

School Improvement Plan

School Year 2016-2017

School: *Roosevelt Middle School*

Principal: *Daniel Bossolt*

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, Roosevelt will show a 40% reduction in students not proficient or advanced in ELA and math for grades 6-8.

- In grade 6, Roosevelt will improve to proficiency approximately 50 students in ELA and 30 students in math.
- In grade 7, Roosevelt will improve to proficiency approximately 60 students in ELA and 40 students in math.
- In grade 8, Roosevelt will improve to proficiency approximately 50 students in ELA and 60 students in math.

2. By EOY, Roosevelt will see at least 10% of students in warning move into needs improvement in ELA and math.

- In grade 6, Roosevelt will move at least 6 students in ELA and 4 students in math out of the warning category.
- In grade 7, Roosevelt will move at least 7 students in ELA and 7 students in math out of the warning category.
- In grade 8, Roosevelt will move at least 9 students in ELA and 10 students in math out of the warning category.

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

- In grade 6, Roosevelt will move at least 7 students in ELA and 7 students in math into the

advanced category.

- In grade 7, Roosevelt will move at least 4 students in ELA and 7 students in math into the advanced category.
- In grade 8, Roosevelt will move at least 4 students in ELA and 4 students in math into the advanced category.

*(According to 15-15 EOY Galileo -Data will be updated using 16-17 BOY Galileo Benchmark Data when available)

(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>*

Roosevelt will track progress toward our goals and utilize new student data throughout the year to inform our instruction by:

- **Creating a data wall: Student names will be placed on magnets and/or post-its and divided by content, team and achievement level. In TCT, Data will be used to drive instruction and monitor the fluid placement of students in MARS-math and reading support intervention classes. We will use TCT to progress monitor MARS groupings and make adjustments as needed per the data. Teachers will use most current data to continually update data walls and track progress of student learning goals.**
- **Continuous completion of the data cycle: (Item analysis by standard/Re-teach/Re-assess) of BOY/MOY benchmark data and CFAs in math and ELA throughout the year as well as authentic student work.**
 - **Identification and focused planning grounded in the mastery of CCSS standards.**
 - **Priority standards should be identified using overall grade level data, sub-group data, and/or individual classroom based needs.**
 - **Accountability for reassessing student progress through LASW along with evidence of teachers' analysis of the work.**

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?

- Through our work with Focused Schools, Roosevelt developed a common instructional focus: Read to Know, Write to Show. Our goal remains to embed this focus into every aspect of our school community specifically by further embedding our IF in all classes.
- Grade 6 math showed strong and steady gains in proficiency from BOY to EOY (38% to 43% to 62%) +24 percentage points District EOY proficiency was 59%. The EOY 2014-15 data showed 44% proficiency, showing this year's results as much improved from last year.
- Grade 7 math demonstrated strong and steady gains in proficiency between BOY and EOY (19% to 35% to 42%) +23 percentage points. District EOY proficiency was 50%. The EOY 2014-15 data showed 22% proficiency. As with Grade 6, these results are improved from last year.

- Grade 6 ELA showed a peak in proficiency at MOY but declined by EOY (45% to 61% to 39%) -6 percentage points.
- Roosevelt introduced its PBIS (PAWS) program in January 2015 and will continue to revise and improve the program into the 15-16 school year. The PAWS program was a direct response to the high amount of disciplinary referrals. (See Part B for data)
- The use of Galileo benchmark data and common formative assessments along with the TCT district protocol has structured teacher collaboration meetings that support the use of the data and action planning to meet the needs of our student population. This is evident in 100% attendance of our core academic and special education teachers at TCTs.

(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?

