Step	Resource / Description	Funding Category / Object Code	Funding Requested	Funding Source
4	Professional Development: Contract with providers ,misc. PD and other PD related to Title I, Educational consultants	SUPPORT SERVICES - Purchased Professional & Technical Services / 200-300	\$1,778	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
4	Professional Development Stipends for Summer Training and Secretarial	SUPPORT SERVICES - Purchased Professional & Technical Services / 200-300	\$2,224	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
2	Reading professional training	SUPPORT SERVICES - Purchased Professional & Technical Services / 200-300	\$3,431	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
4	Conferences/workshops/mis/travel	SUPPORT SERVICES - Other Purchased Services / 200-500	\$1,856	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
6	Non instructional Supplies and Materials	SUPPORT SERVICES - Supplies & Materials / 200-600	\$556	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
6	Other objects-Dues	SUPPORT SERVICES - Other Objects / 200-800	\$18	Federal Title I (School Allocation)

SMART Goal 4

By June 30, 2022, there will be an increase of 5% in parental involvement and participation in academic events relating to their students as measured by sign in sheets and attendance records.

Priority Performance Student learning and social emotional well being is imperative to creating a positive school environment. There must be a support system in the school building and home-school collaboration. Once again COVID-19 highlighted the need more than ever to provide resources for parents to assist in student achievement, as well as hone in on our students' social and emotional learning.

Strategy 1: Develop a SEL curriculum and onboard a SEL program (7Mindsets)

Strategy 2: Parent involvement activities including workshops.

Strategy 3: Extra supports for students (homeless students, English Language Learners, students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students) will be provided as individual needs are known.

Target Population: All Populations

Interim Goals

SMART Goal 4

End of Cycle	Interim Goal	Source(s) of Evidence
Nov 15	By November 15, 2021 there will be an increase of 2% in parental involvement and participation in academic events relating to their students as measured by sign in sheets and attendance records.	Sign in sheets and attendance records
Feb 15	By February 15, 2022 there will be an increase of 3% in parental involvement and participation in academic events relating to their students as measured by sign in sheets and attendance records.	Sign in sheets and attendance records
Apr 15	By April 15, 2022 there will be an increase of 4% in parental involvement and participation in academic events relating to their students as measured by sign in sheets and attendance records.	Sign in sheets and attendance records

End of Cycle	Interim Goal	Source(s) of Evidence
Jul 1	By June 30, 2022, there will be an increase of 5% in parental involvement and participation in academic events relating to their students as measured by sign in sheets and attendance records.	Sign in sheets and attendance records

Action Steps

SMART Goal 4

Step Number	Strategy	Action Steps	Start Date	End Date	Assigned To
1	2	(1) Contract with School Messenger (2) Use School messenger to communicate with parents (2) Use of the Parent Portal (Power School -local funded) (3) Use of Social Media to communicate: Website, Twitter, Facebook, etc.	7/1/21	6/30/22	Assistant Superintendent and GMS Administration
2	1	(1) Plan parent meetings (2) Hire in-house staff or contract with outside speakers (3) Acquire resources, materials and supplies (4) Notify parents	7/1/21	6/30/22	GMS Administration
3	3	(1) Assess the needs of special student populations including homeless students, English Language Learners, students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students (2) Provide extra supports as needed	7/1/21	6/30/22	Assistant Superintendent and GMS Administration

Budget Items

SMART Goal 4

Corresponding Action Step	Resource / Description	Funding Category / Object Code	Funding Requested	Funding Source
3	Supplies and materials for special student populations	INSTRUCTION - Supplies & Materials / 100-600	\$334	Federal Title I (School Allocation)

Corresponding Action Step	Resource / Description	Funding Category / Object Code	Funding Requested	Funding Source
2	In house parent presenters	SUPPORT SERVICES - Personnel Services - Salaries / 200-100	\$300	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
2	Benefits for In-house parent presenters (Stipend X .0765)	SUPPORT SERVICES - Personnel Services - Employee Benefits / 200-200	\$23	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
1	Contract with Parent/School Messenger	SUPPORT SERVICES - Other Purchased Services / 200-500	\$155	Federal Title I (School Allocation)
1	Supplies/materials Supplies/materials for parent involvement activities	SUPPORT SERVICES - Supplies & Materials / 200-600	\$2,111	Federal Title I (School Allocation)

