School Improvement Plan

School Year 2016-2017
School: *Swift School*
Principal: *Elizabeth Correia*

Section 1. Set goals aligned to the AIP

Instructions: *Analyze EOY Galileo data from last year to help set your end-of-year goals for the current school year. You must set three student learning goals, which are aligned to the student learning goals in this year's AIP:*

1. *By EOY, the district will realize at least a 40% reduction in students not proficient or advanced in ELA and Math for grades K-5, and in ELA and Math for grades 6-12*
2. *BY EOY, the district will see at least 10% of students in warning move into needs improvement in ELA and Math*
3. *By EOY, the district will see at least 10% of students in proficient move into advanced in ELA and Math*

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.

(1) By EOY, Swift School will reduce the number of students not proficient or advanced in grades 2-5 by at least 40% with a breakdown as follows:

DIBELs

Grade Level	2015-16 # EOY Students in Intensive and Strategic	EOY Goal-Students Scoring Core	# of Students to Move out of Intensive/ Strategic
K	1 out of 45 (2%)	99% (44 students)	1
1	7 out of 46 (15%)	91% (42 students)	4
2	2 out of 38 (5%)	97% (37 students)	1

ELA-Galileo

Grade Level	2015-16 # EOY- of Students in L1-L3	EOY Goal of Students in L4 & L5	# of Students to Move out of L1-L3 by EOY
2	4 out of 38 (11%)	94% (36 students)	**2**
3	10 out of 42 (24%)	86% (36 students)	**6**
4*	0	0	**0**
5	5 out of 30 (17%)	90% (27 students)	**3**

*****_Due to the fact that our 4th grade scored 100% proficient on the EOY Galileo ELA benchmark, a 40% reduction goal for 2016-17 has been calculated below using preliminary PARCC data:_

Grade Level	2015-16 # EOY- of students in L1-L3	EOY Goal of Students in L4 & L5	# of Students to Move out of L1-L3 by EOY
4	18 out of 30 (60%)	64% (19 students)	**11**

Math-Galileo

Grade Level	2015-16 # EOY- of students in L1-L3	EOY Goal of Students in L4 & L5	# of Students to Move out of L1-L3 by EOY
2	3 out of 38 (8%)	95% (36 students)	2
3	5 out of 42 (12%)	92% (39 students)	3
4	0	0	0
5	10 out of 30 (33%)	80% (24 students)	6

*****_Due to the fact that our 4th grade scored 100% proficient on the EOY Galileo math benchmark, a 40% reduction goal for 2016-17 has been calculated below using preliminary PARCC data:_

Grade Level	2015-16 # EOY- of students in L1-L3	EOY Goal of Students in L4 & L5	# of Students to Move out of L1-L3 by EOY
4	19 out of 30 (63%)	62% (19 students)	**11**

Math-Performance Assessments

Grade Level	2015-16 # of EOY Students in L1-L3	EOY Goal of Students in L4 and L5	# of Students to Move out of L1-L3 by EOY
K	8 out of 45 (17%)	90% (41 students)	4
1	19 out of 46 (42%)	75% (35 students)	11

(2) By EOY, Swift School will move at least 10% of students in warning (L1) to Needs Improvement in ELA and math.

ELA-Galileo

Grade Level	2015-16 # EOY- of students in L1	EOY Goal of Students in L2-L5	# of Students to Move out of L1 by EOY
2	0 out of 38	0	**0**
3	0 out of 42	0	**0**
4	0	0	**0**
5	0 out of 30	0	**0**

Math-Galileo

Grade Level	2015-16 # EOY- of students in L1	EOY Goal of Students in L2-L5	# of Students to Move out of L1 by EOY
2	0 out of 38	0	**0**
3	0 out of 42	0	**0**
4	0	0	**0**
5	0 out of 30	0	**0**

Math-Performance Assessments

Grade Level	2015-16 # of EOY Students in L1	EOY Goal of Students in L2 - L5	# of Students to Move out of L1 by EOY
K	0 out of 45 (0%)	0	0
1	11 out of 46 (24%)	98% (45 students)	1

By EOY, Swift School will increase the number of students scoring from Proficient (L4) to Advanced (L5) in ELA and math by 10%

ELA-Galileo

Grade Level	2015-16 # EOY- of students in L4	# of Students to Move TO L5 by EOY
2	34 out of 38 (89%)	**3**
3	31 out of 42 (74%)	**3**
4	16 out of 38 (42%)	**2**
5	21 out of 30 (70%)	**2**

Math-Galileo

Grade Level	2015-16 # EOY- of students in L4	# of Students to Move TO L5 by EOY
2	16	**2**
3	19	**2**
4	18	**2**
5	21	**2**

Math-Performance Assessments

Grade Level	2015-16 # of EOY Students in L4	# of Students to Move to L5 by EOY
K	16 out of 45 (35%)	6
1	28 out of 46 (61%)	3

(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.

