

School Improvement Plan

School Year 2016-2017
School: *Elwyn G. Campbell*
Principal: *Lisa Wheelden*

Section 1. Set goals aligned to the AIP

- 1. *By EOY, the school will realize at least a 40% reduction in students not proficient or advanced in ELA and Math for grades K-5.***
- 2. *By EOY, the school will see at least 20% of students in Level 1 and/or 2 move into Level 3 in ELA.***
- 3. *By EOY, the school will see at least 20% of students in proficient move into advanced in ELA and Math.***
- 4. *By MOY, 60% of students will show high growth and high achievement on ELA and Math Galileo Assessment. By EOY, 80% of students will show high growth and high achievement on ELA and Math Galileo Assessment.***
- 5. *By MOY, 60% of students performing in L3 on BOY ELA and MATH Galileo will show high growth and high achievement, by EOY, 80% of students performing L3 on BOY ELA and MATH Galileo with show high growth and high achievement.***

Note: Since EOY PARCC scores might not be available yet, please use EOY Galileo scores from last year as a substitute baseline proficiency level for planning purposes. You should have a system to revisit your student data throughout the year, as we get data from BOY Galileo, PARCC, MOY Galileo, and other assessments.

(a) Describe the goals you have for student outcomes, in terms of approximate number of students that you need to move to meet each of the three goals listed above.

Data used is 2016-2017 BOY assessments.

Overall School BOY ELA Data:

2016-2017 NBPS MA ELA GALILEO BOY Scores																			
2 nd					3 rd					4 th					5 th				
L1	L2	L3	L4	L5	L1	L2	L3	L4	L5	L1	L2	L3	L4	L5	L1	L2	L3	L4	L5
5	5	12	22	2	3	2	11	11	0	4	5	16	11	2	2	9	14	9	0
46					27					38					34				

2016-2017 NBPS MA ELA GALILEO BOY Scores- Campbell Elementary Grades 2-5 combined

Warning					Needs Improvement					Proficient					Advanced									
L1					L2					L3					L4					L5				
5					5					12					22					2				
3					2					11					11					0				
4					5					16					11					2				
2					9					14					9					0				
14					21					53					53					4				

Overall School BOY Math Data:

2016-2017 NBPS MA MATH GALILEO BOY Scores																			
2 nd Grade					3 rd Grade					4 th Grade					5 th Grade				
L1	L2	L3	L4	L5	L1	L2	L3	L4	L5	L1	L2	L3	L4	L5	L1	L2	L3	L4	L5
3	5	18	14	6	0	5	7	14	1	2	7	17	11	1	2	10	14	7	1
46					27					38					34				

2016-2017 NBPS MA Math GALILEO BOY Scores- Campbell Elementary

Warning					Needs Improvement					Proficient					Advanced									
L1					L2					L3					L4					L5				
3					5					18					14					6				
0					5					7					14					1				
2					7					17					11					1				
2					10					14					7					1				
7					27					56					46					9				

Goal 1

ELA	# of students not Proficient or Advanced			
	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th
# of students	22	16	25	25
Total # for Campbell	88			

40% of students in Grades 2-5 will move to Proficient				
ELA	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th
Total # of students moving	9	7	10	10

MATH	# of students not Proficient or Advanced			
	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th
# of students per level	26	12	26	26
Total # for Campbell	90			

40% of students in Grades 2-5 will move to Proficient				
Math	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th
Total # of students moving	10	5	10	10

Goal 2 and Goal 3

ELA	Goal 2								Goal 3							
	# of students in Warning				20% of students moving from Warning to Needs Improvement				# of Students Proficient L4				20% of students moving from Proficient to Advanced			
# of students	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th
# of students	10	5	9	11	2	1	2	2	22	11	11	9	4	2	2	2
Total # for Campbell	35				7				53				10			

MATH	Goal 2				Goal 3							
	# of students in Warning				20% of students moving from Warning to Needs Improvement				20% of students moving from Proficient to Advanced			
# of students per level	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th
# of students per level	8	5	9	12	2	1	2	4	3	3	2	1
Total # for Campbell	34				9				9			

Goal 4:**ELA and Math**

Grade Level	2 nd		3 rd		4 th		5 th	
# of students per grade	46		27		38		34	
# of students to show high growth/high performance	60%	80%	60%	80%	60%	80%	60%	80%
	28	37	16	22	23	30	20	27

