School Improvement Plan

School Year 2015-2016
School: *John B. DeValles Elementary School*
Principal: *Joshua L. Almeida*

Section 1. Set goals aligned to the 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*

2014 – 2015
EOY Galileo Benchmark Summary
Grade 2 – Now Grade 3 (Number of Students)

Reading				Math			
Level	**2014 – 2015 EOY Results**	**2015 – 2016 EOY Goal**	**Change**	**Level**	**2014 – 2015 EOY Results**	**2015 – 2016 EOY Goal**	**Change**
Advanced	**0**	**4**	**+4**	**Advanced**	**4**	**7**	**+3**
Proficient	**36**	**54**	**+18**	**Proficient**	**34**	**51**	**+17**
NI	**29**	**8**	**-21**	**NI**	**22**	**3**	**-19**
Warning	**7**	**6**	**-1**	**Warning**	**12**	**11**	**-1**
Total	**72**	**72**		**Total**	**72**	**72**	

2014 – 2015
EOY Galileo Benchmark Summary
Grade 3 – Now Grade 4 (Number of Students)

Reading				Math			
Level	**2014 – 2015 EOY Results**	**2015 – 2016 EOY Goal**	**Change**	**Level**	**2014 – 2015 EOY Results**	**2015 – 2016 EOY Goal**	**Change**
Advanced	**4**	**6**	**+2**	**Advanced**	**31**	**32**	**+1**
Proficient	**20**	**36**	**+16**	**Proficient**	**14**	**19**	**+5**
NI	**29**	**11**	**-18**	**NI**	**6**	**0**	**-6**
Warning	**1**	**1**	**0**	**Warning**	**4**	**4**	**0**
Total	**54**	**54**		**Total**	**55**	**55**	**55**

Grade 3 represents an academic milestone where all content from K-2 "capstones" with the EOY Grade 3 Assessment

2014 – 2015
EOY Galileo Benchmark Summary
Grade 4 – Now Grade 5 (Number of Students)

Reading				Math			
Level	**2014 – 2015 EOY Results**	**2015 – 2016 EOY Goal**	**Change**	**Level**	**2014 – 2015 EOY Results**	**2015 – 2016 EOY Goal**	**Change**
Advanced	**0**	**1**	**+1**	**Advanced**	**8**	**9**	**+1**
Proficient	**14**	**33**	**+19**	**Proficient**	**13**	**28**	**+16**
NI	**23**	**4**	**-19**	**NI**	**13**	**0**	**-13**
Warning	**10**	**9**	**-1**	**Warning**	**14**	**13**	**-1**
Total	**47**	**47**		**Total**	**48**	**50**	**???**

DRAFT

2014 – 2015 EOY Galileo Benchmark Summary Current Grade 3 – 5 (Number of Students)							
Reading				Math			
Level	2014 – 2015 EOY Results	2015 – 2016 EOY Goal	Change	Level	2014 – 2015 EOY Results	2015 – 2016 EOY Goal	Change
Advanced	4	11	+7	Advanced	43	49	+6
Proficient	70	122	+52	Proficient	61	98	+37
NI	81	24	-57	NI	41	1	-40
Warning	18	16	-2	Warning	30	27	-3
Total	173	173		Total	175	175	

2014 – 2015 EOY Galileo Benchmark Summary Current Grade 3 – 5 (Number of Students)						
	2014 – 2015 EOY Results (Historical Data)			2015 – 2016 EOY Goal		
	# of students not Proficient or Advanced	# of students in Warning	# of students in Proficient	# of students not Proficient or Advanced	# of students in Warning	# of students in Advanced
Reading (ELA)	99	18	70	59 or less	16 or less	11 or more
Mathematics	71	30	61	43 or less	27 or less	49 or more

***** DIBELS DATA TO GO HERE *****

(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 examples for tracking student data that could be helpful resources:

- *A data monitoring tool will be created to monitor student growth between Galileo Benchmark BOY, MOY, & EOY, and CFAs for Grades 2-5 as scheduled by the district with the help of Microsoft Excel*
- *DIBELs data will be collected on every student in Grades K – 2 as scheduled in our district assessment calendar.*
- *Grade 1 & 2 students that performed poorly on the Reading Street Baseline and DIBELs will complete the DRA2 assessment as scheduled*
- *Reading Street College and Career Weekly Assessments and enVisionMath2.0 Performance Assessment data will be collected on all students between the MOY and EOY*

DRAFT

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?

