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Public Comment
Starting with 2011 administration, the New Jersey End of Course Biology Exam has been renamed to the New Jersey Biology Competency Test. The NJBCT is administered to all high school students taking Biology for the first time.

NJASK 3-8
The NJASK assessment is administered in Language Arts and Mathematics for students in Grades 3-8.

HSPA
- First-time eleventh-grade students (11) - March Only
- Retained eleventh-grade students (R11)
- Twelfth-grade students (12)
- Retained twelfth-grade students (R12)
- Returning students (RS)
- Adult high school students (AH) who have not yet passed all sections of the HSPA

New Jersey Biology Competency Test (NJBCT)
The Alternative High School Assessment (AHSA) measures high school competency in selected areas of the Core Curriculum Content Standards. It is intended to offer an alternative means of meeting the state graduation proficiency test requirement. The AHSA is available to students who have met all high school graduation requirements except for demonstrating proficiency in selected areas of the Core Curriculum Content Standards (NJSA 18A:7c-3 & NJAC 5A:8-4.1).
# Common Core Standards

## Key Advances

### MATHEMATICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus, coherence and clarity: emphasis on key topics at each grade level and coherent progression across grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedural fluency and understanding of concepts and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote rigor through mathematical proficiencies that foster reasoning and understanding across discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school standards organized by conceptual categories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS / LITERACY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balance of literature and informational texts; focus on text complexity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on argument, informative/explanatory writing, and research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking and listening skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy standards for history, science and technical subjects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ANCHORED IN COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS**
On September 23, 2011, the US Department of Education invited states to apply for flexibility from the requirements for the NCLB Act of 2001. States would be granted flexibility in exchange for rigorous and comprehensive state-developed plans designed to improve educational outcomes for all students, close achievement gaps, increase equity, and improve the quality of instruction.

Deadline for Comments – November 9, 2011

Deadline for Applications – November 14, 2011

New Jersey, along with 31 other states, D.C. and Puerto Rico have applied.
Elementary / Secondary Education Act (ESEA) flexibility focuses on supporting State and local reform efforts underway in three critical areas:

- Transitioning to college- and career-ready standards and assessments
- Developing systems of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support
- Evaluating teacher and principal effectiveness and supporting improvement
Flexibility Regarding the 2013–2014 Timeline for Achieving 100 Percent Proficiency

• State will no longer have to set targets that require all students to be proficient by 2014
• Instead, State will have flexibility to establish ambitious but achievable goals in reading/language arts and mathematics to support improvement efforts for all schools and all students.

Flexibility Regarding District and School Improvement and Accountability Requirements

• States, districts, and schools will receive relief from a system that over-identifies schools as “failing” and prescribes a “one size fits all” approach to interventions.
• Instead, States will have the flexibility to design a system that targets efforts to the schools and districts that are the lowest-performing and to schools that have the largest achievement gaps, tailoring interventions to the unique needs of those schools and districts and their students.
• States will also have flexibility to recognize and reward both schools that are the highest-achieving and those whose students are making the most progress.

Flexibility Related to the Use of Federal Education Funds

• States, districts, and schools will gain increased flexibility to use several funding streams in ways they determine best meets their needs, and rural districts will have additional flexibility in using their funds.
• Funds to meet the needs of particular populations of disadvantaged students will be protected.
In developing a new accountability system, the Department will create three tiers of schools, which will be identified using both growth and absolute proficiency:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Schools</th>
<th>Focus Schools</th>
<th>Reward Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lowest-performing five percent of Title I schools across the state identified using proficiency, growth, and graduation rates.</td>
<td>• At least 10 percent of Title I schools identified as Focus Schools</td>
<td>• Identified based on high proficiency levels or high levels of growth, including progress toward closing achievement gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Schools not categorized as Priority Schools and will be identified based upon achievement gaps between subgroups and low performance or graduation rates among particular subgroups.</td>
<td>• Allows for a range of schools from across the state to attain Reward status, regardless of their absolute starting point.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NJDOE Waiver Application Key Points, cont.

For a State’s lowest–performing schools — Priority schools, generally, those in the bottom 5 percent — a district will implement rigorous interventions to turn the schools around. In an additional 10 percent of the State’s schools — Focus Schools, identified due to low graduation rates, large achievement gaps, or low student subgroup performance — the district will target strategies designed to focus on students with the greatest needs.

Evaluating and Supporting Teacher and Principal Effectiveness

- Each State that receives the ESEA flexibility will set basic guidelines for teacher and principal evaluation and support systems. The State and its districts will develop these systems with input from teachers and principals and will assess their performance based on multiple valid measures, including student progress over time and multiple measures of professional practice, and will use these systems to provide clear feedback to teachers on how to improve instruction.
2011 New Jersey State Assessment Results
Franklin Township Public Schools

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

Schools in Need of Improvement (SINI)
Meeting AYP Benchmarks

AYP Benchmark

Meet Benchmark OR

Make Safe Harbor (Decrease previous year’s partial proficient rate by 10%)

AYP Indicators

40 Indicators
Language Arts Literacy & Mathematics

- Participation
- Ethnicity
- Special Education
- Limited English Proficient
- Economically Disadvantaged

Notes:
- Ethnicity: White, African-American, Hispanic, Native American, Hawaiian-Asian
- Must have 30 students in a group to be counted in AYP calculations
### New Jersey (AYP) Adequate Yearly Progress Benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Arts</strong></td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Math</strong></td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ↑20%
- ↑14%
- ↑7%
- ↑17%
- ↑19%
- ↑12%
2011 HSPA Results
Franklin High School

Language Arts Literacy

First Time 11th Graders
Franklin High School – Made AYP
2011 HSPA, First-time 11th Graders
LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

Total Percent Proficient by Demographic

- Total: 86.6%
- General Education: 95.5%
- Students w/Disabilities: 49.2%
- Economically Disadvantaged: 78.0%