RMS ELA EOY Galileo Data shows:

- Grade 6 showed a peak in proficiency at MOY but declined by EOY (45% to 61% to 39%) -6 percentage points. District EOY proficiency was 44%. The EOY 2014-15 data showed 31% proficiency, which is lower than this year's score.
- Grade 7 demonstrated no increase in proficiency between BOY and EOY with an alarming decline from the BOY to the EOY (38% to 37% to 22%) – 16 percentage points. District EOY proficiency was 31%. The EOY 2014-15 data showed 21% proficiency showing no progress this year over last year.
- Grade 8 decreased in proficiency between BOY and EOY (28% to 27% to 25%) -3 percentage points. District EOY proficiency was 30%. The EOY 2014-15 data showed 38% proficiency. This year's EOY shows a significant decrease in proficient students from last year's results and a significant decrease in high school readiness.
- All RMS proficiency levels in ELA were below the district average and all showed declines from the beginning of the year to the end of the year. Though Grade 6 showed an increase from last year's proficiency (44% compared to 31%), Grade 7 remained flat with last year (22%), and Grade 8 showed an alarming decline (25% compared to 38%.)

RMS Math EOY Galileo Data shows:

- Grade 8 shows a different pattern demonstrating flat results from BOY to EOY (23% to 22% to 24%). District EOY proficiency was 34%. The EOY 2014-15 data showed 26% proficiency. This year's EOY is on par with last year's leaving nearly 75 percent of Grade 8 students entering the high school without the necessary Math skills.
- Though Grade 6 and 7 improved from last year, proficiency levels are extremely low and Grade 8 indicates the need for a major review to determine the root causes for such disparities within and

between grades.

Roosevelt struggled last year with high numbers of tier two and three behaviors, a high amount of disciplinary referrals, and a low percentage at certain school culture data points.

- In 15-16, Roosevelt averaged 75 discipline referrals per grade each month, with a total of 1,612 for the year.
- In 15-16, Roosevelt had a total of 210 OS suspensions.
- According to the student survey administered in spring 2016, only 51% of students reported a favorable response to feeling like Roosevelt had a welcoming environment.
- According to the district staff survey administered in spring 2016, only 58% of Roosevelt staff reported a favorable response to overall school climate. This was a significant increase from the year before, but still not acceptable. In addition, only 67% are satisfied with the school as a place to work, and 32% responded favorably to staff morale being high at Roosevelt.
- RMS was among the bottom five NBPS with regard to overall rank on the Panorama 2016 family survey

Section 3. Develop strategies/actions to address focus areas

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

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

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

Primary Focus Area:

- Enhance Roosevelt's instructional focus, Read to know and Write to show across all disciplines to increase reading/responding proficiency.

Two Secondary Focus Areas:

- Strengthen our behavioral management system with enhanced PBIS, and improve the culture of the staff and students.
- Improve math achievement; specifically with regard to writing to show conceptual understanding of all designated mathematical standards.

- **#1 Primary Focus: Enhance Roosevelt’s instructional focus, Read to know and Write to show across all disciplines to increase reading/writing proficiency.**

Activities bucketed below

Buckets:

- **Curriculum = C**
- **Instruction = I**
- **Assessment = A**
- **Planning = P**

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
Review data from RMS '15-'16 BOY – EOY Galileo ELA results and preliminary PARCC ELA data - P	Principal, SILT	8/'16
Revamp the strategies of our instructional focus with streamlined annotation and written response guides. - I	Principal, TLSs, SILT	8/'16
Hold initial PD and ongoing training around the close reading and writing strategies we will implement to teach all students - I	Principal	8/30/16
Regular TCT meetings that focus on teacher analysis of data and student work within these areas - A/I/C	ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies and SPED Teachers TLSs	At least weekly all 16-17 SY
Observable classroom practices that support the instructional focus. (e.g. close reading, annotation of text and questions, RMS Big 5, accountable talk, +/- differentiation, etc) - I/C	Principal, AP, TLS, Teachers	9/2016-6/2017
Tracking of student progress on a range of assessments and LASW during every TCT meeting using the district provided template - I/C	Teachers, SILT, TLSs, and teachers	Monthly through 16-17 sy
Restructure intervention “MARS” classes to organize students by academic need and create a focused instructional plan that meets the needs of <u>ALL</u> learners. - I/A	HR team teachers, SpEd and ELL teachers, TLSs, and administration	8/'16
Revamp SILT with deeper and more frequent focus on data and SW - A/I	SILT	8/2016-6/2017
Weekly meeting with admin and TLSs to calibrate feedback, share LWs/recommendations, and hold each other accountable – I/C	ILT	8/2016-6/2017
Data meetings with teachers around BOY, MOY, and EOY benchmark scores to review progress, differentiate instruction, and rearrange MARS classes accordingly – I/P	TLSs, admin, SILT team, and teachers	After benchmark results are available throughout SY
Relaunch “SWAG” to make proficiency levels available to students so they can develop personal goals and motivate	Admin, TLSs, PBIS and SILT teams	

themselves to make gains and receive tier 3 incentives - I/P		
Lesson plan review and compare/contrast to observations – I/P	Admin	Bi-weekly throughout SY