Here are some examples for tracking student data that could be helpful resources:

- *Putting every student name on a post-it and tracking them across achievement levels based on the most current benchmark assessment data*
- *Tracking proficiency levels on unit assessments by grade level or classroom*
- *Tracking number of students demonstrating mastery by standard to help identify what parts of the content need revisiting*

You can find data wall systems online, for example:

- *Photos and samples: http://www.teachthought.com/teaching/what-a-data-wall-looks-like/*
- *DESE guidance, see section 6.2.2T) http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/ddtt/toolkit.pdf*

Swift will track individual classroom achievement data on DIBELs and STAR benchmark assessments via classroom data boards in the principal's office. These boards will indicate the names, scores and levels of all students based on BOY benchmark performance. The data walls will be updated with MOY benchmark data. Additionally, separate data boards will be devoted to identifying and gauging at-risk students' individual progress toward proficiency on targeted standards as measured through progress monitoring using DIBELS and STAR. These students will be progress monitored on a regular basis. K-2 students scoring in strategic and intensive will be progressed monitored in DIBELs every two weeks. Grades 2-5 students scoring below grade level on STAR math and reading assessments will be progress monitored every 6-8 weeks to assess the effectiveness of interventions on student learning,

All teachers will utilize the district's reading CCR assessment trackers as well as the enVision Performance Assessment trackers to analyze student and class performance. ELA teachers will track reading data weekly and will meet with the principal twice a month during admin-directed periods to look at student work, analyze and discuss students' performance and progress both formative and summative assessments and develop action plans accordingly. Math teachers will track student data on Performance Assessments for each topic covered. Teachers will meet with the principal at least once a month to look at student work, analyze and discuss students' performance and progress on both formative and summative assessments and develop action plans accordingly.

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?

2015-16 DIBELs Data

% of Students Meeting Benchmark K-2

Grade	BOY	EOY
K	55%	**98%**
1	87%	**84%**
2	89%	**95%**

2015-16 Galileo Data- ELA

% Students Scoring at L4 and L5

Grade	BOY	EOY
2	71%	89%
3	81%	76%
4	66%	100%
5	53%	83%

2015-16 Galileo Data- Math

% Students Scoring at L4 and L5

Grade	BOY	EOY
2	63%	92%
3	62%	83%
4	50%	100%
5	47%	43%

2015-16 CFA Data-Math

% Scoring at L4 and L5

Grade	Overall CFA Proficiency
K	78%
1	26%

2015-16 CFA Writing Data-Narrative

% Students Scoring Proficient –Written Expression

Grade	Narrative	Literary Analysis
K	60%	60%
1	63%	44%
2	37%	55%
3	30%	45%
4	42%	62%
5	10%	50%

2015-16 Assessment Participation –PARRC ELA and Math Grades 3-4

Group	Enrolled	Assessed	Percentage
All Students	108	89	91%
High Needs	51	44	93%
Econon. Disadvantaged	45	38	92%
White	83	64	88%

2015-16 Panorama Survey-Parent Engagement

Survey Question	% Responded Favorably
How often do you meet in person with teachers at your child's school?	25% (up 10 % from 2014-15)
How involved have you been with a parent group(s) at your child's school?	18% (up 3% from 2014-15)
In the past year, how often have you discussed your child's school with other parents from the school?	38% (up 5% from 2014-15)
In the past year, how often have you helped out at your child's school?	10% (down 4% from 2014-15)
In the past year, how often have you visited your child's school?	31% (down 11% from 2014-15)

(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?**
-

Overall

Historically, Swift students in grades K-2 have consistently made strong gains in oral reading fluency from BOY to EOY. The 2015-16 data shows growth, with the majority of students (92%) meeting grade level proficiency levels on DIBELs by EOY. However, 8% of our K-2 students did not reach proficiency and are most likely beginning a new school year with deficiencies in phonemic awareness, phonics and oral reading fluency. Literacy remains a concern at the primary level.

Swift students demonstrated an overall weakness in writing, with proficiency rates in written expression (i.e. focus, organization, development and language), ranging from 10%-63% across genres.

Swift's 2015-16 Galileo data indicates that students in grades 2, 4 and 5 made growth in ELA with 3rd grade proficiency dropping 5% from BOY to EOY. Students in grades 2-4 made significant growth in math over the course of the year; however grade 5 showed a 3% drop in proficiency at the end of the year. While our overall performance on Galileo appears positive, our students failed to demonstrate proficiency in key literacy and math standards across grade levels and classrooms. Reading skills in

grades 2-5 are deficient and present a considerable concern. While students are demonstrating a deeper understanding of math in comparison to previous years, our data indicates overall conceptual understanding and the application of mathematical thinking appear weak in several domains.

ELA-Reading

To develop a better understanding as to why students struggled in reading, the Swift SILT reviewed Galileo EOY data, identifying standards on which students demonstrated a proficiency level of less than 80%. Through this analysis, the SILT identified areas of deficit across grades levels in background knowledge, vocabulary acquisition and development and tier 1 instruction. The SILT also cited staff a delay in the implementation of the new ELA curriculum units of study as contributing toward students' poor performance on specific standards.

Kindergarten

- Although our kindergarteners demonstrated strong growth on the EOY DIBELs benchmark, students experienced difficulty with learning and recognizing sight words over the course of the academic year. As in years past, students struggled with decoding skills and blending sounds to read CVC words. We believe these deficiencies stem from the fact that most of our incoming K students did not attend preschool and had limited phonemic awareness upon entering school.