AYP Benchmark
Safe Harbor
Franklin High School – Made AYP
2011 HSPA, First-time 11th Graders
LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

2010 → 2011 HSPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2010 → 2011 Percentage Increase / Decrease

- Increase:
  - Advanced Proficient: ↑10.6%
  - Total: ↑10.6%

- Decrease:
  - Partial Proficient: ↓3.6%
  - Sp Ed: ↓6.1%
  - LEP: ↓14.8%
Franklin High School – Made AYP
2011 HSPA, First-time 11th Graders
LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

Total Percent Proficient by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>AYP Benchmark</th>
<th>Safe Harbor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afr. Amer.</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increase Advanced Proficient
- White ↑11.1%
- Afr. Amer. ↑66.1%
- Asian ↑15.9%

Decrease Partial Proficient
- Afr. Amer. ↓39.2%

2010 → 2011 Percentage Increase / Decrease
Franklin High School
Current Senior Cohort (341 Students)
8th to 11th Grade Performance by Proficiency Level

Language Arts Literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partially Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gr. 8, GEPA (2008)</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr. 11, HSPA (2011)</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Franklin High School

**Current Senior Cohort (341 Students)**

**8th to 11th Grade Performance by Proficiency Level**

**LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 8</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2011 HSPA - Grade 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 11</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Franklin High School  
**Current Senior Cohort (341 Students)**  
*8th to 11th Grade Performance by Proficiency Level*

**LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Students (341)</th>
<th>Number of Students Gained/Lost (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Proficient and Gained</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>245 (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Below Proficient and Gained</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Below Proficient and Decreased</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>89 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Proficient and Decreased</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Stayed the Same</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Franklin High School
Language Arts Literacy

Programmatic Initiatives

Curricular & Instructional Initiatives

Carolyn Armstrong, Supervisor of Secondary Language Arts Literacy
Franklin High School
Programmatic & Curricular Initiatives
LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

**Programs**
- Survey of Literature, World literature, American Literature, British literature
- Advanced Placement and Concurrent Enrollment Classes
- 13 Literacy-Based Elective Courses
- Research paper in each grade level
- Writing embedded in each unit of study
- Word of the Week Program
- Summer Reading Program

**Measurement**
- Department created common assessments, mid-terms and finals
- Writing assessments in each unit both process and on-demand
- Writing Folder Assessments
- Reading and Writing Notebooks
- Common scoring of student writing
Franklin High School
Programmatic & Curricular Initiatives

LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

Program Implementation

- Curriculum design and mapping in alignment with the Common Core State Standards
  - Thematic units in each grade level
  - Development of both formative and summative assessments within each unit of study
- Vertical articulation of curriculum (9-12) insuring increasing rigor and sequence.
- Extensive professional development for teachers to help them understand and apply the new standards.
- District writing samples
- Common planning time by grade level in which teachers:
  - Work on developing their common units of study
  - Share best practices, lessons and units
  - Examine student work and plan instructional next steps
- Increase in the use of non-fiction text and expository and argumentative writing.
- Academic support (lab classes) pacing guides and common assessments to benchmark progress.
  - Addition of an educational proficiency plan for each student receiving academic support
- Literacy coach’s work with content area teachers to facilitate reading and writing in the content areas.
Franklin High School
Programmatic & Curricular Initiatives
LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

What’s Working & Next Steps

• A diagnostic reading assessment given to grade 9 academic support and special education students (228) to identify areas for targeted instruction. The two areas in which the students most struggled in reading non-fiction texts:
  • Supporting details (77%)
  • Inference- drawing conclusions (83%)
• Professional development will be given in December to the teachers of special education students (in all contents) and to the grade 9 academic support teachers. The literacy coach will provide the teachers with strategies and materials for focused instruction in the two areas. Teachers will then provide 6 weeks of targeted instruction in these areas.
• A benchmark assessment will be given in mid-February to measure student progress.
2011 HSPA Results
Franklin High School

Mathematics

First Time 11th Graders
Franklin High School – Made AYP
2011 HSPA, First-time 11th Graders
MATHEMATICS

Total Percent Proficient by Demographic

- Total: 68.5%
- General Education: 79.1%
- Students w/Disabilities: 20.0%
- Economically Disadvantaged: 61.6%

Total Percent Proficient by Demographic

AYP Benchmark
Safe Harbor
Franklin High School – Made AYP

2011 HSPA, First-time 11th Graders

MATHEMATICS

2010 → 2011 HSPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2010 → 2011 Percent Increase / Decrease

Increase
Advanced Proficient
- Total ↑23.5%
- SpEd ↑150%
- ED ↑15.38%

Decrease
Partial Proficient
- Total ↓7.6%
- Sp Ed ↓2.4%
- LEP ↓14.1%
- ED ↓23.4%
Franklin High School – Made AYP
2011 HSPA, First-time 11th Graders
MATHEMATICS

2010 → 2011
Percentage Increase / Decrease

**Total Percent Proficient by Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>AYP Benchmark %</th>
<th>Safe Harbor %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afr. Amer.</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Increase Advanced Proficient**
- White: 35.9%
- Afr. Amer.: 69.6%
- Asian: 8.5%
- Latino: 24%

**Decrease Partial Proficient**
- White: 37.5%
- Afr. Amer.: 8.9%
- Asian: 17.3%
Franklin High School

Current Senior Cohort (343 Students)

8th to 11th Grade Performance by Proficiency Level

Mathematics

Gr. 8, GEPA (2008)   Gr. 11, HSPA (2011)

Partially Proficient

- Partially Proficient: 104
- Proficient: 161
- Advanced Proficient: 78

Proficient

- Partially Proficient: 92
- Proficient: 187
- Advanced Proficient: 64

Advanced Proficient
Franklin High School
Current Senior Cohort (343 Students)
8th to 11th Grade Performance by Proficiency Level
MATHEMATICS

