



School Improvement Plan

School Year 2016-2017

School: *Pacheco Elementary School*

Principal: *Celeste Hoeg*

Section 1. Set goals aligned to the AIP

(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.

Using STAR BOY Data and the STAR State Performance Report,

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.*

At Pacheco, this means in grade 3 in STAR Math we will need to move 18 students from level 1, 2, & 3 to level 4 or 5.

At Pacheco, this means in grade 4 in STAR Math we will need to move 24 students from level 1, 2, & 3 to level 4 or 5.

At Pacheco, this means in grade 5 in STAR Math we will need to move 17 students from level 1, 2, & 3 to level 4 or 5.

At Pacheco, this means in grade 3 in STAR Reading we will need to move 21 students from level 1, 2, & 3 to level 4 or 5.

At Pacheco, this means in grade 4 in STAR Reading we will need to move 22 students from level 1, 2, & 3 to level 4 or 5.

At Pacheco, this means in grade 5 in STAR Reading we will need to move 16 students from level 1, 2, & 3 to level 4 or 5.

2. *BY EOY, the district will see at least 10% of students in warning move into needs improvement in ELA and Math.*

At Pacheco, this means in grade 3 in STAR Math and Reading we will need to move 6 students from level 1, 2, to level 3

At Pacheco, this means in grade 4 in STAR Math and Reading we will need to move 6 students from level 1, 2, to level 3

At Pacheco, this means in grade 5 in STAR Math and Reading we will need to move 6 students from level 1, 2, to level 3

3. *By EOY, the district will see at least 10% of students in proficient move into advanced in ELA and Math*

At Pacheco, this means in grade 3 in STAR Math and Reading we will need to move 3 students to level 5.

At Pacheco, this means in grade 4 in STAR Math and Reading we will need to move 2 students to level 5.

At Pacheco, this means in grade 5 in STAR Math and Reading we will need to move 2 students to level 5.

(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.

Content data boards will be utilized to track student progress. Each class will have its own min-data board on the larger grade level data board. BOY scores in STAR Reading and Math and DIBELs will be noted on the appropriate colored papers and placed in the corresponding category on the data board. As progress monitoring takes place, students will be moved to the area on the board that corresponds with their PM score.

Grade level and individual data meetings will be utilized on a monthly basis. Grade level teams will move students based on PM scores and in individual data meeting teachers will discuss how their instructional time is matched to their students' needs as demonstrated by PM scores and student work.

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

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

Based on EOY Galileo data, there was a significant increase in the percentage of Grade 3 students scoring at the proficiency level this year (Level 4 and 5) from 12% to 35% - tripling the number of students attaining proficiency (+23)

There was a significant increase in the percentage of Grade 3 students scoring at the proficiency level this year (Level 4 and 5) from 8% to 36% - quadrupling the number of students attaining proficiency (+28).

Kindergarten students gained 19 percentage points between BOY and EOY (38-44-57). Although this is lower than the 2014-15 EOY K proficiency level of 69% where consistent gains were made between BOY- MOY- EOY (38-48-69).

ELA EOY Galileo Data shows:

Grade 2 increased 20 percentage points between BOY and EOY (37-50-57) attaining an EOY

proficiency of 57% outpacing the district average of 55%.

Grade 3 increased 22 percentage points between BOY and EOY (29-51-51) attaining an EOY proficiency of 51% slightly below the district proficiency of 53.

Grade 2 was the only grade that surpassed the district proficiency level, though Grade 3 came close.

Significant progress is noted for ELL students in ELA with 57% of Grade 2 students (20 students), 50% of Grade 3 students (20 students), 38% of Grade 4 students (11 students), and 28% of Grade 5 students (7 students) attaining proficiency. Grades 2, 3, and 4 all showed strong progress.

Math EOY Galileo Data shows:

Grade 2 increased 37 percentage points from BOY to EOY (47-79-86) with 86% of the students attaining proficiency at EOY outpacing by a considerable margin the district proficiency of 72%.

Grade 3 increased 41 percentage points from BOY to EOY (26-42-63) with 63% of the students showing proficiency at EOY, a dramatic change from last year's EOY at 23% and demonstrating this year, continuous momentum in the right direction.

Strong progress was made for ELL students also in Math with 89% of Grade 2 students (31 students), 63% of Grade 3 students (25 students), 17% of Grade 4 students (5 students), and 28% of Grade 5 students (7 students) attaining proficiency. Grades 2 and 3 showed the strongest progress and the assessment of how SEI strategies are being embedded while Grade 4 and Grade 5 classrooms bears review given the above data.

Math Growth data was much stronger than ELA and came closer to the goal: *At least 60-80% in each class will have high growth between BOY-MOY and EOY.* In Math, out of 11 classrooms, 7 classrooms exceeded growth targets and 4 classrooms maintained growth targets.