Grade 1

- Students in grade 1 struggled with long and short vowels as well as beginning/middle/end sounds. More rigorous phonics instruction is required to address this issue.

Grade 2

- Students struggled with beginning consonant blends for words. . More rigorous phonics instruction is required to address this issue.

An analysis of Galileo data revealed the following ELA standards as high priority areas for students in grades 2-5:

Grade 2:

Student ELA performance in 2nd grade classrooms was quite different despite the fact that both classes demonstrated high proficiency rates (both classrooms showed proficiency rates of 89% at EOY). One teacher's students consistently demonstrated significantly higher mastery rates on reading standards than the other. However, the following areas of weakness were common to both classrooms:

- Students demonstrated weaknesses in phonics, showing overall proficiency rates of less than 50% in standards related to distinguishing long and short vowels when reading regularly-spelled one-syllable words, knowing spelling-sound correspondences for common vowel teams, identifying words with inconsistent but common spelling-sound correspondences, and recognizing and reading grade-appropriate irregularly spelled words. This difficulty with phonics can be contributed to some degree to a weak phonics instruction component in Reading Street.

- Second grade students also struggled with overall reading comprehension as evidenced by their inability to consistently identify main ideas and key details in both literature and informational texts. This may be due to the fact that teachers did not implement the curriculum units of study for ELA immediately and with fidelity during the beginning of the 2015-16 school year. Consequently, explicit instruction in identifying main ideas and key details was not adequately

taught over the course of the school year.

- Second graders struggled with the mastery of craft and structure standards, specifically standards focused on the structure of poetry. This is most likely attributed to the fact that poetry standards are part of the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and not the Common Core Standards. Reading Street materials are CCSS aligned and therefore do not focus heavily on craft and structure as it pertains to poetry.

Grade 3:
A lack of targeted, rigorous and explicit tiered instruction most likely resulted in third grade students struggling with:

- overall reading comprehension as evidenced by their inability to identify main ideas and key details in both literature and informational texts.
- determining the meaning of general academic and domain-specific vocabulary words and phrases in a text relevant to a grade-level topic or subject area.
- identifying and describing the connection between sentences and paragraphs in a text.

Grade 4:
According to Galileo EOY data, 100% of 4th graders demonstrated proficiency on the EOY ELA benchmark. This data does not correspond to preliminary PARCC data, which indicates that only 40% of students demonstrated proficiency at this grade level. Despite overall proficiency on the Galileo EOY, our 4th grade students did struggle with several standards highlighted here.

Based on Galileo EOY data, a lack of targeted, rigorous and explicit tiered instruction most likely resulted in fourth graders struggling with:

- overall reading comprehension as evidenced by their inability to identify main idea and key details in both literature and informational text.
- Integrating information from two texts on the same topic in order to write or speak about the subject knowledgeably.
- comparing and contrasting a firsthand and secondhand account of the same event or topic and describing differences in focus and information provided.
- explaining how an author uses reasons and evidence to support particular points in a text.

Grade 5:
Unlike students in grades 2-4, Swift's 5th graders demonstrated proficiency in standards requiring them to determine the main ideas and key details in literature. However, a lack of targeted, rigorous and explicit tiered instruction most likely attributed to students struggling with:

- overall reading comprehension as evidenced by their inability to identify main idea and key details in informational text.
- comparing and contrasting two or more characters, setting, or events in a story or drama, drawing upon specific events in the text.

- comparing and contrasting the overall structure of events, ideas, concepts or information in two or more texts.
- integrating information from several texts on the same topics in order to communicate about the subject knowledgeably.

ELA-Writing

To develop an understanding of how our students are performing in writing, teachers reviewed CFA data as it related to the narrative, and literary analysis writing taught over the course of the school year. Overall, Swift students struggled with overall focus, organization and development in their writing.

Kindergarten

In Kindergarten, only 60% of students demonstrated proficiency in narrative writing and literary analysis/research writing over the course of the school year.

Based on writing data, a lack of targeted, rigorous and explicit tiered instruction most likely resulted in kindergarteners struggling with:

- generating a statement of purpose/focus in writing.
- organizing a piece of writing.
- developing details to support writing

Grade 1:

In first grade, 63% of students demonstrated proficiency in narrative writing. Forty-four percent of students demonstrated proficiency in literary analysis writing.

Based on writing data, a lack of targeted, rigorous and explicit tiered instruction most likely resulted in first graders struggling with:

- generating a statement of purpose/focus in writing.
- organizing a piece of writing.
- developing details to support writing

Grade 2:

In second grade, 37%% of students demonstrated proficiency in narrative writing. Fifty-five percent of students demonstrated proficiency in literary analysis writing.

Based on writing data, a lack of targeted, rigorous and explicit tiered instruction most likely resulted in kindergarteners struggling with:

- generating a statement of purpose/focus in writing.
- organizing a piece of writing.
- developing details to support writing

Grade 3:

In second grade 30% of students demonstrated proficiency in narrative writing. Forty-five percent of students demonstrated proficiency in literary analysis writing.

Based on writing data, a lack of targeted, rigorous and explicit tiered instruction most likely resulted in kindergarteners struggling with:

- effectively developing writing appropriate to the task.
- effectively and consistently developing writing with purposeful and controlled organization
- effectively using language to express ideas with clarity

Grade 4:
In fourth grade, 42% of students demonstrated proficiency in narrative writing. Sixty-two percent of students demonstrated proficiency in literary analysis.