2011 HSPA - Grade 11

Grade 8
Advanced
78

Grade 8
Proficient
161

Grade 8
Partial
104

Advanced (56)  Proficient (22)  Partial (0)
Advanced (8)   Proficient (137)  Partial (16)
Advanced (0)   Proficient (28)  Partial (76)

Grade 11
Advanced
64

Grade 11
Proficient
187

Grade 11
Partial
92
### Franklin High School

**Current Senior Cohort (343 Students)**

**8th to 11th Grade Performance by Proficiency Level**

**MATHEMATICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Students (343)</th>
<th>Number of Students Gained/Lost (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Proficient and Gained</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>189 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Below Proficient and Gained</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Below Proficient and Decreased</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>146 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Proficient and Decreased</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Stayed the Same</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Areas of Strength
• Pacing and stamina during assessments
• Geometry

Areas of Continued Focus
• Problem Solving
• Transfer and Application of Skills
• Number and Numerical Operations
• Expansion of Analysis of Common Assessment Results
District, K-12
Programmatic & Curricular Initiatives
MATHEMATICS

Program

- Curriculum Alignment
- Standards-based Instruction
- Student Learning
- Collection and use of Assessment
- Lesson Design: Increased emphasis on student writing, problem solving and use of vocabulary
- Learning Environment
- Instructional Strategies and Grouping
- The Workshop Model of Instruction
- Professional Learning

Measurement

- Common Marking Period Assessments
- Formative Assessments
- Walkthroughs
- Teacher Observations
- Student Work Samples
Franklin High School
Programmatic & Curricular Initiatives
MATHEMATICS

Math Workshop Model

Math Workshop

Whole Group mini-lesson

Independent Work

Small Group / Individual Conferencing

Group Share
Use problem solving assessment results to identify root causes of problem solving weaknesses.

Implement instructional strategies that develop students’ problem solving process and use of problem solving strategies.

Reassess problem solving in 8 weeks.

Continue to collaborate with all stakeholders regarding the implementation of the math workshop model.

Monitor and measure the implementation of the model.
FHS, State, DFG-GH Performance
2011 HSPA, First-Time 11th Graders
LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

Total Proficient by Demographic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Gen Ed</th>
<th>Students w/Disabilities</th>
<th>Econ Disadv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FHS</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFG-GH</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FHS, State, DFG-GH Performance
2011 HSPA, First-Time 11th Graders
MATHEMATICS

Total Proficient by Demographic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Gen Ed</th>
<th>Students w/Disabilities</th>
<th>Econ Disadv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FHS</strong></td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DFG-GH</strong></td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Franklin High School Board Presentation

January 12, 2012

Graduation Rate
Post-Graduation Plans
Advanced Placement
SAT Exam
College & Career Readiness
¿QUESTIONS?
5 minute break
Schools that Made AYP
SY 2011

- Franklin High School
- Conerly Road
- Franklin Park
- MacAfee Road
- Pine Grove Manor
2011 Elementary Grade Span
*Schools that Made AYP*

- Language Arts Literacy
- Grades 3 & 4
2011 Schools Making AYP
Benchmarks and Safe Harbor
LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

Conerly Road
Safe Harbor All Students

Franklin Park
ARYP Benchmark
White Asian

MacAfee Road
Safe Harbor All Students

Pine Grove Manor
Safe Harbor All Students

Safe Harbor
Total Students
Students w/Disabilities
African-American Economically Disadvantaged

Note: Subgroups with <30 students are not represented

AYP (79%)
Safe Harbor
↓ previous year’s partial proficient rate by 10%
Schools Making AYP
NJASK 3 & 4
2010 → 2011 Language Arts Literacy

PARTIAL PROFICIENT
PERCENT DECREASE

Pine Grove Manor, 19.6%
Conerly Road, 13.7%
MacAfee Road, 16.1%
Franklin Park, 25.3%
Schools Making AYP
2011 NJASK, Grades 3 & 4
LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

Total Proficient
AYP 79%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conerly Road</th>
<th>Franklin Park</th>
<th>MacAfee Road</th>
<th>Pine Grove Manor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schools Meeting AYP
NJASK 3 & 4
2010 → 2011 Percentage Increase / Decrease
Language Arts Literacy

2010
• Partial 49.3%
• Proficient 47.8%
• Advanced 3%

2011
• Partial 41.2%
• Proficient 53.8%
• Advanced 5.1%

Percentage Increase / Decrease
• Partial ↓16.4%
• Proficient ↑12.6%
• Advanced ↑70%
2011 Elementary Grade Span

Schools that Made AYP

Mathematics

Grades 3 & 4
2011 Schools Meeting AYP
Benchmark and Safe Harbor
MATHEMATICS

Conerly Road

AYP Benchmark
White

Safe Harbor
Total
Students w/Disabilities
African-American
Latino
Economically Disadvantaged

Franklin Park

AYP Benchmark
Total
White
African-American
Asian
Economically Disadvantaged

Safe Harbor
Students w/Disabilities

MacAfee Road

AYP Benchmarks
Total
Students w/Disabilities
African-American

Safe Harbor
Economically Disadvantaged

Pine Grove Manor

Safe Harbor
All Students

Note: Subgroups with <30 students are not represented

AYP (79%)

Safe Harbor
↓ previous year’s partial proficient rate by 10%
Schools Meeting AYP Benchmarks

2011 NJASK, Grades 3 & 4

MATHEMATICS

- Conerly Road: 35.6% (2010), 26.6% (2011)
- Franklin Park: 16.0% (2010), 11.9% (2011)
- MacAfee Road: 23.1% (2010), 19.0% (2011)
- Pine Grove Manor: 44.7% (2010), 34.3% (2011)
Schools Meeting AYP Benchmarks

2011 NJASK, Grades 3 & 4

MATHEMATICS

Total Proficient
AYP 83%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conerly Road</th>
<th>Franklin Park</th>
<th>MacAfee Road</th>
<th>Pine Grove Manor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schools Meeting AYP
NJASK 3 & 4