- **#2 Secondary Focus Area: Strengthen our behavioral management system with enhanced PBIS, and improve the culture of the staff and students.**

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
Analyze behavioral, cultural, and discipline data	Admin and Wrap Coord	8/25/16
Revised our staff created tiered PBIS/RTI response system	Principal, all staff	8/2016
Train teachers on method of “teaching” our common expectations during the first two days of the year	Admin	8/29/16
Post common expectations continuously review and reinforce them	All RMS staff and students	Consistently all '16-'17 sy
Hold regular PD and additional training around PD with resources as needed	Principal, PBIS committee, state PBIS team	Monthly all '16-'17
Create a NB Middle School PLC team aligned in practice, partnerships, and during/after school programming including a potential Innovation Zone	Middle School Principals, selected staff, and community and organizational partners.	Regularly beginning in 7/2016 – 6/2017
Further define the Student Success Center with new programming, interventions, criteria, and support	CAO, WAM, Principal, Admin, School-based WAC, and SSC room teacher.	8/2016 – 10/2016

- **#3 Secondary Focus Area: Improve math achievement; specifically with regard to math fluency and writing to show conceptual understanding of all designated mathematical standards.**

Activities bucketed below

Buckets:

- **Curriculum = C**
- **Instruction = I**
- **Assessment = A**
- **Planning = P**

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
Review data from RMS '15-'16 BOY – EOY Galileo Math results and preliminary PARCC results - P	Principal, SILT	8/16
Run PD on application of the KNSA process with a focus on the writing/explaining piece - I/C/P	Principal, SILT	10/2016
When MCAS 2.0 information is available, run initial PD and ongoing training around the close reading and problem solving of MCAS style questions. I/P	Principal, TLS	2016
Regular TCT meetings that focus on teacher analysis of data and student work within these areas - A/I/C	All math and science teachers and new TLS	At least weekly '16-'17 sy
Tracking of student progress on a range of assessments - A/I/P	Teachers, SILT, and TCT members	Monthly through '16-'17 sy
Observable classroom practices that support the school instructional focus and increased rigor. (e.g. KNSA,	Principal, AP, TLS, Math Teachers	09/2016 -06-2017

accountable talk, differentiated multi-step, higher order word problems) - I/C		
Restructure intervention "MARS" classes to organize students by academic need and create a focused instructional plan that meets the needs of <u>ALL</u> learners. - I	HR team teachers, TLSs, SpEd and ELL teachers, and administration	8/2016 – 10/2016

(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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Results from the BOY Galileo in ELA and math - Results from BOY district CFAs - Comparison statistics re. conduct cards and/or disciplinary action between Sept./Oct. '15 and Sept./Oct. '16 - Regular cycle of LASW - School based culture survey
What I will see by <u>Feb. 1</u> to know that students are on track to meet the end-of-year goal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Results from the MOY Galileo in ELA and math - Data from last spring's PARCC assessments - Results from recent writing CFAs - Comparison statistics re. conduct cards and/or disciplinary action between Oct. '15 – Feb '16 and Oct. '16 – Feb. '17 - Progress Reports/report cards - Two cycles of LASW - Modified Panorama culture survey
What I will see by <u>May 1</u> to know that students are on track to meet the end-of-year goal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Results from ongoing district CFAs - Analysis of student work with evidence of our instructional focus during TCTs - Progress reports/report cards - Comparison statistics re. conduct cards and/or disciplinary action between Feb '16 – April '16 and Feb. '17 – April '17 - School based student survey prior to Panorama survey - Multiple cycles of LASW - School based culture survey