2014 – 2015
EOY Galileo Benchmark Summary
Last Year's 3 – 5 (Number of Students)

	2014 -2015 EOY Goal # of students not Proficient or Advanced	2014 -2015 EOY Actual # of students not Proficient or Advanced	Goal Met (Y/N)	2014 -2015 EOY Goal # of students in Warning	2014 -2015 EOY Actual # of students In Warning	Goal Met (Y/N)	2014 -2015 EOY Goal # of students in Advanced	2014 -2015 EOY Actual # of students In Advanced	Goal Met (Y/N)
Reading (ELA)	**66**	**131**	**N**	**25**	**24**	**Y**	**?**	**?**	**?**
Mathematics	**54**	**98**	**N**	**16**	**47**	**N**	**?**	**?**	**?**

DRAFT

(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?**

Strengths:

Reading/ELA –

Grade 2 Students outperformed the district & scored 75% or higher on questions relating to the standards below
- RL.2.4: Craft & Structure – 80.56 on EOY Galileo (1 question)
- RL.2.5: Craft & Structure – 76.39 on EOY Galileo (4 questions)
- RI.2.1: Key Ideas & Details – 75% on EOY Galileo (4 questions)
- RI.2.6: Craft & Structure – 81.94% on EOY Galileo (1 question)

Grade 3 Students outperformed the district & scored 75% or higher on questions relating to the standards below
- RL.3.4: Craft & Structure – 90.91% on EOY Galileo (1 question)
- L.3.4: Vocabulary & Acquisition Use – 87.27% on EOY Galileo (2 questions)

Grade 4 Students outperformed the district & scored 75% or higher on questions relating to the standards below
- RL.4.4: Craft & Structure – 81.25% on EOY Galileo (1 question)

In conclusion, in comparison to the district, Grades 2-4 found strength in the area of craft and structure. Grade 2 specifically saw the most growth in RI.2.1 and RI.2.6 where gains toward mastery from BOY to EOY exceeded 50%. They tie this success to differentiated resources from Reading Street which encourage the use of workshops, level readers, and leveled fresh reads.

Mathematics –

Grade 2 Students outperformed the district & scored 75% or higher on questions relating to the standards below
- MD.3: Measurement & Data – 93.06% on EOY Galileo (1 question)
- MD.7: Measurement & Data – 84.72% on EOY Galileo (1 question)
- G.2: Geometry – 75% on EOY Galileo (1 question)

Grade 3 Students outperformed the district & scored 75% or higher on questions relating to the standards below
- OA.2: Operations & Algebraic Thinking – 85.45% on EOY Galileo (1 question)
- OA.4: Operations & Algebraic Thinking – 90.91% on EOY Galileo (1 question)
- OA.7: Operations & Algebraic Thinking – 85.45% on EOY Galileo (2 questions)
- NBT.1: Number & Operations in Base Ten – 83.64% on EOY Galileo (1 question)
- NBT.3: Number & Operations in Base Ten – 76.36% on EOY Galileo (2 questions)
- NF.1: Number & Operations-Fractions – 98.18% on EOY Galileo (1 question)
- NF.3d: Number & Operations-Fractions – 85.45% on EOY Galileo (1 question)
- MD.5: Measurement & Data – 94.55% on the EOY Galileo (1 question)
- MD.6: Measurement & Data – 76.36% on the EOY Galileo (1 question)
- MD.7d: Measurement & Data – 90.91% on the EOY Galileo (1 question)
- G.2: Geometry – 83.64% on the EOY Galileo (1 question)

Grade 4 Students outperformed the district & scored 75% or higher on questions relating to the standards below
- NF.3b: Number & Operations-Fractions – 89.80% on the EOY Galileo (1 question)
- MD.7: Measurement & Data – 77.55% on the EOY Galileo (1 question)
- G.3: Geometry – 75.51% on the EOY Galileo (1 question)

Grade 5 Students outperformed the district & scored 75% or higher on questions relating to the standards below
- MD.4: Measurement & Data – 87.50% on the EOY Galileo (1 question)

In conclusion, in comparison to the district, Grades 2-5 found strength in the area of measurement & data. It was determined that Grade 3 was an overall strength in mathematics as that were the only grade level where teachers were content specific.