2010 → 2011 Percentage Increase / Decrease
Mathematics

2010
• Partial 26.7%
• Proficient 40.6%
• Advanced 32.7%

2011
• Partial 21.5%
• Proficient 43.4%
• Advanced 35.1%

Percentage Increase / Decrease
• Partial ↓19.5%
• Proficient ↑6.9%
• Advanced ↑7.3%
### Schools Meeting AYP Benchmarks

#### 2010 → 2011 NJASK, Grades 3 & 4

**MATHEMATICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>2010 Proficient</th>
<th>2011 Proficient</th>
<th>Percentage Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conerly Road</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>↑14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Park</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>↑4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacAfee Road</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>↑5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Grove Manor</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>↑18.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2010 → 2011 Percentage Increase
2011 New Jersey State Assessment Results

Franklin Township Public Schools

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

Schools in Need of Improvement (SINI)
Hillcrest (Grades 3-4)

- Mathematics (Year 1)
  - African-American
- Language Arts Literacy (AYP)
Elizabeth Avenue (Grades 3-4)

- Language Arts Literacy (Year 2)
  - Students w/ Disabilities
  - African-American

- Mathematics (AYP)

Sampson G. Smith (Grade 5)

- Language Arts Literacy (Year 2)
  - Students w/ Disabilities

- Mathematics (Year 6)
  - African-American

Schools in Need of Improvement (SINI)
Elementary Grade Span
2011 NJASK 3-5
Schools in Need of Improvement (SINI)
Middle Grade Span
2011 NJASK 6-8

Sampson G. Smith (Grade 6)
- Language Arts Literacy (Year 4)
  - Students w/Disabilities
- Mathematics (Year 3)

Franklin Middle School (Grades 7 & 8)
- Language Arts Literacy (Year 7)
  - Total, SE, LEP, ED
  - African-American, Latino
- Mathematics (Year 2)
  - Total, LEP, ED
  - African-American, Latino
2011 Elementary Grade Span
Schools in Need of Improvement / Early Warning

Language Arts Literacy

Grades 3-5
Schools in Need of Improvement / Early Warning
Elementary Grade Span (Grades 3-5)
2011 LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

Total Proficient
AYP 79%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hillcrest</th>
<th>Elizabeth Avenue</th>
<th>Sampson G. Smith (Grade 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schools in Need of Improvement / Early Warning

Elementary Cohort – Grades 3-5 (Current Grade 6)

2009 → 2011 LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

Elementary Cohort
(526) Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Partially Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3, '09</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4, '10</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5, '11</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elementary Grade Span (Grades 3-5)

Current Elementary Cohort (526 Students)

3rd to 5th Grade Performance by Proficiency Level

LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

2011 NJASK Grade 5

Grade 3

Advanced
11

Proficient
(7)

Partial (0)

Grade 5

Advanced
16

Proficient
277

Partial 233

Grade 3

Advanced
(4)

Proficient
(12)

Partial (56)

Grade 5

Advanced
16

Proficient
277

Partial 233

Grade 3

Partial
240

Proficient
(63)

Partial (177)

Grade 5

Advanced
16

Proficient
277

Partial 233
Elementary Grade Span (Grades 3-5)

**Current Elementary Cohort (526 Students)**

*3rd to 5th Grade Performance by Proficiency Level*

**LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Students (526)</th>
<th>Number of Students Gained/Lost (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Proficient and Gained</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>271 (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Below Proficient and Gained</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Below Proficient and Decreased</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>239 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Proficient and Decreased</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Stayed the Same</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elementary Grade Span (Grades 3-5)
Current Elementary Cohort (526 Students)
3rd to 5th Grade Performance by Proficiency Level
LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

Proficient or Above
- 69% of the students proficient or above in grade 3 demonstrated an increase in performance by grade 5
- 27% of the partial proficient students in grade 3 demonstrated proficiency by Grade 5

Partial Proficient
- 28% of the partial proficient students in grade 3 demonstrated consistent gains in grades 4 and 5
- 17% of the partial proficient students in grade 5 are within 10 points of proficiency
Elementary Grade Span
Language Arts Literacy

2011 NJASK 3-5  District, State, DFG
Franklin, State, DFG-GH Performance
Elementary Grade Span

**2011 NJASK 3-5**

**LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY**

Total Proficient by Demographic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Gen Ed</th>
<th>Sp Ed</th>
<th>LEP</th>
<th>Econ Disadv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFG-GH</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Franklin, State, DFG-GH Performance
Elementary Grade Span
2011 NJASK 3-5
LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

Total Proficient by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Franklin</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>DFG-GH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Franklin, State, DFG-GH Performance
Elementary Grade Span
3 Year Trend – Total Proficient

LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>SpEd</th>
<th>LEP</th>
<th>ED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL
• Annual ↑7.7%
• 3 Year ↓3.2%

LEP
• Annual ↑47%
• 3 Year ↑29.6%

Students w/Disab
• Annual ↑36.6%
• 3 Year ↓10%

Econ Disadv
• Annual ↑17.5%
• 3 Year ↓4.1%
Elementary Grade Span
Language Arts Literacy

Formative Assessments

Running Records
### Elementary Grade Span (Grades 3-5)
### Running Records, 2011
#### LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>% of Students MEETING/EXCEEDING Benchmarks - Sept.</th>
<th>% of Students MEETING/EXCEEDING Benchmarks - June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Average Number of Actual Text Levels through which Students Progressed</th>
<th>Expected Number of Text Levels through which Students are Expected to Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elementary Grade Span
Language Arts Literacy

Programmatic Initiatives

Curricular & Instructional Initiatives

Dr. Karen Schubert-Ramirez,
Supervisor of Elementary Language Arts Literacy
Elementary Grade Span
Programmatic & Curricular Initiatives

**LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY**

---

**Reading**
- Daily 120 minute Balanced Literacy Block (80 minutes, Grade 5)
- Reading Workshop
- Whole Group Mini-Lesson
- Independent Reading
- Small Group / Individual Conferencing
- Group Share
- Shared Reading
- Word Study
- Read aloud w/Accountable Talk

**Writing**
- Daily 40 minute Writing Workshop
- Whole Group Mini-Lesson
- Independent Writing
- Small Group / Individual Conferencing
- Group Share

---

- Uninterrupted Instruction
- No Pull-Outs
- New Academic Support Model
Elementary Grade Span
Programmatic & Curricular Initiatives
LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

Instructional Initiatives

• Continued use of Words their Way which differentiates word study instruction

• Explicit teaching of comprehension strategies

• Targeted instruction based on formative assessment
  • Running Records
  • High Frequency Word Assessment
  • Letter / Sound Identification
  • Baseline Writing Samples

• Continued collaboration between Director, Principal and Coaches for Literacy Focus Walks
Elementary Grade Span
Programmatic & Curricular Initiatives
LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

Instructional Initiatives

• Increased attention to explicit teaching point, architecture of the mini-lesson, direct conferring, and small group instruction
• On-going Professional Development Facilitated by Literacy Coaches
  • Grade level and assessment meetings
  • Sessions during in-service days
  • Co-teaching in classrooms
  • Book study groups
• Additional support provided to re-assigned teachers
• “Lunch and Learns”
• Gap Analysis of current curriculum and new CCSS
• Follow-up and support between consultant visits
• Analysis of authentic student work
Expected Outcomes for Teacher’s College Writing Project

• Consultants from Teachers College Reading and Writing Project provide the most current research-based approaches to writing instruction and staff development sessions that include:

• Meetings with grade level teachers to discuss status of the work and to prepare for in-class modeling by reviewing and assessing student writing, discussing the lesson’s focus/teaching point, and setting goals.

• ‘In the moment’ training within a classroom setting through:
  • Conducting demonstration lessons accompanied by commentary.
  • Coaching into teacher/student interactions during the independent writing portion of the workshop (conferring and small-group strategy instruction).

• Discussions following the lab site to debrief and reflect on the observed lesson/conference/small group work, to clarify key points, and to set goals for subsequent professional development sessions.

• Support between visits by responding to teachers’ requests for information
Writing Intervention Strategies

• Teachers will continue to create focused and specific teaching points to target writing instruction based on student needs as determined by assessment of writing samples and individual and small group conferences.

• Students will continue to increase their writing stamina through daily independent writing opportunities in the Writing Workshop.

• Students will continue to effectively use the writing process to draft, revise, edit and publish writing on self-selected topics in a variety of genres.

• Teachers will continue to become proficient in the use of the Teachers College Narrative Writing Continuum to assess student writing and to foster growth to the next developmental level.

• Building administrators will continue to conduct classroom walk-throughs and teacher observations that focus on specific instructional features of Writing Workshop to enhance teacher effectiveness and student achievement in writing.
2011 Elementary Grade Span

Schools in Need of Improvement / Early Warning

Mathematics

Grades 3-5
Schools in Need of Improvement (SINI)
Elementary Grade Span (Grades 3-5)
2011 MATHEMATICS

Total Proficient
AYP 83%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hillcrest</th>
<th>Elizabeth Avenue</th>
<th>Sampson G. Smith (Grade 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schools in Need of Improvement / Early Warning

Elementary Cohort – Grades 3-5 (Current Grade 6)

2009 → 2011 MATHEMATICS

Elementary Cohort (526 Students)

- Grade 3, '09
- Grade 4, '10
- Grade 5, '11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Partially Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3, '09</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4, '10</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5, '11</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elementary Grade Span (Grades 3-5)

Current Elementary Cohort (526 Students)

3rd to 5th Grade Performance by Proficiency Level

MATHEMATICS

2011 NJASK Grade 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced 160</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3 Proficient 217</td>
<td>Advanced 47</td>
<td>Proficient 147</td>
<td>Partial 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3 Partial 149</td>
<td>Advanced 3</td>
<td>Proficient 50</td>
<td>Partial 96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced 184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5 Proficient 222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5 Partial 120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Elementary Grade Span (Grades 3-5)

#### Current Elementary Cohort (526 Students)

#### 3rd to 5th Grade Performance by Proficiency Level

**MATHEMATICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Students (526)</th>
<th>Number of Students Gained/Lost (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Proficient and Gained</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>295 (56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Below Proficient and Gained</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Below Proficient and Decreased</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>211 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Proficient and Decreased</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Stayed the Same</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20 (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elementary Grade Span (Grades 3-5)
Current Elementary Cohort (526 Students)
3rd to 5th Grade Performance by Proficiency Level
MATHEMATICS

Proficient or Above

60% of the students proficient or above in grade 3 demonstrated an increase in performance by grade 5

44% of the partial proficient students in grade 3 demonstrated proficiency by Grade 5

7% of the students in grade 5 are on the cusp of Advanced Proficiency and 36 students received a perfect score of 300.

Partial Proficient

42% of the partial proficient students in grade 3 demonstrated consistent gains in grades 4 and 5

23% of the partial proficient students in grade 5 are on the cusp of proficiency.
Elementary Grade Span Mathematics

Formative Assessments

Learnia, Mid-Year, End-of-Year Common Assessments
Areas of Strength

• Patterns
• Comparing & Ordering Numbers
• Numerical Operations
• Geometry

Areas of Continued Focus

• Problem Solving
• Data Analysis
• Estimation Strategies
• Place Value
• Area & Perimeter
• Expansion of Analysis of Common Assessment Results
Franklin, State, DFG-GH Performance
Elementary Grade Span
2011 NJASK 3-5
MATHEMATICS

Total Proficient by Demographic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Gen Ed</th>
<th>Sp Ed</th>
<th>LEP</th>
<th>Econ Disadv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFG-GH</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Franklin, State, DFG-GH Performance
Elementary Grade Span
2011 NJASK 3-5
MATHEMATICS