Goal 5: ELA

Grade Level	2 nd		3 rd		4 th		5 th	
# of students per grade at Level 3	12		11		16		14	
# of students to show high growth/high performance	60%	80%	60%	80%	60%	80%	60%	80%
	7	10	7	9	10	13	8	11

Goal 5: Math

Grade Level	2 nd		3 rd		4 th		5 th	
# of students per grade at Level 3	18		7		17		14	
# of students to show high growth/high performance	60%	80%	60%	80%	60%	80%	60%	80%
	11	14	4	6	10	14	8	11

(b) Describe the process or system you will use to revisit student data throughout the year and track progress toward your goals as new data become available.

Using BOY Galileo and DIBELS data, teachers will identify the below level, on level and advanced students. Students will also be identified with in each category as EL and/or special education. Strengths and weaknesses in both math and ELA standards will be identified at each grade level and with in each classroom. Growth on these standards will be monitored through formal and informal assessments.

Bi-weekly, teachers will analyze student samples of below level, on level and above level work and use results to modify flexible groupings of students.

We will continually monitor the students identified in each group through out the year to assist with determining how students are responding to the strategies and practices with in the classroom. Adjustments to practice will be made based on student progress.

CCR Data trackers for ELA and Math Performance Assessment trackers will be monitored as a way to make adjustments to groupings of students and/or to make instructional adjustments to meet student needs.

A data wall will be utilized to keep track of formal data; Galileo, DIBELS, ACCESS, PARRC.

Teachers will progress monitor using DIBELS as follows: Students scoring in the red will be tested weekly, students scoring in the yellow will be tested every 2 weeks, and students scoring in the green will be monitored once a month.

Kid friendly data walls and/or tracking guides will be utilized at the classroom level for students to form goals and track progress toward their goals.

Section 2. Use data to determine school-specific strengths and weaknesses for each AIP objective

Instructions: School leaders must analyze data in order to create a school-specific plan to meet the student learning goals established in Section 1. This section is intended to help you look at student work in a meaningful way and to help you identify your school's strengths and the areas you will focus on this year to improve student outcomes.

Focus on analyzing your school's progress on work related to the four objectives in the AIP, as these are the key levers that the district believes will lead to change. Not every objective may be a focus area for every school. The district's four objectives are outlined on page 3.

Answer questions (a) and (b) in the space provided. Potential data sources to use to answer these questions include:

Student performance data:

- PARCC/MCAS item analysis, if available
- Final exams
- DIBELS
- Galileo
- Formative assessments
- Examples of student work

Instructional data:

- Observation data on curriculum and instruction
- Feedback to teachers

Student indicator data:

- Student attendance
- IEPs and 504s
- Disciplinary data
- SPED referrals
- Graduation/dropout data
- Intervention data
- Mobility
- Course failures

Teacher data:

- Teacher attendance
- Teacher evaluations
- Tiering of teachers
- TELL Massachusetts survey

(a) What progress did your school make last year in student learning?

Student Learning Goal: Green indicates areas where the goal has been met or exceeded.

1. The number of students not achieving at least proficiency will be reduced by 40% by the end of the year on the following assessments: k-2 DIBELS, Gr. 2-5 ELA/Math Galileo, Gr. 5 Galileo Science.

2015-2016 Percentage of Students Not Achieving Proficiency

DIBELS Gr. K-2 (red, yellow)	BOY	EOY	Reduced by
K	41%, 16 students	23%, 8 students	50%
1	26%, 10 students	13%, 5 students	50%
2	26%, 8 students	28%, 8 students	0%

Galileo Gr. 2-5 L1-3	BOY	EOY	Reduced by
ELA- Overall	50%, 62students	37%, 36students	42%, 26 Students
Grade 2	50%, 14students	41.3%, 12students	15%, 2 students
Grade 3	41%, 14students	41.7%, 15students	Increased, 1 student
Grade 4	66%, 24students	27.8%, 10students	42%, 14 students
Grade 5	43%, 10 students	39.1%, 9students	10%, 1student
MATH- Overall	62%, 78 Students	33%, 42 Students	46%, 36 Students
Grade 2	58%, 16 students	13.8%, 4 Students	75%, 12 students
Grade 3	42%, 15students	16%, 6 students	60%, 9 students
Grade 4	74%, 26students	48%, 18 students	30%, 8 students
Grade 5	91%, 21students	60.8% 14students	33%, 7 students
SCIENCE (gr.5)	61%, 13 students	95%, 22 students	increased