DRAFT

Concerns:

Reading/ELA –

Grade 2 standards in which the gap between John B. DeValles Elementary and the district were the largest
- RL.2.2: Key Ideas & Details – 10 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (4 questions)
- RI.2.2: Key Ideas & Details – 12 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (2 questions)

Grade 3 standards in which the gap between John B. DeValles Elementary and the district were the largest
- RI.3.1: Key Ideas & Details – 10 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (3 questions)

Grade 4 standards in which the gap between John B. DeValles Elementary and the district were the largest
- RL.4.1: Key Ideas & Details – 14 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (4 questions)
- RI.4.1: Key Ideas & Details – 16 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (5 questions)
- L.4.6: Vocabulary Acquisition & Use – 27 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (1 question)

Grade 5 standards in which the gap between John B. DeValles Elementary and the district were the largest
- RL.5.4: Craft & Structure – 15 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (2 questions)
- RI.5.4: Craft & Structure – 17 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (3 questions)
- RI.5.5: Craft & Structure – 12 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (3 questions)
- L.5.4: Vocabulary Acquisition & Use – 13 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (3 questions)

In conclusion, in comparison to the district, Grades 2-4 struggled with finding Key Details using informational text.

Mathematics –

Grade 2 standards in which the gap between John B. DeValles Elementary and the district were the largest
- OA.1: Operations & Algebraic Thinking – 21 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (2 questions)
- OA.4: Operations & Algebraic Thinking – 17 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (1 question)
- NBT.5: Number & Operations in Base Ten – 20 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (2 questions)

Grade 3 standards in which the gap between John B. DeValles Elementary and the district were the largest
- NF.3.c: Number & Operations-Fractions – 20 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (1 question)
- OA.1: Operations & Algebraic Thinking – 6 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (2 questions)

Grade 4 standards in which the gap between John B. DeValles Elementary and the district were the largest
- NBT.4: Number & Operations in Base Ten – 22 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (2 questions)
- NF.5: Number & Operations-Fractions – 26 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (2 questions)
- MD.2: Measurements & Data – 25 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (2 questions)

Grade 5 standards in which the gap between John B. DeValles Elementary and the district were the largest
- NBT.1: Number & Operations in Base Ten – 29 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (1 question)
- NBT.3a: Number & Operations in Base Ten – 23 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (1 question)
- NF.4b: Number & Operations-Fraction – 27 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (1 question)

In conclusion, in comparison to the district, Grades 2 struggled with operations and algebraic thinking while grade 3-5 struggles with Number & Operations in Base Tens and Fractions.

DRAFT

Section 3. Develop strategies/actions to address focus areas

(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:

- ***Read to Know, Write to Show***

2 – 3 Secondary Focus Areas

- ***Conceptual Mathematics***
- ***Rigorous objectives tied to standards supported through the gradual release model***

#1 Primary Focus Area: A school wide focus on reading to know and writing to show in an effort to increase every child's proficiency in finding key details to support a claim.

Activities	*Person(s) Responsible*	*By when*
Professional Development will be provided to JBD staff that will share expectations and strategies of close reading as a strategy that supports students in reading for comprehension	*Principal, TLS, ILT*	
Professional Development will be provided to JBD staff that will support them in adopting a partner read and summarize strategy to support students with close reading and writing across content areas	*Principal, TLS, ILT*	
The common district writing protocol will be adopted by all staff members and implemented in ELA, Science and Social Studies	*Principal, TLS, ILT*	
Bi-weekly observations will be conducted to monitor the use of close reading to know, partner reading/summarizing and writing to explain and show	*Principal*	

#2 Secondary Focus Area: A school wide focus on conceptual mathematics in an effort to equip students with multiple problem-solving strategies.

Activities	*Person(s) Responsible*	*By when*
Professional Development will be provided to JBD staff that will define conceptual mathematics and look-fors.	*Principal, TLS, ILT*	
Professional Development will be provided to the JBD staff in order to increase the implementation of enVisionMath2.0 resources with a focus on conceptual mathematics	*Director of Math & STEM*	
Bi-weekly observations will be conducted to monitor the use of enVisionMath2.0 resources	*Principal*	

#3 Secondary Focus Area: A school wide focus on rigorous objectives tied to standards supported through the gradual release model so that every child is working towards meeting our high expectations with the appropriate supports.