Total Proficient by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFG-GH</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elementary Grade Span
3 Year Trend – Total Proficient
MATHEMATICS

- **Total**
  - Annual ↑2.7%
  - 3 Year ↑8.3%

- **SpEd**
  - Annual ↑26.7%
  - 3 Year ↑51.1%

- **LEP**
  - Annual ↑71.9%
  - 3 Year ↑51.1%

- **ED**
  - Annual ↑8.6%
  - 3 Year ↑19.8%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>SpEd</th>
<th>LEP</th>
<th>ED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elementary Grade Span Mathematics

Programmatic Initiatives

Curricular & Instructional Initiatives

Nubeja Allen, Supervisor of Mathematics
Elementary Grade Span (Grades 3-5)
Programmatic & Curricular Initiatives
MATHEMATICS

Program

Curriculum Alignment
Standards-based Instruction
Student Learning
Collection and use of Assessment
Lesson Design: Increased emphasis on student writing, problem solving and use of vocabulary
Learning Environment
Instructional Strategies and Grouping
The Workshop Model of Instruction
Professional Learning

Measurement

Common Marking Period Assessments
Formative Assessments
Walkthroughs
Teacher Observations
Student Work Samples
Elementary Grade Span (Grades 3-5)
Programmatic & Curricular Initiatives
MATHEMATICS

K-12 Math Workshop Model of Instruction.

• Using effective strategies applied during LAL instruction, this Instructional pacing allows teachers to lead whole group instruction and provide daily opportunities for students to practice, apply, discuss and reflect on new learning.

Small / Flexible Group Instruction.

• In K-8 classrooms each cycle/week teachers provide 20 minutes of small / flexible group instruction to meet the needs of all students. Through the use of games, puzzles, practice, and skill application students engage in activities that challenge and extend the learning of some students while other students receive support and additional instruction from the classroom teacher. Teachers use a variety of assessment data to create students groups which are fluid and differentiated.
Math Workshop Model

The daily 80 minute math block offers students the ability to:

- learn process
- discover in groups or on their own
- practice and complete product all in one session

The extended time allows for extension and remediation and closure demonstrating more understanding for each student.

- Uninterrupted Instruction
- No Pull-Outs
- New Academic Support Model
Elementary Grade Span (Grades 3-5)
Programmatic & Curricular Initiatives
MATHEMATICS

Writing in Mathematics

- An increased emphasis on problem solving while developing students' ability to respond to extended constructed response questions. Elementary students have a mathematics checklist to use as they responded to extended constructed response problems.

Exemplars / Differentiated Performance Tasks

- Exemplars and Differentiated Performance Tasks will be available in each building. Students can discuss exemplary student responses as they further develop and apply their problem solving skills while completing the task.
Instructional Initiatives

- Teachers will strengthen their development of comprehensive standards-based lessons that demand appropriate grade-level rigor and understanding of mathematical concepts and their application to the real world

- Teachers will create focused and specific teaching points to target math instruction based on student needs as determined by formative assessment data

- Students will use practical situations to make connections, build concepts and solve real-world problems

- Teachers will extend their use of formative assessments to include anecdotal note-taking for determining individual student needs

- Curriculum maps will be refined to provide greater emphasis on foundational math concepts at the lower grades
¿QUESTIONS?
5 minute break
2011 Middle Grade Span
Schools in Need of Improvement

Language Arts Literacy

Grades 6-8
Schools in Need of Improvement (SINI)
Middle Grade Span (Grades 6-8)
2011 LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

Total Proficient
AYP 86%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sampson G. Smith (Grade 6)</th>
<th>Franklin Middle School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schools in Need of Improvement (SINI)
Middle Grade Span Cohort (Current Grade 9)
2009 → 2011 LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

Language Arts Literacy Cohort (477)

- Partially Proficient: 194, 180, 112
- Proficient: 264, 238, 291
- Advanced Proficient: 19, 59, 74

Grade 6, '09
Grade 7, '10
Grade 8, '11
2009 → 2011 NJASK
Middle Grade Span Cohort (477 Students)
6th to 8th Grade Performance by Proficiency Level
LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

Grade 6
Advanced
19

Grade 7
Proficient
264

Grade 8
Partial
194

2011 NJASK 6-8

Advanced (16)
Proficient (3)
Partial (0)

Advanced (57)
Proficient (195)
Partial (12)

Advanced (1)
Proficient (93)
Partial (100)

Grade 8 Advanced
74
Grade 8 Proficient
291
Grade 8 Partial
112
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Students (477)</th>
<th>Number of Students Gained/Lost (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Proficient and Gained</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>392 (82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Below Proficient and Gained</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Below Proficient and Decreased</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>77 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Proficient and Decreased</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Stayed the Same</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2009 → 2011 NJASK
Middle Grade Span Cohort (Current Grade 9)
6th to 8th Grade Performance by Proficiency Level
LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

Proficient or Above
- 89% of the students proficient or above in grade 6 demonstrated an increase in performance by grade 8
- 84% of the partial proficient students in grade 6 demonstrated proficiency by Grade 8

Partial Proficient
- 56% of the partial proficient students in grade 6 demonstrated consistent gains in grades 7 and 8
- 30% of the partial proficient students in grade 5 are within 10 points of proficiency
Middle Grade Span
Language Arts Literacy

Formative Assessments

Reading & Writing
WRITING:

On Demand Piece

- Particular areas of growth included:
  - Writing volume (length)
  - Use of transitions and structures
  - Sentence structure

- Areas of continued focus for improvement:
  - Elaboration
  - Focus

READING:

Learnia

- Particular areas of growth included:
  - Using textual evidence to support interpretations
  - Identifying and analyzing literary techniques

- Areas of continued focus for improvement:
  - Non-fiction text structures
  - Vocabulary
Total Proficient by Demographic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Gen Ed</th>
<th>Sp Ed</th>
<th>LEP</th>
<th>Econ Disadv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFG-GH</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Franklin, State, DFG-GH Performance
Middle Grade Span