The table above shows:

- In ELA, grades K, 1 (DIBELS) and 4 (GALILEO) met the goal of students not achieving at least proficiency will be reduced by 40% by the end of the year.
- In math Galileo, grades 2 and 3 met the goal of students not achieving at least proficiency will be reduced by 40% by the end of the year.

Student Learning Goal: Green indicates areas where the goal has been met or exceeded.

- The number of Gr 2-5 students who score advanced on district wide benchmarks will increase by 10% from BOY to EOY.

Number of Students Who Scored Advanced

Galileo ELA: L5	BOY	EOY	Increase by
ELA-Overall	3 Students	4 Students	+1 Student
Grade 2	0 students	0 students	0 students
Grade 3	1 students	0 students	Decreased
Grade 4	1 students	1 students	0 students
Grade 5	1 students	3 students	+2 students

Galileo Math: L5	BOY	EOY	Increase by
MATH-Overall	0	25 Students	+25 Students
Grade 2	0 students	11 students	+11 students
Grade 3	0 students	12 students	+12students
Grade 4	0 students	2 students	+2students
Grade 5	0 students	0 students	0 students

- **In ELA, grade 5 met the goal of: the number of Gr 2-5 students who score advanced on district wide benchmarks will increase by 10% from BOY to EOY.**
- **In Math, grades 2,3, and 4 met the goal of: the number of Gr 2-5 students who score advanced on district wide benchmarks will increase by 10% from BOY to EOY.**

(b) What did students struggle with last year? Why? Please consider data by grade level and subject. Questions to consider include:

- **Where are the strong classrooms and grades? How can you use them to lift up other grades and classrooms?**
- **What grades/classrooms are of the most serious concern?**
- **What does your data suggest are the reasons why students are struggling?**

ELA: In all grades, all 3 layers of questions, Key Ideas and Details, Craft and Structure, and integration of Knowledge and Ideas in Informational text continues to be areas of concern. Skills of concern are point of view, compare and contrast, and inference. At all grade levels, we are striving to build capacity in teachers to deliver rigorous core instruction using research based practices.

K-1 DIBELS: Students not achieving proficiency in DIBELS struggle with fluency, segmenting words and non-sense words. Standards our students struggled in are as follows:

In math, grades 2 and 3 are stronger. Students in these grade levels were able to grasp the idea of conceptual understanding and making their thinking visible. Grades 2 and 3 were given the foundational training of conceptual understanding through the EnVision 2.0 program where our grades 4 and 5 did not have this foundational training. The procedural training the grades 4 and 5 students had in their primary years did not prepare them for the mathematical shift from procedural mathematics to conceptual understanding. Current Grade 5 students are a concern in math due to the fact that they have had just one year of foundational training needed to access the EnVision 2.0 curriculum. Teachers must continue to frontload the strategies and skills needed to build conceptual understanding so they can build on to that foundation, to continue to move grade 5 students toward having a solid conceptual understanding in mathematics. At all grade levels, we are striving to build capacity in teachers to deliver rigorous core instruction using research based practices.

Analysis of BOY Galileo ELA and Math high priority standards determined by mastery not at 80% or standards that fall below NBPS percentage and BOY performance on standards identified as areas of weakness EOY 2015-2016 are as follows :

Campbell Elementary School 2016-2017
BOY Galileo Data Math & ELA

Grade 2 Math

BOY Performance on Current Priority Standards					
ENVISIONS TOPIC 1 & 2 STANDARDS	Meets Standard	Approaches Standard	Falls Below Standard	Mastery of Standard at Campbell	Mastery of Standard in NBPS
2.OA.2	28	13	5	19.57%	12.19%
2.OA.3	32	9	5	60.87%	70.40%
2.OA.4	29	0	17	69.57%	64.18%