Budget Summary

Budget Category	Sub Category	Function & Object Code	State/Local Budget for School	Federal Title I (Priority / Focus Interventions Reserve)	Federal Title I (School Allocation)	Federal Title I (Reallocated Funds)	Federal CARES - ESSER Funds	Other Federal Funds Allocated to School	SIA (If Applicable) Allocated to School	SIA Carryover	TOTAL
INSTRUCTION	Personnel Services - Salaries	100-100	\$0	\$0	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,000
INSTRUCTION	Purchased Professional & Technical Services	100-300	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
INSTRUCTION	Other Purchased Services	100-500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
INSTRUCTION	Supplies & Materials	100-600	\$0	\$0	\$224,182	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$224,182
INSTRUCTION	Other Objects	100-800	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
INSTRUCTION	Sub-total		\$0	\$0	\$249,182	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$249,182
SUPPORT SERVICES	Personnel Services - Salaries	200-100	\$0	\$0	\$5,379	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,379
SUPPORT SERVICES	Personnel Services - Employee Benefits	200-200	\$0	\$0	\$1,809	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,809
SUPPORT SERVICES	Purchased Professional & Technical Services	200-300	\$0	\$0	\$14,418	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$14,418
SUPPORT SERVICES	Purchased Property Services	200-400	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Budget Category	Sub Category	Function & Object Code	State/Local Budget for School	Federal Title I (Priority / Focus Interventions Reserve)	Federal Title I (School Allocation)	Federal Title I (Reallocated Funds)	Federal CARES - ESSER Funds	Other Federal Funds Allocated to School	SIA (If Applicable) Allocated to School	SIA Carryover	TOTAL
SUPPORT SERVICES	Other Purchased Services	200-500	\$0	\$0	\$5,721	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,721
SUPPORT SERVICES	Travel	200-580	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SUPPORT SERVICES	Supplies & Materials	200-600	\$0	\$0	\$3,777	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,777
SUPPORT SERVICES	Other Objects	200-800	\$0	\$0	\$50	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$50
SUPPORT SERVICES	Indirect Costs	200-860	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SUPPORT SERVICES	Sub-total		\$0	\$0	\$31,154	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$31,154
FACILITIES	Buildings	400-720	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FACILITIES	Instructional Equipment	400-731	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FACILITIES	Noninstructional Equipment	400-732	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
FACILITIES	Sub-total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SCHOOLWIDE	Schoolwide Blended	520-930	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SCHOOLWIDE	Sub-total		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Budget Category	Sub Category	Function & Object Code	State/Local Budget for School	Federal Title I (Priority / Focus Interventions Reserve)	Federal Title I (School Allocation)	Federal Title I (Reallocated Funds)	Federal CARES - ESSER Funds	Other Federal Funds Allocated to School	SIA (If Applicable) Allocated to School	SIA Carryover	TOTAL
Total Cost			\$0	\$0	\$280,336	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$280,336



Overview of Total Title 1 Expenditures

	Federal Title 1 (Priority/Focus Interventions)	Federal Title 1 (School Allocation) Total	Federal Title 1 (Reallocated Funds)	TOTAL
Included in SMART Goal Pages	\$0	\$280,336	\$0	\$280,336
Other Title 1 Expenditures	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$0	\$280,336	\$0	\$280,336

School Level Certification Page

x	The results of the Comprehensive Needs Assessment are included in the designated tabs. For designated Targeted Support and all Comprehensive Support schools, the Comprehensive Data Analysis and Needs Assessment process must be completed in collaboration, and with the concurrence of your Comprehensive Support Network (CSN) Team.
x	The Annual School Plan requires a minimum of three SMART goals with an option to create a fourth. At least one of these goals must be developed with an area of focus "Effective Instruction." Goals must address the areas of priority performance needs identified during Comprehensive Needs Assessment process. Check all the SMART Goal areas included in your ASP.
x	Effective Instruction
x	Effective Instruction
x	Effective Instruction
x	Climate and Culture, including Social and Emotional Learning
	For Comprehensive Support and Targeted Support schools, the Annual School Plan includes evidence-based interventions to improve academic achievement for all students who are not yet performing on grade level, and all SIA funds will be used for evidence-based interventions that meet the requirements set forth in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).
x	The Budget Summary includes all planned expenditures, as identified within the 'Budget Items' section of the SMART goal pages.
x	This plan has been submitted for final review and approval by the District Business Administrator, Federal Programs Administrator, Chief School Administrator, and any other district personnel with responsibility for expenditures of federal funds to ensure all purchases and uses of funds (SIA, other Title I, other federal, and state/local) are reviewed and approved.

Completed By: Susan Ekimoglou

Title: Instructional Supervisor, ASP District reviewer

Date: 07/13/2021

District Business Administrator or District Federal Programs Administrator Certification

< NO DATA >

ASP District CSA Certification and Approval Page

< NO DATA >