2011 NJASK 6-8

LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

Total Proficient by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFG-GH</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Franklin, State, DFG-GH Performance
Middle Grade Span
3 Year Trend – Total Proficient
LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

3 Year Trend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Stud w/Disab</th>
<th>LEP</th>
<th>ED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**
- Annual, ↓5.1%
- 3 Year, ↓8.7%

**LEP**
- Annual, ↑316%
- 3 Year, ↑303.1

**Stud w/Disab**
- Annual, ↓16%
- 3 Year, ↓13.4%

**Econ Disadv**
- Annual, ↓9.5%
- 3 Year, ↓16%
Middle Grade Span Language Arts Literacy

Programmatic Initiatives

Curricular & Instructional Initiatives

Carolyn Armstrong, Supervisor of Secondary Language Arts Literacy
Middle Grade Span

Programmatic & Curricular Initiatives

LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

Program

Reading Workshop

Writing Workshop

Teacher’s College Units of Study for reading and writing in varied genres aligned to the Common core State Standards

Alignment in grades 6, 7, and 8

READ 180

Research paper in each grade level

Word of the Week Program

Summer Reading Program

Measurement

Department created assessments, mid-terms and finals

Writing Assessments in each unit both process and on-demand

Writing Folder Assessments

Reading and writing notebooks

Reading logs

Running records

SRI assessments in READ 180
Instructional Initiatives

- Curriculum design and mapping in alignment with the Common Core State Standards
- Vertical articulation of curriculum (6-12) insuring increasing rigor and sequence.
- Extensive professional development for teachers to help them understand and apply the new standards.
- Increase in the use of non-fiction text and expository and argumentative writing.
- Targeted instruction based on formative assessment data.
- Increased reading and writing time for students
- Emphasis on student products, goal setting and individual improvement.
- Professional development by literacy coaches and TC staff developers
What’s Working.

• The workshop model and units of study implemented with fidelity
• Student independence in reading and writing as evidenced by:
  • The volume and quality of their writing in their notebooks, on-demand, and process pieces
  • Student reading logs and notebooks showing growth in reading stamina and application of strategies
Middle Grade Span
Programmatic & Curricular Initiatives
LANGUAGE ARTS LITERACY

Next Steps...

• Continuing to bridge the gap between grade 6 and grade 7
  • Time differences (120 minutes versus 80 minutes)
  • Academic support model differences and training in intervention strategies
• Fidelity of program implementation in grade 7
2011 Middle Grade Span
Schools in Need of Improvement

Mathematics

Grades 6-8
Schools in Need of Improvement (SINI)
Middle Grade Span (Grades 6-8)
2011 MATHEMATICS

Total Proficient
AYP 80%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sampson G. Smith (Grade 6)</th>
<th>Franklin Middle School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2009 → 2011 NJASK
Middle Grade Span Cohort (479 Students)
6th to 8th Grade Performance by Scale Score
MATHEMATICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 6, '09</th>
<th>Grade 7, '10</th>
<th>Grade 8, '11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partially Proficient</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Advanced Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2009 → 2011 NJASK
Middle Grade Span Cohort (479 Students)
6th to 8th Grade Performance by Proficiency Level
MATHEMATICS

2011 NJASK Grade 8

- **Grade 6 Advanced**
  - Advanced: 105
  - Proficient: 16
  - Partial: 0

- **Grade 6 Proficient**
  - Advanced: 36
  - Proficient: 135
  - Partial: 47

- **Grade 6 Partial**
  - Advanced: 0
  - Proficient: 40
  - Partial: 116

Grade 8 Advanced: 125
Grade 8 Proficient: 191
Grade 8 Partial: 163
# 2009 → 2011 NJASK

Middle Grade Span Cohort (479 Students)

6th to 8th Grade Performance by Scale Score

MATHEMATICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Students (526)</th>
<th>Number of Students Gained/Lost (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Proficient and Gained</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>243 (51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Below Proficient and Gained</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Below Proficient and Decreased</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>217 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Proficient and Decreased</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Stayed the Same</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19 (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2009 → 2011 NJASK
Middle Grade Span Cohort (479 Students)
6th to 8th Grade Performance by Scale Score
MATHEMATICS

**Proficient or Above**

- 66% of the students proficient or above in grade 5 demonstrated an increase in performance by grade 8
- 19% of the partial proficient students in grade 5 demonstrated proficiency by grade 8
- 8% of the students in grade 8 are on the cusp of Advanced Proficiency and 41 students received a perfect score of 300

**Partial Proficient**

- 21% of the partial proficient students in grade 5 demonstrated gains by grade 8
- 20% of the partial proficient students in grade 5 are on the cusp of proficiency.
Areas of Strength

• Geometry

Areas of Continued Focus

• Problem Solving
• Numerical Operations with decimals and fractions
• Numerical operations with rational numbers
• Ratios, proportions and percents
• Expansion of Analysis of Common Assessment Results
Franklin, State, DFG-GH Performance
Middle Grade Span
2011 NJASK 6-8
MATHEMATICS

Total Proficient by Demographic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Gen Ed</th>
<th>Sp Ed</th>
<th>LEP</th>
<th>Econ Disadv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFG-GH</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Franklin, State, DFG-GH Performance
Middle Grade Span
2011 NJASK 6-8
MATHEMATICS

Total Proficient by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFG-GH</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Middle Grade Span
3 Year Trend
MATHEMATICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>SpEd</th>
<th>ED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- SpEd:
  - Annual \(\uparrow 18.6\%\)
  - 3 Year \(\downarrow 13.2\%\)

- ED:
  - Annual \(\downarrow 9.2\%\)
  - 3 Year \(\downarrow 16.6\%\)

- Total:
  - Annual \(\downarrow 0.9\%\)
  - 3 Year \(\downarrow 5.6\%\)
Middle Grade Span Mathematics

Programmatic Initiatives

Curricular & Instructional Initiatives

Nubeja Allen, Supervisor of Mathematics
Middle Grade Span (Grades 6-8)

Programmatic & Curricular Initiatives

MATHEMATICS

Program

- Curriculum Alignment
- Standards-based Instruction
- Student Learning
- Collection and use of Assessment
- Lesson Design: Increased emphasis on student writing, problem solving and use of vocabulary
- Learning Environment
- Instructional Strategies and Grouping
- The Workshop Model of Instruction
- Professional Learning

Measurement

- Common Marking Period Assessments
- Formative Assessments
- Walkthroughs
- Teacher Observations
- Student Work Samples
K-12 Math Workshop Model of Instruction.