BOY Performance on Standards Identified as areas of Weakness EOY 2015-2016					
CCSS Area of Weakness	Meets Standard	Approaches Standard	Falls Below Standard	Mastery of Standard at Campbell	Mastery of Standard in NBPS
MA2.MD.7	4	0	42	8.7%	17.41%
MA2.MD.8	14	18	14	30.43%	27.36%
MA2.MD.10	11	21	14	23.91%	33.33%

Grade 2 ELA

BOY Performance on Current Priority Standards

Reading Street Unit 1 Priority Standards	Meets Standard	Approaches Standard	Falls Below Standard	Mastery of Standard at Campbell	Mastery of Standard in NBPS
RL.2.1	18	18	10	39.13%	34.08%
RL.2.3	22	18	6	47.83%	47.01%
RI.2.1	18	6	22	39.13%	23.88%
RI.2.2	13	17	16	28.26%	17.41%
RI.2.3	15	15	16	32.61%	20.90%

BOY Performance on Standards Identified as areas of Weakness **EOY 2015-2016**

CCSS Area of Weakness	Meets Standard	Approaches Standard	Falls Below Standard	Mastery of Standard at Campbell	Mastery of Standard in NBPS
RL.2.6	20	14	12	43.48%	32.34%
RI.2.7	4	15	27	8.7%	12.44%
RF.2.3e	10	15	21	21.74%	25.62%
RF.2.3f	8	13	25	17.39%	18.16%

Grade 3 Math

BOY Performance on Current Priority Standards					
ENVISIONS TOPIC 1 & 2 STANDARDS	Meets Standard	Approaches Standard	Falls Below Standard	Mastery of Standard at Campbell	Mastery of Standard in NBPS
3.OA.1	9	0	18	33.33%	33.33%
3.OA.2	9	0	18	33.33%	37.58%
3.OA.3	14	5	8	51.85%	46.67%
3.OA.4	26	0	1	96.3%	86.67%

BOY Performance on Standards Identified as areas of Weakness EOY 2015-2016					
CCSS Area of Weakness	Meets Standard	Approaches Standard	Falls Below Standard	Mastery of Standard at Campbell	Mastery of Standard in NBPS
MA.3.NF.3b	3	0	24	11.11%	19.09%
MA.3.NF.3c	4	0	23	14.81%	20.61%
MA.3.MD.1	3	13	11	11.11%	13.33%
MA.3.MD.3	5	6	16	18.52%	36.06%

Grade 3 ELA

BOY Performance on Current Priority Standards					
CCSS Area of Weakness	Meets Standard	Approaches Standard	Falls Below Standard	Mastery of Standard at Campbell	Mastery of Standard in NBPS
RL.3.1	21	4	2	77.8%	66.97%
RL.3.2	15	8	4	55.56%	60.61%
RL.3.3	17	0	10	62.96%	52.73%
RI.3.1	5	13	9	18.52%	23.94%
RI.3.2	8	11	8	29.63%	23.33%

BOY Performance on Standards Identified as areas of Weakness EOY 2015-2016					
CCSS Area of Weakness	Meets Standard	Approaches Standard	Falls Below Standard	Mastery of Standard at Campbell	Mastery of Standard in NBPS
RL.3.4	0	4	23	0%	1.21%
RL.3.5	5	0	22	18.52%	43.03%
RL.3.6	5	8	14	18.52%	46.06%
RL.3.9	13	10	4	48.15%	43.94%
RI.3.1	5	13	9	18.52%	23.94%
RI.3.2	8	11	8	29.63%	23.33%
RI.3.4	3	20	4	11.11%	23.03%
RI.3.8	6	13	8	22.22%	23.94%

Grade 4 Math

BOY Performance on Current Priority Standards					
ENVISIONS TOPIC 1 & 2 STANDARDS	Meets Standard	Approaches Standard	Falls Below Standard	Mastery of Standard at Campbell	Mastery of Standard in NBPS
4.NBT.1	14	0	24	36.84%	45.07%
4.NBT.2	35	0	3	92.11%	84.79%
4.NBT.3	32	0	6	84.21%	77.46%
4.NBT.4	29	5	4	76.32%	59.15%