Based on writing data, a lack of targeted, rigorous and explicit tiered instruction most likely resulted in fourth graders struggling with:

- effectively developing writing appropriate to the task.
- effectively and consistently developing writing with purposeful and controlled organization
- effectively using language to express ideas with clarity

Grade 5:
In fifth grade, 10% of students demonstrated proficiency in narrative writing. Fifty percent demonstrated proficiency in literary analysis writing.

Based on writing data, a lack of targeted, rigorous and explicit tiered instruction most likely resulted in fifth graders struggling with:

- effectively developing writing appropriate to the task.
- effectively and consistently developing writing with purposeful and controlled organization
- effectively using language to express ideas with clarity

Math
To develop a better understanding of why our students struggled with key areas in math, the SILT reviewed Galileo EOY data, identifying standards on which our students demonstrated proficiency rate of less than 80%. Through this analysis, the SILT identified deficits across grade levels in student conceptual knowledge and instruction that continue to prevent student mastery of standards.

Kindergarten:
Student performance in math, as measured by performance on the CFA (enVision Topic Performance Assessments), was relatively strong with 78% of students demonstrating overall proficiency on these assessments throughout the year. However, number sense development in kindergarten remains a concern.

A lack of targeted, explicit instruction rooted in developing conceptual understanding of key math ideas most likely led students in kindergarten to struggle with:

- Comparing numbers 0-20
- Understanding addition and subtraction.
- Composing and decomposing numbers to 20.

Grade 1:
Student performance in math in our 1st grade classrooms, as measured by students' performance on the enVision Performance Assessments, was weak with overall proficiency levels of 26%. Teachers cite students' inability to successfully read and interpret the assessments as playing a factor in their poor performance. However, the development of number sense at this level remains a weakness.

A lack of targeted, explicit instruction rooted in developing conceptual understanding of key math ideas most likely led students in grade 1 to struggle with:

- Fluently adding and subtracting within 20.
- Understanding place value.

Grade 2:
Again, student performance in math in 2nd grade classrooms was quite different despite the fact that both classes demonstrated strong proficiency rates (one class demonstrated 84% proficiency; the other class demonstrated 100% proficiency on the EOY benchmark). Despite their strong EOY data, both classrooms performed poorly in several areas.

A lack of targeted, explicit instruction rooted in developing conceptual understanding of key math ideas most likely led students in grade 2 to struggle with:

- Using addition and subtraction within 100 to solve one and two-step problems involving situations of adding to, taking from, putting together and taking apart with unknowns in all positions.
- Fluently adding and subtracting within 100 using strategies based on place value, properties of operations, and/or the relationship between addition and subtraction.
- Estimating lengths using units of inches, feet, centimeters, and meters.
- Using addition and subtraction within 100 to solve word problems involving lengths that are given in the same units.
- Recognizing and drawing shapes having specified attributes, such as a given number of angles or equal faces.

Grade 3:
A lack of targeted, explicit instruction rooted in developing conceptual understanding of key math ideas most likely led students in grade 3 to struggle with:

- Solving 2-step word problems using the four operations; represent these problems using equations with a letter standing for the unknown quantity.
- Representing a fraction on a number line diagram by defining the interval from 0 to 1 as the whole and partitioning it into equal parts.
- Understanding two fractions as equivalent if they are of the same size or the same point on a number line.
- Recognizing and generating simple equivalent fractions.
- Expressing whole numbers as fractions and recognize fractions that are equivalent to whole numbers.
- Telling and writing time to the nearest minute and measure time intervals in minutes. Solve word problems involving addition and subtraction of time intervals in minutes.
- Measuring and estimating liquid volumes and masses of objects using metric units of

measurement.
- Generating measurement data by measuring lengths using rulers marked with halves and fourths of an inch.
- Solving real world problems involving perimeter of polygons.
- Partitioning shapes into parts with equal areas and expressing the area of each part as a unit fraction of the whole.

Grade 4:
According to Galileo EOY data, 100% of 4th graders demonstrated proficiency on the EOY math benchmark. This data does not correspond to preliminary PARCC data, which indicates that only 37% of students demonstrated proficiency at this grade level. Despite overall proficiency on the Galileo EOY, data indicates our 4th graders struggled with several standards highlighted here.

Based on Galileo EOY data, a lack of targeted, explicit tiered instruction at the conceptual level most resulted in fourth grade students struggling with:

- Multiplying or dividing to solve word problems involving multiplicative comparisons.
- Solve mutli-step word problems using the four operations and representing those problems using equations.
- Generating a number or shape pattern that follows a given rule.
- Multiplying whole numbers of up to 4 digits by a one-digit whole number and multiplying two-digit numbers using strategies based on place value and the properties of operations.
- Comparing two fractions with different numerators and different denominators.
- Adding and subtracting mixed numbers with like denominators.
- Solving word problems involving addition and subtraction of fractions.
- Knowing relative size of measurement units.
- Using the four operations to solve word problems involving distances, intervals of time, liquid volumes, masses of objects and money.
- Measuring angles in whole number degrees using a protractor.
- Classifying 2-dimensional figures.