Grade 2 – 84% (Ranges in the high growth/high achievement category were significant: 67%, 100%, and 85% with only 3 students in the entire grade showing low growth/low achievement).

Grade 3 – 61% (Ranges in the high growth/high achievement category were: 48%, 77%, and 57% with all three classrooms exceeding growth targets).

(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?

The areas with the greatest concern at Pacheco based on SY 15-16 data is grade K, 1 & 2 DIBELS growth and Grades 4 & 5 overall subject matter growth based on Galileo English & Math data.

In ELA,

There was a severe drop in the percentage of Grade 4 students attaining proficiency SY 15 16 (Level 4 and 5) from 35% to a low 8%, this was a -27.

There was an equally disconcerting drop in Grade 5 students attaining proficiency SY 15 16 (Level 4 and 5) from 35% to 22%, this was -13.

Both Grade 4 and 5 had no students scoring at Level 5.

In Math.

There was a decline in the percentage of Grade 4 students attaining proficiency this year (Level 4 and 5) from 17% to 14% (-3).

There was an equally disconcerting drop in Grade 5 students attaining proficiency this year (Level 4 and 5) from 28% to 12% (-16).

Again, as in ELA, both Grade 4 and 5 had no students scoring at Level 5.

ELA

Overall EOY DIBELS data reflects a 6% increase from BOY to EOY (56-50-62) to a 62% proficiency level. This reflects an overall decline from the 2014-15 EOY overall proficiency of 76%.

Kindergarten students gained 19 percentage points between BOY and EOY (38-44-57). This is lower than the 2014-15 EOY K proficiency level of 69% where consistent gains were made between BOY- MOY- EOY (38-48-69).

Grade 1 students moved 4 percentage points between BOY and EOY (53-46-57). The 57% EOY proficiency level is significantly lower than the 2014-15 EOY for Grade 1 at 77% where again gains were made throughout last year (62-68-77).

Grade 2 students declined 9 percentage points between BOY and EOY (80-65-71) with a significant difference from the 2014-15 EOY proficiency level of 83%. Last year, students showed flat performance from BOY to MOY but gained momentum between MOY and EOY (72-72-83).

Grade 4 increased 5 percentage points between BOY and EOY (24-24-29) demonstrating abysmally low progress with very low proficiency levels. The district proficiency was 59%. The EOY proficiency of 29% is flat with the 2014-15 EOY proficiency of 28%.

Grade 5 had flat performance between BOY and EOY (29-38-30) demonstrating no gains and a decline between MOY and EOY. The district proficiency was 55%. The 2014-15 EOY proficiency level was 50%.

Math

Grade 4 made very little progress (7 percentage points) between BOY and EOY (9-6-16) with only 16% of the students attaining proficiency at EOY. The district proficiency for this year is 56%.

Grade 5 increased 7 percentage points between BOY and EOY (14-7-21) with only 21% of the students attaining proficiency at EOY which is significantly lower than the 2014-15 EOY proficiency of 89% (59-60-89). The district proficiency for this year is 53%.

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:

- Differentiated Instruction

2-3 Secondary Focus Areas:

- Writing Instruction
- Accountable Talk

#1 Primary Focus Area: *Differentiated Instruction*

Due to the lack of increase in student achievement in most grades as noted by DIBELs and Galileo scores over SY 15 16, students need to be taught the standards using text and materials they can access. If students are expected to continuously complete the same worksheet, writing assignment, and centers, without matching these opportunities of practice/application to their data, Pacheco students will not be successful in the mastery of standards and closing the achievement gap.

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
What is differentiated instruction?	Principal	10/4
Why to differentiate Instruction?	Principal	10/5
Planning to differentiate instruction using Reading Street & NB Curriculum Guides (including UbD template & productive struggle opportunities)	RS & Principal	10/2016 1 hour after school
Planning to differentiate using enVisions2.0 and the NB Curriculum Guides (including UbD template & productive struggle opportunities)	TLS & Principal	10/2016 1 hour after school
Teacher Application LASW re: planning	Principal	10/11
Delivering Differentiated Instruction (including formative	ESL & Principal	10/25

assessment and checking for understanding strategies)		
Teacher Application LASW re: delivery & execution	Principal	11/3
Re-teaching based on outcomes of Differentiated Instruction	Principal	11/2016 1 hour after school
Teacher Application LASW re: re-teaching & student outcomes	Principal	11/10
<i>Teacher products presentations (either lesson plans, student outcomes/work & post lesson observations)</i>	Principal	Not sure right now

#2 Secondary Focus Area: Writing in ELA

Students need to be taught not only how to write but what to write based on the depth of the grade level writing standard. Teachers will have opportunities to unpack writing standards, plan, execute and review the effectiveness of their instruction based on student work and outcomes. Writing routines and expectations for both teachers and students will be developed through school wide norms.