BOY Performance on Standards Identified as areas of Weakness EOY 2015-2016					
CCSS Area of Weakness	Meets Standard	Approaches Standard	Falls Below Standard	Mastery of Standard at Campbell	Mastery of Standard in NBPS
MA.4.OA.2	21	0	17	55.26%	54.93%
MA.4.OA.3	9	14	15	23.68%	30.70%
MA.4.NBT.2	35	0	3	92.11%	84.79%
MA.4.NF.1	12	0	26	31.58%	37.46%
MA.4.NF.2	3	14	21	7.89%	10.99%
MA.4.NF.3b	7	0	31	18.42%	32.39%
MA.4.NF.3c	1	0	37	2.63%	9.58%
MA.4.NF.3d	12	0	26	31.58%	37.75%
MA.4.NF.4a	10	0	28	26.32%	31.27%
MA.4.NF.4b	1	6	31	2.63%	5.07%
MA.4.MD.1	5	0	33	13.16%	15.21%

Grade 4 ELA

BOY Performance on Current Priority Standards					
Reading Street Unit 1 Priority Standards	Meets Standard	Approaches Standard	Falls Below Standard	Mastery of Standard at Campbell	Mastery of Standard in NBPS
RL.4.1	21	8	9	55.26%	46.76%
RL.4.2	6	11	21	15.79%	16.34%
RL.4.3	26	6	6	68.42%	71.27%
RI.4.1	25	6	7	65.79%	62.82%
RI.4.2	5	6	27	13.16%	10.42%
RI.4.3	18	15	5	47.37%	45.07%

BOY Performance on Standards Identified as areas of Weakness EOY 2015-2016					
CCSS Area of Weakness	Meets Standard	Approaches Standard	Falls Below Standard	Mastery of Standard at Campbell	Mastery of Standard in NBPS
RL.4.2	6	11	21	15.79%	16.34%
RI.4.5	14	12	12	36.84%	37.75%
RL.4.9	22	8	8	57.89%	47.89%
RI.4.2	5	6	27	13.16%	10.42%
RI.4.5	17	14	7	44.74%	37.46%
RI.4.6	17	0	21	44.74%	43.66%
RI.4.8	13	13	12	34.21%	29.01%
RI.4.9	28	0	7	73.68%	69.58%

Grade 5 Math

BOY Performance on Current Priority Standards					
ENVISIONS TOPIC 1 & 2 STANDARDS	Meets Standard	Approaches Standard	Falls Below Standard	Mastery of Standard at Campbell	Mastery of Standard in NBPS
5.NBT.1	5	0	30	14.29%	24.32%
5.NBT.2	28	0	7	80%	84.5%
5.NBT.3A	32	0	3	91.43%	85.11%
5.NBT.3B	20	0	15	57.14%	69.30%
5.NBT.4	28	0	7	80%	74.16%
5.NBT.7	1	9	25	2.86%	3.65%

BOY Performance on Standards Identified as areas of Weakness EOY 2015-2016					
CCSS Area of Weakness	Meets Standard	Approaches Standard	Falls Below Standard	Mastery of Standard at Campbell	Mastery of Standard in NBPS
MA.5.NF.1	7	7	21	20%	14.59%
MA.5.NF.3	5	15	15	14.29%	22.49%
MA.5.NF.4a	2	5	28	5.71%	4.26%
MA.5.G.1	10	0	25	28.57%	36.78%
MA.5.G.2	12	0	23	34.29%	29.48%

MA.5.G.3	16	0	19	45.71%	60.49%
MA.5.G.4	10	BOY Performance on Current Priority Standards		28.57%	51.37%
Reading Street Unit 1 Priority Standards	Meets Standard	Approaches Standard	Falls Below Standard	Mastery of Standard at Campbell	Mastery of Standard in NBPS
RL.5.1	12	12	11	34.29%	43.60%
RL.5.2	16	9	10	45.71%	49.39%
RL.5.3	21	7	7	60.00%	54.57%
RI.5.1	2	9	24	5.71%	11.28%
RI.5.2	5	10	20	14.29%	14.33%
RI.5.3	4	20	11	11.43%	25.61%

Grade 5 ELA

BOY Performance on Standards Identified as areas of Weakness EOY 2015-2016					
CCSS Area of Weakness	Meets Standard	Approaches Standard	Falls Below Standard	Mastery of Standard at Campbell	Mastery of Standard in NBPS
RL.5.3	21	7	7	60.00%	54.57%
RI.5.1	2	9	24	5.71%	11.28%
RI.5.4	25	0	10	71.43%	83.84%
RI.5.6	7	19	9	20%	22.26%
RI.5.9	11	14	10	31.43%	28.96%