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

Section 4. Develop a targeted PD plan to support SIP

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

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

Focus area	What exemplary practice will look like after PD (describe for teachers and students)	Current strengths in teacher practice related to this focus	Desired changes in teacher practice related to this focus
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance our instructional focus, Read to know and Write to show, across all disciplines to increase reading/writing proficiency. 	<p>Students will be fully engaged in text and media while showing this engagement through close reading/viewing, annotation, and responding.</p> <p>Teachers across all content will weave in close reading, annotation, and writing strategies into their ranges of content in a consistent way through the gradual release structure.</p>	<p>In math, teachers had formal training in the KNSA annotation model – aligned to our new model. Also, we already received a year of consistent PD and implementation support of our IF.</p>	<p>Teachers must commit to try to consistently infuse these practices in their classes immediately within all classes along with a range of authentic and engaging texts.</p> <p>Teachers consistently bringing applicable SW to TCT meetings as well as post observations and binder evaluations.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen our behavioral management system with enhanced PBIS, and improve the culture of the staff and students. 	<p>Complete buy-in from teachers where: All staff are practicing our RMS staff expectations. Teachers are proficient with knowledge of PBIS supports and interventions as evidence by their utilization of tier 1-3 strategies to reinforce/consequence aligned +/- behaviors. Complete buy-in from students where all are meeting RMS student</p>	<p>We received a year of consistent PD on PBIS systems and all staff collectively created our tiered levels of +/- consequences as well as common expectations.</p>	<p><u>All</u> teachers must buy in to this system through meeting of PBIS expectations and use of tiered supports/interventions. Also, more representation is necessary on our PBIS committee as well as more involvement in our school day and after school PBIS incentives/events. Lastly, all teachers posting, reinforcing, and using language of our expectations.</p>

	<p>expectations. Students are motivated by positive reinforcements and PAWS as evidence by consistent positive behavior, investment in tier 1-3 incentives, regular attendance, improvement in frequency of discipline issues compared to '15-'16, and favorable responses on climate surveys.</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve math achievement; specifically with regard to math fluency and writing to show conceptual understanding of all designated mathematical standards. 	<p>Students will show increased ability to understand these types of problems through improved annotation as the year progresses. Teachers will use KNSA strategies and evidence of this practice in student work to progress monitor and differentiate instruction based on areas of need.</p>	<p>Teachers are comfortable and had choice in the KNSA tools/support.</p>	<p>Staff who is comfortable in the use of KNSA will collaborate with those that need additional assistance. Also, a higher level of consistency is need across all math grade levels with regard to scope/sequence of units and lesson as well as KNSA annotation practice done in TCTs. Lastly, teachers are regularly bringing appropriate SW to TCTs.</p>

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

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

Focus area 1:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance our instructional focus, Read to know and Write to show, across all disciplines to increase reading/writing proficiency. 		
Instructional strategies:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Close Reading/Annotation - HOT questions and responses - Open and Constructed Response writing 	Approximate dates:	Sept. '16 – June '17
Meeting	Learning objectives for teachers		Support needed
Sept PD 1 & 2	Reintroduce the revamped instructional focus and aligned teaching strategies. Also we will continue training around new PBIS system and tiered interventions. Additionally, we will learn how to use a new multi sectioned folder to organize and progress monitor student work that stems from RMS Big 5 best practices. Lastly, we will discuss and offer Q&A on the Innovation Zone plans.		SILT, TLSs, WAC, PBIS team, District admin
October PD 1 October 27 th full day	Review our RMS Big 5 LASW folder system. Modeling/guided practice of close reading/annotation on a range of standard-based <u>HOT questions</u> from various content areas. 10/27 – Further training and deeper understanding of PBIS with focus on tier 1 +/- behaviors and supports/interventions. Continue modeling/guided practice of close reading/annotation on a range of standard-based <u>HOT questions</u> .		SILT, ELA TLS, WAC, and PBIS committee
November PD 1 & 2	Modeling and guided practice of close reading/annotation on a myriad of <u>texts</u> from various content areas. (Focus on rigor as 1/5 of our Big 5). Review our RMS Big 5 LASW folder system.		SILT, ELA TLS, and PBIS committee
December PD 1& 2	Review and deeper dive into our strategies of close reading/annotation of more <u>texts</u> . Review of student work (from folder system) to analyze progress and proficiency levels of students with regard to close reading/annotation practice of <u>texts</u> . (Focus on rigor)		SILT, TCT products, and TLS