Grade 5:
Based on Galileo EOY data, a lack of targeted, explicit, tiered instruction at the conceptual level most likely resulted in fifth grade students struggling with:

- Understanding the place value system.
- Writing simple expressions that record calculations with numbers and interpret numerical expressions.
- Explaining patterns in the number of zeroes of the product when multiplying a number by powers of 10.
- Comparing two decimals to the thousandths based on meaning of the digits in each place.
- Using place value understanding to round decimals to any place.
- Adding, subtracting, multiplying and dividing decimals.
- Adding and subtracting fractions with unlike denominators.
- Solving word problems involving addition and subtraction of fractions.
- Multiplying and dividing fractions.
- Making line plots to display a data set of measurement in fractions of a unit

- Measuring volume.
- Understanding attributes of 2-dimensional figures and classify 2-dimentional figures based on properties.

Family Engagement
During the 2015-16 school year, Swift experienced significant opposition from parents/guardians expressing dissatisfaction with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks incorporating the Common Core State Standards as well as the district's participation in state-mandated testing. A small group of Swift parents organized a PARCC and MCAS testing refusal movement, resulting in 21 students refusing all state testing (PARCC ELA and Math, MCAS Science, Technology and Engineering). Consequently, Swift's overall testing participation rate dropped below 95%, with subgroup participation rates between 88% and 91%. This resulted in the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education designating Swift with an accountability rating of Level 3 for the 2016-17.

The opposition to state learning standards and testing generated a significant amount of negativity among parents at Swift and strained relationships between parents/guardians, teachers and school administration. The Panorama survey conducted last spring indicated that overall parent engagement with teachers was low (only 25% of parents surveyed responded favorably when asked how often they met with teachers at Swift.) When asked how involved parents had been with parent groups at Swift, only 18% responded favorably. Perhaps most notable was only 31% of parents responded favorably when asked how often they visited the school. This reflected an 11% decrease from the previous year.

A lack of effective communication with Swift families most likely attributed to the testing refusals and apparent disconnect between Swift parents and staff.

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 <u>one</u> 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 <u>not</u> 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).

Primary Focus Area:

- Strengthen overall literacy development in grades K-2 and reading comprehension in grades 2-5

2-3 Secondary Focus Areas:

- Strengthen writing across all grade levels
- Strengthen conceptual understanding in math grades K-5
- Strengthen overall family engagement at Swift

- **#1 Primary Focus Area:** Strengthen overall literacy development in grades K-2 and reading comprehension in grades 2-5

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
Using DIBELs, RS baseline testing and DRA, tier all K-2 students and identify K-2 students in need of literacy intervention.	Classroom teachers, TLS, SILT, principal	September
Kindergarten teacher will use weekly assessment data to develop and deliver daily, targeted, small-group instruction reflective of student needs in phonemic awareness, letter recognition, blending sounds and reading CVC words.	K teacher, TLS, SILT	September-Ongoing Weekly
First grade teachers will use assessment data to develop and deliver daily, targeted, small-group instruction reflective of student needs in phonics, reading words with long and short vowels, reading beginning, middle and ending sounds, and recognizing sight words.	Grade 1 teachers, TLS, SILT	September-Ongoing Weekly
Second grade teachers will use assessment data to develop and deliver daily, targeted, small-group instruction reflective of student needs in phonics and beginning consonant blends.	Grade 2 teachers, TLS, SILT	September-Ongoing Weekly
Use DIBELs to progress monitor all K-2 students scoring strategic or intensive.	Teachers, SILT	October-Ongoing Every 2 weeks
Communicate reading comprehension as an ongoing school-wide area of focus K-5	Principal, TLS, SILT	September-Ongoing
Using Galileo EOY, STAR data, RS baseline testing and DRA, tier all students K-5 and identify students in need of literacy intervention.	Principal, TLS	September
Teachers in grades K-5 will use weekly reading assessment data to develop and deliver regular, targeted, small-group instruction reflective of student needs in reading. STAR progress monitoring will be conducted every 6-7 weeks in	Classroom teachers, TLS, SILT, principal	October-Ongoing Weekly with Progress

grades 2-5.		Monitoring Every 6-7 Weeks
Provide all teachers with research-based professional development focused on K-5 reading comprehension instruction.	Classroom teachers, TLS, SILT, principal	October-Ongoing
Provide all teachers with research-based professional development on assessing targeted reading comprehension strategies.	Principal, TLS	October-Ongoing
Establish the school-wide expectation that all teachers will be implementing reading comprehension instruction practices and strategies learned in PD into their daily instruction. Evaluate lesson plans incorporating comprehension lessons and provide teachers growth-producing feedback.	Principal. TLS, SILT	October-Ongoing
Focus 50% of observations/learning walks on comprehension instruction in grades K-5. Provide teachers with targeted, specific and actionable feedback on improving instruction.	Principal	October-Ongoing
Meet with teachers weekly to review and analyze student work/formative assessments and weekly CCR tests, measure progress and develop additional Tier 1 and small-group plans accordingly.	Principal, TLS	October-Ongoing
Using STAR testing, progress monitor all students reading below grade level every 6-7 weeks and develop small-group instruction tailored to student needs.	Principal. TLS, SILT	October-Ongoing Every 6 Weeks