2016 Spring PARCC Writing Data: Written Expression			
Grade	# of students Below	# of students Near	# of students At or above
3	6	5	25
4	19	10	7
5	1	11	11

2016 Spring PARCC Writing Data: Writing Knowledge and Conventions			
Grade	# of students Below	# of students Near	# of students At or above
3	3	9	24
4	17	15	4
5	3	9	11

May 2016 CFA Overall Writing Data					
Grade	0	1	2	3	4
K	0	6%	31%	56%	8%
1	0	15%	38%	38%	10%
2	14%	21%	31%	31%	3%

May 2016 CFA Overall Written Expression Data				
Grade	0	1	2	3
3	25%	25%	33%	17%
4	0	27%	35%	38%
5	26%	35%	17%	22%

May 2016 CFA Overall Writing Knowledge of Language and Conventions Data				
Grade	0	1	2	3
3	11%	14%	47%	28%
4	3%	5%	54%	38%
5	0%	30%	61%	9%

Through data analysis of each grade level the following trends are apparent:

ELA:

- **Determining point of view**
- **Making inferences**
- **Making sense of non-fiction text**
- **Connecting with text to determine how characters and events interact with each other to determine the outcome of the story.**
- **Responding in writing to text; compare/contrast, cause and effect**
- **Overall about 60% of students are not reaching benchmark in written expression**

Math:

- **Problem solving**
- **Conceptual understanding**
- **Fractions**
- **Measurement and Data**

Section 3. Develop strategies/actions to address focus areas

Instructions: Based on your analysis of student needs in Section 2, especially question (b), identify 2-4 focus areas for your school to pursue this year. These focus areas should be high-impact levers that you believe will drive student achievement, and should be aligned to the AIP. In the space below, list each focus area and the specific strategies and activities you will complete as part of this focus area to raise student achievement.

Once you have developed these focus areas, identify one benchmark that you will use to measure student progress by November 1, February 1, and May 1. These benchmarks should be based on student work—not adults’ actions. They will be used as part of the focus areas that you discuss with your instructional liaison. You do not need a benchmark for each individual focus area.

(a) List your school’s primary focus areas and 1-3 secondary focus areas for this year. At least one should be ELA/literacy-focused and at least one should be math-focused. These focus areas could be either general (e.g., improve reading comprehension, improve writing) or standard-specific (e.g., improve narrative writing).

<p>Primary Focus Area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Literacy <p>2-3 Secondary Focus Areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MATH School Culture
--

#1 Primary Focus Area: *[Improve reading and writing practices]*

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
<p>Curriculum: Unpack ELA reading standards to identify skills needed to access the standard.</p>	Teachers TLS Principal	November 2016
Utilize the Units of Study Reference Guide in ELA to plan effective lessons focusing on Priority Standards	Teachers TLS	September-June
Unpack writing priority standards and writing prompts to identify skills students will need to access the writing. Develop mini-lessons that reflect the needed writing skills.	Teachers TLS Principal	October-June
<p>Instructional: Model lessons pairing reading strategies to reading skills that lead to a more solid approach in teaching the reading standards</p>	TLS Teachers	September-On-going
Model lessons that differentiate Instruction utilizing the workshop model.	TLS	September-on-going
Differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all learners	Teachers	On going
Implement identified mini-lessons in daily writing instruction aligned to the district Writing Guide	Teachers	September-June

Develop a writer's workshop model in each classroom and monitor students' daily writing through conferences giving growth producing feedback.	Teachers TLS	October- June
Develop After-School Literacy and Math program (January-March) for a targeted group of students, scoring Level 3 on BOY in grades 3-5 focusing on high priority standards tracked through progress monitoring from October to December.	Principal TLS	October- March
Assessment: Utilize the common formative assessments as it aligns to the curriculum maps and make midcourse corrections to meet the needs of all learners.	Teachers TLS SILT	On-going
Collect student work samples to monitor growth and effectiveness of lessons.	Teachers TLS Principal SILT	October- June
Track student progress through the use of data notebooks. Students track their individual progress and set goals for next steps.	Teachers	October- June
Professional Development: Provide PD on unpacking ELA reading standards to identify skills and strategies needed to show proficiency.	Teachers TLS Principal	September- April
Provide PD on unpacking writing standards and prompts to identify the skills and strategies needed to show proficiency in responding to text	Teachers TLS Principal	October- April
PD on Differentiating Instruction utilizing the workshop model in ELA and Math	TLS Principal	September- on going as needed
<i>PD to vertically align writing expectations when responding to text and in writing narrative, informative, and argumentative responses.</i>	TLS Principal	October - April