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
Unpack the focus standard for Unit	Principal/RS/TLS	11/2016-1/2017
Identify key factors to be taught	Principal/RS/TLS	11/2016-1/2017
Identify teacher actions (how will key factors be taught)	Principal/RS/TLS	11/2016-1/2017
Identify student actions (what will the students act on)	Principal/RS/TLS	11/2016-1/2017
Crosswalk between rubric and standard	Principal/RS/TLS	11/2016-1/2017
Review PARCC writing prompts & exemplars	Principal/RS/TLS	11/2016-1/2017
Creation of mini lessons based on validated key factors from crosswalk	Principal/RS/TLS	11/2016-1/2017
What does writing instruction look like at Pacheco? (identify student pre-assessment for writing standard, classroom routines, norms by grade span, resources & uses of resources, student products)	Principal/RS/TLS	11/2016-1/2017
Effective student conferences T-S, S-S & student to self-assessment (checklist, student rubric based on district rubric)	Principal/RS/TLS	11/2016-1/2017
Re-teaching model for writing-why & how	Principal/RS/TLS	11/2016-1/2017
Revision model and school wide routines	Principal/RS/TLS	11/2016-1/2017

#3 Secondary Focus Area: Accountable Talk/Academic Discourse

Before students can do “it” they need to talk about “it”. Student discussion and processing of information is key to students then being able to respond to the given material in writing and master grade level standards. Accountable Talk/Talk Moves/Academic Discourse will provide another strategy

to engage students with grad level material and keep students accountable and help them to articulate their thinking and extend their understanding across subjects with the given strategy or knowledge.

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
What is accountable talk/academic discourse?	Principal/RS/TLS/ESL	2/2017-4/2017
The role accountable talk with ELLs & SPED	Principal/RS/TLS/ESL	2/2017-4/2017
How to utilize accountable talk in math—making their thinking visible to others	Principal/RS/TLS/ESL	2/2017-4/2017
Planning for accountable talk in math—resources, unpacking math standards and identify key factors students need to not only understand and revoice	Principal/RS/TLS/ESL	2/2017-4/2017
Teacher presentations for planning	Principal/RS/TLS/ESL	2/2017-4/2017
Creation of Pacheco norms for using accountable talk in math and in general by grade spans	Principal/RS/TLS/ESL	2/2017-4/2017
Linking accountable talk to writing in both ELA & Math	Principal/RS/TLS/ESL	2/2017-4/2017
Planning for student use of accountable talk in math writing/math explanations	Principal/RS/TLS/ESL	2/2017-4/2017
Teacher presentations re: evidence of accountable talk in writing	Principal/RS/TLS/ESL	2/2017-4/2017

(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	PM on STAR, student writing samples & evidence from lesson plans & classroom observations
What I will see by <u>Feb. 1</u> to know that students are on track to meet the end-of-year goal	MOY on STAR, LASW data meetings, District writing outcomes/data collection & evidence from lesson plans & classroom observations
What I will see by <u>May 1</u> to know that students are on track to meet the end-of-year goal	PM on STAR, LASW data meetings, lesson plans and classroom observations

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 <u>and</u> students)	Current strengths in teacher practice related to this focus	Desired <u>changes</u> in teacher practice related to this focus
Differentiated Instruction	Instruction will be based on data, not a given program. Teachers will link data and student outcomes. Students will have differentiated avenues/centers/opportunities to demonstrate their mastery of standards.	In some centers during some topics, teachers differentiate the work students are given to act on and practice their application of knowledge.	Teachers will review given standards and plan backwards with their students proficiency levels in mind and match materials to students’ needs. Differentiation will begin with planning, continue in instructional time and be evident in student work and engagement
Writing in ELA	Teachers will follow a similar writing routine and use of resources when delivering instruction to students to ultimately master the given writing standard.	The narrative writing process in SY 16 17 followed a similar process and have been met with some initial success.	Teachers will plan their instruction based on standards and not on a given program like Reading Street or enVisions. Opportunities for students to demonstrate their understanding of the given writing standard will be developed with productive struggle. Students will have increased opportunities to produce writing that demonstrated their understanding while teachers facilitate learning and build capacity via mini-lessons.
Accountable Talk/academic language	Classroom discussions across the grade spans will be normed so that students have strategies to articulate	Only a few classes utilize a given set of norms when having classroom discussions.	Opportunities for students to actively discuss their reasoning will be developed based on standards and

	their thinking and extend their understanding.		would-be student outcomes for a given topic. School-wide norms will be followed and these discussion techniques will be transferred into students' writing on the given topic where they explain their thinking and answers.
--	--	--	--