Activities	*Person(s) Responsible*	*By when*
Professional Development will be provided to JBD staff that will define rigorous objectives that are supported through the gradual release model	*Principal*	
Bi-weekly observations will be conducted to monitor the use of rigorous objectives supported by the gradual release model	*Principal*	

DRAFT

(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 Nov. 1 to know that students are on track to meet the end-of-year goal	**By November 1st,** **1) 80% of students in grades 2 – 5 will be observed using close reading strategies on their ELA CFA** **2) 80% of students will be able to define what conceptual mathematics is and provide an example** **3) 50% of teachers will have fully implemented rigorous objectives aligned to the standards and supported through the gradual release model**
What I will see by Feb. 1 to know that students are on track to meet the end-of-year goal	**By February 1st,** **1) The percentage of students scoring warning on the ELA Galileo Benchmark will be reduced by 20% from the BOY to MOY as a result of using close reading strategies** **2) The percentage of students scoring warning on the Math Galileo Benchmark will be reduced by 20% from the BOY to MOY as a result of using strategies which support the conceptual understanding of mathematics** **3) 100% of teachers will have partial to full implementation of rigorous objectives tied to the standards supported through the gradual release model**
What I will see by May 1 to know that students are on track to meet the end-of-year goal	**By May 1st,** **1) The percentage of students scoring 0-1 on the ELA CFA will be reduced by 40% from the BOY to EOY as a result of using close reading strategies** **2) The percentage of students scoring "red" on the Math CFA will be reduced by 40% from the BOY to EOY as a result of using strategies which support the conceptual understanding of mathematics** **3) 90% of teachers will have full implementation of rigorous objectives tied to the standards supported through the gradual release model**

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.

DRAFT

Section 4. Develop a targeted PD plan to support SIP

(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
Read to Know, Write to Show	Teachers will model close reading in every part of their lesson; when reviewing the daily objective, text, and questions Teachers will model pair reading and summarizing Teachers will model a writing strategy presented during the PD Students will be able to efficiently annotate text and questions for the purpose of comprehension Students will be observed partner reading and summarizing Students will be observed efficiently using the writing protocol to respond to a prompt	Close reading not observed Pair reading & summarizing not observed Writing strategy observed in Grade 3	Teacher will model and require students to extract information from text using annotation strategies. Teachers will model and create lessons that allow students the opportunity to participate in pair reads and summarizing. JBD will adopt a common writing strategy.
Conceptual Mathematics	Teachers will design lessons that support conceptual understanding of mathematics through the implementation of centers and questioning Students will be able to apply their conceptual understanding of mathematics in order to improve their results on the district performance based assessments	Observed in grade 3 Early stages of development observed in grade 2	Teachers will create lessons that allow students to understand and practice mathematics using both procedural and conceptual methods.
Rigorous objectives tied to standards supported through the gradual release model	Teachers will post rigorous objectives tied to the CCSS supported through the gradual release model and aligned to all classroom activities Students will clearly identify the objectives and how they are connected to the work they are expected to complete	Understanding on CCSS	Objectives will be aligned to standards, tiered activities and daily assessments.

DRAFT

(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.

EXAMPLE

Focus area 1:			
Instructional strategy:		**Approximate dates:**	
Meeting	**Learning objectives for teachers**		**Support needed**
Oct. PD session 1	Introduce the purpose of using checks for understanding		
Oct. PD session 2	Explore 4 different styles of checks for understanding, analyzing strengths and weaknesses of each		
Oct. SILT meeting	Review results of baseline walkthrough looking for checks for understanding to determine current strengths and weaknesses		Would like Liaison to do learning walk and join SILT meeting
Oct. TCT meeting	(optional) Teachers share strategies to check for understanding		
Nov. PD session 1	Explore what points in the lesson are most important to check. Teachers bring upcoming lesson plans and incorporate checks for understanding at key points		
Nov. PD session 2	Explore tradeoffs between speed vs. simplicity, getting a deep answer from few students vs. shallow answer from many students, etc		
Nov. SILT meeting	Discuss differences between content areas and prepare guidance to teachers specific to content		Literacy and Math director support for how to use checks for understanding with Reading Street and enVisions
Nov. TCT meeting	(optional) Teachers share strategies to check for understanding		
Dec. PD session 1	Discuss how to use the data from checks for understanding to adjust mid-lesson. Teachers bring an upcoming lesson and add a plan to adapt and respond based on a check for understanding		
Focus area 1:	**Read to Know, Write to Show**		

DRAFT

Instructional strategies:	Close reading and summarizing (TBD)	**Approximate dates:**	October – December (Approximately 8 weeks)
Meeting	**Learning objectives for teachers**		**Support needed**

Focus area 2:	**Conceptual Mathematics**		
Instructional strategies:	Conceptual vs. Procedural Mathematics (TBD)	**Approximate dates:**	January – February (Approximately 8 weeks)
Meeting	**Learning objectives for teachers**		**Support needed**

DRAFT

Focus area 3:	**Rigorous objectives tied to standards supported through the gradual release model**		
Instructional strategies:	TBD	**Approximate dates:**	March – May
Meeting	**Learning objectives for teachers**		**Support needed**

DRAFT