#2 Secondary Focus Area: [Math fluency, concepts, and procedures]

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
Curriculum: Develop and vertically align problem solving strategies k-2, 3-5.	Teachers TLS Principal	October-February
Unpack high priority math standards to identify skills and strategies needed to access the standard and to make instructional decisions to support learning.	Teachers TLS Principal	October-February
Instructional: Embed mathematical practices in daily lessons	Teachers	September-June
Provide balanced instruction in mathematics of conceptual and procedural skills and strategies.	Teachers	September-June
Develop an After-School Math program for grades 3-5 focusing on conceptual understanding and productive struggle.	Principal TLS Teachers	January-March
Assessment: Collect and analyze BOY mathematical data to determine strengths and weaknesses of students in each grade and trends across grade levels.	Teachers SILT Principal	October
<i>Track student progress through the use of data notebooks. Students track their individual progress and set goals for next steps.</i>	Teachers	January- June
<i>Collect student work samples to monitor student growth and effectiveness of lessons.</i>	Teachers SILT	October-June
Professional Development: Develop and implement mathematical PD around results of the BOY data collection.	SILT Principal	October-June
Develop professional learning communities as a way to share and/or model lessons focused on conceptual understanding and making thinking visible in math.	Teachers TLS Principal	January- June

#3 Secondary Focus Area: [School Culture]

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
Revisit PBIS and our 5 expectations to set consistency between teachers and all settings within the school.	PBIS committee Teachers	September
Collect monthly discipline data to see trends and problem solve concerns.	SAC PBIS Committee	September-June
Establish monthly character traits for students to exhibit to highlight positive behavior.	PBIS Committee	September-October
Monthly assemblies to highlight students who have demonstrated behaviors reflecting the “Character Trait of the Month”. Student of the month recognition will go to student who have met expectations, put forth good effort, or who have shown the most improvement.	PBIS Committee Teachers Principal	September-June
Partner with various community members to provide	Principal	September-

social/emotional growth opportunities for students: Kawanas:K-Club for grades 3-5, Saturday School for boys grades 4-5, YWCA Sisters Club for girls, Caring Network	SAC	June
Partnership with New Bedford Symphony Orchestra to support science curriculum for grade 3	Principal Teacher	September- June
Continue to strengthen partnership with PTO and be a part of the decision making for family events at school	Principal Teachers PTO	September- June

(b) How will you measure student progress along the way? Please list at least one way you will measure student progress by November 1, February 1, and May 1.

	Benchmark
What I will see by <u>Nov. 1</u> to know that students are on track to meet the end-of-year goal	Student work samples will be collected bi weekly from lessons that the Principal observes and/or targeted groups of students that have been identified. Progress will be noted through a portfolio system and/or use of tracker for specific formative assessments.
What I will see by <u>Feb. 1</u> to know that students are on track to meet the end-of-year goal	Student work samples should show growth over time. Growth should be evident from BOY to MOY (DIBELS, Galileo)
What I will see by <u>May 1</u> to know that students are on track to meet the end-of-year goal	Student work samples should show growth over time. Growth should be evident from MOY to EOY (DIBELS, Galileo)

Note: This year, Office of Instruction liaisons will meet with principals twice monthly to conduct learning walks with an emphasis on monitoring and supporting the implementation of SIPs, including how well teachers are implementing key strategies from recent trainings. Liaisons will help principals develop and execute plans to provide extra support to teachers, as needed.

Section 4. Develop a targeted PD plan to support SIP

Instructions: Identify 2-3 instructional focus areas that are aligned to your school’s SIP. Then, outline goals for teacher practice and how you will monitor changes in teacher practice. Lastly, build out a targeted PD plan to serve as a road map for providing training to teachers in your building. Where appropriate, indicate what support will be needed from the Office of Instruction for each PD activity.