(b) How will you measure student progress along the way? Please list at least <u>one</u> way you will measure <u>student progress</u> 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	• All students in grades K-5 will be receiving rigorous and targeted reading instruction daily in all tiers as evidenced in lessons plans, student work analysis, CCR weekly assessments and the RS Unit 1 assessment. • In grades K-2, student progress will be measured through comparing baseline data with data collected from weekly CCR assessments, the RS Unit 1 assessment LEXIA student reports and DIBELs progress monitoring. Kindergarten students will show progress on DIBELs progress monitoring and formative assessments in decoding, letter recognition and blending sounds to read CVC words in ORF assessments. First graders will show growth in recognizing sight words, reading words with long and short vowels and beginning,

	middle and end sounds on DIBELs progress monitoring and weekly assessments. Second grade students will demonstrate growth in beginning consonant blends on weekly assessments and DIBELS progress monitoring. • In grades 2-5, reading progress will be gauged through STAR progress monitoring of at risk students in October. Students will show a continuous increase in reading level/scaled score. Additionally, all students will demonstrate mastery on reading standards on weekly assessments (CCR, fluency assessments, and RTI data). Teachers will continue to develop/modify instruction based on assessment information.
What I will see by <u>Feb. 1</u> to know that students are on track to meet the end-of-year goal	• All students in grades K-5 will be receiving rigorous and targeted reading instruction daily in all tiers as evidenced in lessons plans, student work analysis, CCR weekly assessments and the RS Unit 1 assessment. • In grades K-2, student progress will be measured through comparing baseline data with data collected from weekly CCR assessments and progress monitoring in November, December and January. Progress will also be measured through RS Unit 2 and 3 assessments, LEXIA student reports and DIBELs progress monitoring. Kindergarten students will demonstrate growth in decoding, letter recognition and blending sounds to read CVC words in ORF assessments and will have mastered 50% of their sight words. First graders will demonstrate mastery in recognizing 50% of sight words. They will also show progress in reading words with long and short vowels and beginning, middle and end sounds on weekly assessments. Second grade students will demonstrate growth in beginning consonant blends on weekly assessments. K-2 MOY DIBELs scores will show student progress toward EOY fluency goals. • In grades 2-5, progress will be gauged through STAR progress monitoring of at risk students in November, December and January. All students will show a continuous increase in reading level/scaled score. Additionally, all students will demonstrate growth toward the mastery of targeted reading standards on weekly assessments (CCR, fluency assessments, and RTI data) the RS Unit 2 and 3 assessments and LEXIA student reports. Teachers will continue to develop/modify instruction based on assessment data.

	• MOY STAR benchmark testing will reveal overall increases in student reading levels and scaled scores compared to BOY data.
What I will see by <u>May 1</u> to know that students are on track to meet the end-of-year goal	• All students in grades K-5 will be receiving rigorous and targeted reading instruction daily in all tiers as evidenced in lessons plans, student work analysis, CCR weekly assessments and the RS Unit 4 and 5 assessments. . • In grades K-2, student progress will be measured through comparing MOY data with data collected from weekly CCR assessments and progress monitoring in February, March and April. Progress will also be measured through RS Unit 4 and 5 assessments, LEXIA student reports and DIBELs progress monitoring. Kindergarten students will show progress in decoding, letter recognition and blending sounds to read CVC words in ORF assessments and will have mastered 90% of their sight words. First graders will show growth in recognizing 90% of their sight words. They will also demonstrate proficiency in reading words with long and short vowels and beginning, middle and end sounds on weekly assessments. Second grade students will demonstrate mastery in beginning consonant blends on weekly assessments. K-2 DIBELs progress monitoring will show significant progress toward EOY fluency goals. • In grades 2-5, student progress will be measured through comparing STAR MOY benchmark data to data collected from STAR progress monitoring in February, March and April. In addition, reading comprehension will be measured through analyzing weekly assessments (CCR, fluency assessments, and RTI data) the RS Unit 4 and 5 assessments and LEXIA student reports. Data should reveal students reading at or above grade level. Teachers will continue to develop/modify instruction based on assessment information.

- **#2 Secondary Focus Area:** Strengthen writing across all grade levels

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
All teachers will collect a baseline writing sample from students at the beginning of each genre instructional window (trimester 1-narrative; trimester 2: argumentative; trimester 3: research).	Classroom teachers	September-ongoing
Provide all teachers with research-based PD focused on writing instruction and the development and implementation of writers' workshops.	Principal; TLS	October-Ongoing
Provide all teachers with research-based PD focused on assessing student writing.	Principal; TLS	October-Ongoing
Meet with teachers by grade level every two weeks to analyze students writing and develop additional intervention plans accordingly.	Principal, TLS	October-ongoing
Teachers use weekly student writing data to develop and deliver regular, targeted, individual and small group instruction reflective of students' writing needs.	Teachers; TLS	October-Ongoing

- **#3 Secondary Focus Area:** Strengthen conceptual understanding in math grades K-5