- Using effective strategies applied during LAL instruction, this Instructional pacing allows teachers to lead whole group instruction and provide daily opportunities for students to practice, apply, discuss and reflect on new learning.

Small / Flexible Group Instruction.

- In K-8 classrooms each cycle/week teachers provide 20 minutes of small / flexible group instruction to meet the needs of all students. Through the use of games, puzzles, practice, and skill application students engage in activities that challenge and extend the learning of some students while other students receive support and additional instruction from the classroom teacher. Teachers use a variety of assessment data to create students groups which are fluid and differentiated.
Middle Grade Span (Grades 6-8)
Programmatic & Curricular Initiatives
MATHEMATICS

Math Workshop Model

The daily 80 minute math block offers students the ability to:

• learn process
• discover in groups or on their own
• practice and complete product all in one session

The extended time allows for extension and remediation and closure demonstrating more understanding for each student.

• Uninterrupted Instruction
• No Pull-Outs
• New Academic Support Model
Middle Grade Span (Grades 6-8)
Programmatic & Curricular Initiatives
MATHEMATICS

Writing in Mathematics

• An increased emphasis on problem solving while developing students' ability to respond to extended constructed response questions. Elementary students have a mathematics checklist to use as they responded to extended constructed response problems.

Exemplars / Differentiated Performance Tasks

• Exemplars and Differentiated Performance Tasks will be available in each building. Students can discuss exemplary student responses as they further develop and apply their problem solving skills while completing the task.
Middle Grade Span (Grades 6-8)

Programmatic & Curricular Initiatives

MATHEMATICS

Instructional Initiatives

• Increase student writing and reflection through the use of math journals. Teachers to provide regular feedback to students.

• Develop a student centered environment by posting student work and making the classroom math-friendly, and also increasing student-centered instruction.

• Increase the use of graphing calculators

• Teachers will strengthen their development of comprehensive standards-based lessons that demand appropriate grade-level rigor and understanding of mathematical concepts and their application to the real world.

• Teachers will create focused and specific teaching points to target math instruction based on student needs as determined by formative assessment data.
¿QUESTIONS?
5 minute break
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**District Science**

**2011 NJASK 4, NJASK 8**

**Total Proficient by Demographic**
### 2011 NJASK 4

#### 3 Year Trend

**SCIENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Partially Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Science 3 Year Trend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Partially Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009</strong></td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011</strong></td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of 2010 & 2011 BCT scores as a % of Total (all students)

- % of advanced proficient students increased by 10%
- % partial proficient students remained static
SCIENCE
Programmatic & Instructional Initiatives
Elementary Grade Span

Completion and Introduction of Revised K-12 Science Curriculum, based on 2009 Standards.


Continue emphasis of writing in Science journals during Science Lab, K-5.

Professional Development in Physical Science as part of the MSP at Kean University for grade K-6 and 9 teachers.
SCIENCE
Programmatic & Instructional Initiatives
Middle Grade Span

Implementation of Lab books (Grades 6-11) to improve and emphasize communication skills.

Interactive Science Notebooks (ISN) for all Grade 8 students.

Introduction of common assessments in grades 6-8.

Rutgers / FMS Life Science partnership.

Continue emphasis on Academic language Tier 2 and Tier 3 Vocabulary in Word Walls & Lab Lingo and journals.

Introduction of common planning time at Grade 6.

Three units on cellular processes, genetics, and natural selection & evolution are being developed in conjunction with Rutgers GSE. These are aligned to the 2009 NJCCCS and will be integrated into the new curriculum.
Scheduling changes at FHS to create designated science lab rooms. Classes rotate through these rooms for their double lab period.

- Helps to promote the development & implementation of common lab activities.
- Efficiencies in equipment.
- Ensures all students receive instruction in core labs, deemed to be essential to learning.

Introduction of congruent Science labs in core courses for grades 9-11.

Refinement of common assessments in grades 9-12.

Implementation of Lab books (Grades 9-11) to improve and emphasize communication skills.
A concurrent enrollment program for Biology was introduced for the 2011-12 school year.

Other opportunities for CEP programs in science are available, including Anatomy & Physiology.
¿QUESTIONS?
Title I Unified Plans
Board Presentation

February 9, 2012

Sampson G. Smith
Pine Grove Manor

Eileen Brett, Principal
Sampson G. Smith School

Jennifer Whitner, Principal
Pine Grove Manor School
School Presentations

Beginning
January 2012

2011 State Assessment Data
Formative Assessments
School Level Action Plans
Board Presentations

Beginning January 2012 – SCHOOL BASED PRESENTATIONS

- 2011 State Assessment Data
- Formative Assessments
- School Level Action Plans

January 12, 2012 – FRANKLIN HIGH SCHOOL

- Graduation Rate
- Post-Graduation Plans
- Advanced Placement
- SAT Exam
- College & Career Readiness

January 26, 2012 – SPECIALIZED POPULATIONS

- Academic Intervention Services (AIS)
- Special Education
- Limited English Proficient

February 9, 2012 – TITLE I UNIFIED PLANS

- Sampson G. Smith
- Pine Grove Manor

February 23, 2012 – PARCC ASSESSMENTS

- PARCC Assessments
thank you
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