(a) What are the changes in teacher practice that need to occur to reach the goals set out in this plan?

Focus area	What exemplary practice will look like after PD (describe for teachers and students)	Current strengths in teacher practice related to this focus	Desired changes in teacher practice related to this focus
<p>1. Improve reading and writing practices</p>	<p>Teachers will carry out mini lessons in Reading and Writing reflecting the strategies and skills needed for each standard.</p> <p>Teachers will target instruction based on student need.</p> <p>When given a writing prompt, teachers will develop a criteria for success so students are clear of the expectation of the assignment.</p> <p>Students will engage in high academic rigor appropriate for their level during whole group and small group instruction.</p> <p>Students will use the criteria for success when they write to meet the expectation of the assignment.</p> <p>Students will be given time to practice</p>	<p>Teachers analyze data and make adjustments to groups of students as needed.</p>	<p>Teachers will conduct targeted mini-lessons in Reading and Writing on specific strategies and skills related to the standards.</p> <p>Small group instruction and learning centers will be differentiated to meet the needs of all students</p> <p>Teachers will develop criteria for success to outline the expectation of each writing assignment.</p>

	skills and strategies and apply newly learned skills and strategies to other learning.		
2. Improve math fluency, concepts and procedures	<p>Teachers will use math manipulatives and mathematical practices to assist students in conceptual understanding.</p> <p>Students will be asked to share their thinking when solving math problems with both teacher and peers.</p> <p>Exemplary models of student thinking will be posted in the classroom.</p>	Teachers implement the structure of the lesson; problem based learning, guided practice, and independent practice.	<p>Teachers will consistently use math manipulatives/strategies that help develop conceptual understanding in math.</p> <p>Teachers will consistently engage students in making their thinking visible.</p> <p>Teachers will do “Check ins” periodically throughout the math lesson to clear up misconceptions along the way.</p>

(b) Outline, by topic and by month, the PD programming and sequencing that will help your staff make the necessary changes in practice.

This section should be a year-long plan for teacher learning, analogous to a year-long plan that you might make for units and lessons when teaching a class. Each focus area is like a unit, where individual PD sessions and meetings are the lessons within that should build skills on top of previous lessons.

Focus area 1:	<i>Improve reading and writing practices</i>		
Instructional strategies:	Differentiate instruction Growth Producing Feedback; goal setting	Approximate dates:	September-January
Meeting	Learning objectives for teachers	Support needed	
September PD meetings	Teachers will unpack Reading standards RL.1, RL.2, RL.3, RI.1 and determine skills needed to teach. Mini lessons will be developed based on identified skills		
September	Model Lessons: To build teachers capacity to conduct a mini-lesson pairing reading strategy and skill, differentiate instruction during small group work. Meet during Admin. Time to debrief on lesson and determine next steps.	TLS	
October PD-December	Teachers will unpack identified writing prompts and determined skills needed to teach. Mini lessons will be developed based on identified skills.	TLS Literacy Director	
October-December	Model Lessons: To build teachers capacity to conduct a mini-lesson pairing writing strategy and skill, differentiate instruction during small group work. Meet during Admin. Time to debrief on lesson and determine next steps.		
October-December	To build capacity in providing growth producing feedback to students. Students set goals to work on.	TLS	
January-June Thursday admin. times	To further provide support for teachers in the area of differentiating instruction and mini-lessons in ELA, as needed	TLS Literacy Director	

Focus area 2:	<i>Math fluency, concepts, and procedures</i>		
Instructional strategies:	Differentiate Instruction Utilizing multiple strategies to solve problems; manipulatives, bar diagrams, drawings, number lines	Approximate dates:	February-June
Meeting	Learning objectives for teachers		Support needed
February-March PD- Differentiate small group instruction	To build capacity in differentiating math instruction in small group.		Math director
February-May	Model Lessons: To build teachers capacity to conduct a mini-lesson pairing math strategy and skill, differentiate instruction during small group work. Meet during Admin. Time to debrief on lesson and determine next steps.		
April-May: PD- Manipulatives	Using math manipulatives and other strategies to build conceptual understanding.		Math director