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
Using Galileo EOY, STAR Math (grades 2-5) and enVision assessment data, tier all students, identifying those in need of math intervention.	Math teachers, principal	October
Teachers in grades 2-5 will use assessment data to develop targeted, small group instruction reflective of students' needs across math domains.	Teachers, SILT, principal	October-Ongoing
Provide all teachers with research-based PD on developing conceptual understanding of key math concepts.	Principal	October-Ongoing
Establish the school-wide expectation that all teachers will focus instruction on conceptual math development practices and strategies learned in PD. Evaluate lesson plans incorporating conceptual math instruction and provide teachers with growth-producing feedback	Principal	October-Ongoing
Focus 50% of observations/learning walks on conceptual instruction in grades K-5. Provide teachers with targeted, specific and actionable feedback on enhancing instruction.	Principal	October-Ongoing
Meet with teachers weekly to analyze student work, exits tickets and enVision topic tests, measure student progress and develop additional whole/small group plans	Principal	October-Ongoing

accordingly.		
Using STAR, progress monitor all students performing below grade level in math every 4 weeks to identify areas of growth/weakness and develop small-group instruction tailored to student needs.	Teachers, SILT, principal	October-Ongoing

- **#4 Secondary Focus Area:** Strengthen overall family engagement at Swift.

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
Assemble a committee focused on developing and enhancing parent and student engagement at Swift.	Principal	September
Assess Swift family engagement by completing and unpacking the PTA National Standards for Family-School Partnerships Assessment Guide and Panorama survey data relating to parent engagement.	Principal	November
Develop an action plan for improving family engagement based on assessment guide and 2015-16 Panorama survey results.	Principal, Swift Staff	November-Ongoing
Conduct targeted PD based on engagement standards.	Principal	November-Ongoing
Plan and implement a minimum of 4 parent engagement opportunities at Swift over the course of the school year.	Family Engagement Committee, Swift Staff	November-Ongoing

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
Strengthen overall literacy development in grades K-2 and reading comprehension in grades 2-5	• Teachers will develop and deliver rigorous and differentiated lessons integrating an array of research-based best practices for the explicit instruction of literacy in grades K-1 and reading comprehension in grades 2-5. • Teachers will use daily formative assessments to gauge students' application of reading strategies taught and use this data to inform instruction. • Throughout all tiers of instruction and during individual/partner work, students will be actively engaged in utilizing specific reading strategies. Students will develop an ongoing awareness of their thinking as they read, monitor their understanding, keep track of meaning and make sense of text. Students will notice when meaning breaks down, employ a variety of strategies to repair meaning, and know when and how to apply strategies to maintain and enhance understanding.	• Teachers have experience teaching reading comprehension strategies. • Teachers have experience using formative assessments to plan instruction and group students.	• Using Reading Street materials and district units of study, teachers will strategically plan and deliver daily engaging, rigorous comprehension lessons that (1) are differentiated to individual student needs; (2) fully incorporate the Gradual Release of Responsibility framework and (2) allow students meaningful opportunities for guided and individual practice. • Teachers will design and deliver daily small-group instruction based on data and responsive to students' individual needs.

Strengthen writing across all grade levels	• Teachers will develop whole class, small group and individual lessons integrating research-based best practices for the explicit instruction of writing narrative, argumentative, and expository (research) writing. • Teachers will assess students' writing during weekly writing workshops and use this data to inform instruction. • Students will actively engage in focused and daily writing workshops during which they develop confidence in their ability to write across genres. Students will actively and successfully apply the skills, strategies and techniques learned during writing instruction into their daily work, using checklists and rubrics to examine their writing and the writing of peers.	• Teachers have experience teaching common core writing. • Teachers have some experience implementing a writing workshop format into their weekly instruction.	• Teachers will fully implement daily writers' workshops during which they deliver well-planned, targeted and mini-lessons lessons that address the needs of the class, small group and/or individual students. • Teachers deliver writing workshops focused on providing students with meaningful opportunities for writing, conferring, revising, editing and sharing their work. • Teachers will provide students with targeted, specific and actionable feedback to all students on their writing each week.
Develop and strengthen conceptual understanding in math grades K-5	• Teachers will develop and deliver rigorous lessons/units with the singular goal of developing students' conceptual understanding of the operations, place value system, fractions, measurement and data and geometry. • Teachers will focus on developing conceptual understanding prior to teaching students algorithms for mathematical operations. • Teachers will assess students' development of conceptual knowledge with daily formative assessments and will use this data to inform whole group, small group and individual instruction. • During all tiers of instruction, students	• Teachers implement the workshop model in math and use manipulatives with students. • Teachers use formative assessments to plan instruction.	• Teachers will develop and deliver engaging, differentiated math lessons/units that focus on the development of conceptual understanding through strategically designed activities that allow students to utilize manipulatives and models. • Teachers will explicitly model the Standards for Mathematical Practice in their daily instruction and empower students utilize these practices during all tiers of instruction. • Teachers will teach with conceptual understanding at the forefront and utilize authentic formative assessments to plan instruction that is responsive to students' individual needs.

	in K-5 will explore key math concepts through hands-on activities at the concrete and pictorial levels. Students will actively employ the Standards for Mathematical Practice daily during all tiers of instruction.		

(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:	Strengthen overall literacy development in grades K-2 and reading comprehension in grades 2-5		
Instructional strategies:	Developing comprehension lessons	**Approximate dates:**	October-December
Meeting	**Learning objectives for teachers**		**Support needed**
Admin-Directed (10/4)	Teachers will develop an understanding of how to teach students to monitor their comprehension when reading through annotating, noting when meaning breaks down, applying "fix-it strategies."		
Admin-Directed (10/11)	Teachers will develop an understanding of how to teach students to monitor their comprehension when reading through annotating, noting when meaning breaks down, applying "fix-it strategies."		
Admin-Directed (10/18)	Grade level teachers will develop whole/small group mini-lessons monitoring comprehension using RS stories		
SILT (11/1)	Share learning walk data on monitoring comprehension mini-lessons and discuss what teachers are doing well and the areas in which they needed support (individual, grade level or group)		
BB PD (11/9)	Teachers will develop an understanding of how to teach students to		

	engaging with and question text to deepen understanding.	
Admin-Directed (11/15)	Grade level teachers develop whole/small-group mini-lessons on questioning texts using RS stories	
SILT (11/23)	Share learning walk data on questioning texts mini-lessons and discuss what teachers are doing well and the areas in which they needed support (individual, grade level or group)	
Admin-Directed (11/29)	Teachers will develop an understanding of how to teach students to visualizing and infer as they read.	
Admin-Directed (12/6)	Grade level teachers will develop whole/small group mini-lessons visualizing and inferring using RS stories	
SILT (12/13)	Share learning walk data on visualizing and inferring mini-lessons and discuss what teachers are doing well and the areas in which they needed support (individual, grade level or group)	

Focus area 2:	Strengthen writing across all grade levels		
Instructional strategies:	Developing/Implementing Writers' Workshop Model	**Approximate dates:**	January-March
Meeting	**Learning objectives for teachers**		**Support needed**
Admin-Directed (1/4)	Teachers will unpack writing standards for argumentative writing and identify the skills that need to be taught to master the standard. Teachers will develop a student writing checklist for argumentative writing and student-friendly rubrics for this genre.		
Admin-Directed (1/18)	Teachers will develop whole/small group mini-lessons for teaching the skills embedded in the standard		
1/23: Professional	Teachers will analyze student writing and plan addition lessons based on		Literacy Director

Development	data; Teachers will learn how to conduct student conferences and provide targeted, explicit feedback to students on writing;	
BB PD (2/1)	Teachers will share examples of student work, mini-lessons and feedback	
SILT 2/15	Teachers will share student exemplars	

Focus area 3:	Develop and strengthen conceptual understanding in math grades K-5		
Instructional strategies:	Teaching conceptual understanding: place value; subtracting, multiplication/division; fractions	**Approximate dates:**	March-June
Meeting	**Learning objectives for teachers**		**Support needed**
Admin-Directed (3/1)	Teachers will develop conceptual understanding of place value and how to structure learning to build place value knowledge in grades K-5.		Math Director
BB PD (3/8)	Teachers will explore hands-on activities for teaching place value K-2 and 3-5.		Math Director
Admin-Directed (3/15)	Teachers will develop conceptual understanding of subtracting with regrouping and how to structure learning to build subtracting/grouping knowledge in grades K-5.		Math Director
Admin-Directed (4/5)	Teachers will explore hands-on activities for teaching regrouping K-2 and 3-5.		Math Director
BB-PD (4/12)	Teachers will develop conceptual understanding of multiplication/division and how to structure learning to build this knowledge in grades K-5.		Math Director
Admin-Directed (4/26)	Teachers will explore hands-on activities for teaching multiplication and division.		Math Director
BB-PD (5/10)	Teachers will develop conceptual understanding of fractions and how to structure learning to build fraction knowledge in grades K-5.		Math Director
Admin-Directed (5/24)	Teachers will explore hands-on activities for teaching units of measurement.		Math Director

Focus area 4:	Strengthen overall family engagement at Swift.		
Instructional strategies:	Develop staff capacity to build and strengthen family engagement through exploring ways to welcome families, communicate effectively with parents/guardians, and support student success through parent-teacher communication regarding student progress.	**Approximate dates:**	November-June
Meeting	**Learning objectives for teachers**		**Support needed**
Admin-Directed (11/22)	Teachers will assess the school's overall climate by completing and discussing the PTA National Standards for Family-School Partnerships Assessment Guide.		
Admin-Directed (12/21)	Staff will discuss results of assessment guide, drawing connections between it and the 2015-16 Panorama survey results. Staff will select 2-3 focus areas/standards on which to focus (Standard 1-Welcoming All Families; Standard 2 Communicating Effectively; Standard 3-Supporting Student Success; Standard 4-Speaking Up for Every Child; Standard 5-Sharing Power; Standard 6: Collaborating Community). Staff will develop an action plan.		
Admin-Directed (1/11; 2/8; 3/14; 4/11)	Using the National PTA National Standards Implementation Guide and Action Plan Templates, teachers will develop capacity around focus areas/standards. Teachers will share progress with action plans.		
Admin-Directed (5/16)	Teachers will share individual and team successes regarding their progress in developing/strengthening family engagement through work on the PTO School Partnership standards. Staff will reflect on areas within the standards that need to be developed additionally.		