January PD 1 January 23 rd full day	Review of annotation practice for HOT <u>questions and aligned texts</u> and its connection to PBIS through incentivizing this practice. Training on student engagement through the implementation of teaching to different modalities as well as +/- differentiation.	SILT, TLS, and PBIS committee
February PD 1 & 2	Bridging the skills of close reading/annotation to that of <u>open and/or constructed response writing</u> . Guided practice for deeper understanding of proficient and exemplar OR/CR writing examples per our school-wide common rubric.	SILT and ELA TLS
March PD 1 & 2	Review of the gradual release model (1/5 of RMS Big 5). Guided practice for deeper understanding of proficient and exemplar <u>OR/CR</u> writing examples per the DESE ELA rubric.	SILT, TLS, and PBIS committee
April PD 1 & 2	Focus on high leverage areas of instruction (close reading, annotation, OR/CR, etc.) based on MOY and CFA data. Additional focus on target students' data through LASW.	SILT and ELA TLS
May PD 1 & 2	Continued focus on high leverage areas based on data to prepare for Galileo EOY. Plan to implement highly motivating school-wide PBIS incentives/event to encourage effort and performance on EOY assessment.	SILT and PBIS committee
June PD 1 & 2	Review of EOY data when available as well as +/- of instructional focus and aligned strategies on student achievement in order to finish year strong as well as prepare for launch next year.	SILT, admin, and teachers

Focus area 2:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthen our behavioral management system with enhanced PBIS, and improve the culture of the staff and students. 		
Instructional strategies:	Tier 1 -3 interventions and supports	Approximate dates:	Sept. '16 – June '17
Meeting	Learning objectives for teachers		Support needed
Sept PD 1 & 2	We will continue training and review our revised PBIS system and tiered interventions as well as common expectations stemming from our full day PBIS training on 8/29/16.		WAC and SSC teacher

October PD 1 & 2	Continued training and deeper understanding of PBIS with focus on tier 1 +/- behaviors and supports/interventions. Also, plan for Halloween PBIS event.	PBIS committee, WAC
Oct. 27 PD day	Deep dive into PBIS tiered supports, interventions in response to tiered behaviors.	PBIS committee, WAC, and DESE training
November PD 1 & 2	Continued training and deeper understanding of PBIS with focus on tier 2 and 3 +/- behaviors and supports/interventions.	PBIS committee, WAC
December PD 1	Plan for PBIS winter event to recognize students who've met RMS expectations	PBIS committee, WAC
January PD 1	Continued training and deeper understanding of PBIS with a focus on tier 2 and 3. Check in on school wide interventions, incentives, and events.	PBIS committee, WAC, and DESE training
January all day PD	Review of common expectations and tiered interventions to promote them. Also planning of winter classroom/school-wide incentives and tier 1-3 events.	PBIS committee and WAC
March PD 1 & 2	Review of PBIS tier 1 interventions and supports. State support.	PBIS committee, WAC, and DESE
April PD 1 & 2	Review of PBIS tier 2 & 3 interventions and supports.	PBIS committee and WAC
May PD 1 & 2	Plan to implement highly motivating school-wide PBIS incentives/event to encourage effort and performance on EOY assessment.	PBIS committee, WAC, and DESE training
June PD 1 & 2	Review of PBIS success per disciplinary data and Panorama results to finish year strong as well as prepare for launch next year.	PBIS committee and WAC

Focus area 3:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve math achievement; specifically with regard to math fluency and writing to show conceptual understanding of all designated mathematical standards. 		
Instructional strategies:	KNSA math annotation	Approximate dates:	Sept. '16 – June '17
Meeting	Learning objectives for teachers		Support needed
Sept PD 1 & 2	Reintroduce the revamped instructional focus and aligned teaching strategies and the parallels between the new annotation and KNSA.		Admin, SILT, and math TLS
October PD 1 October 27 th PD	Modeling and guided practice of close reading/KNSA of a range of questions from various units including math <u>PARCC/MCAS like questions</u> . Further review of evidence of this practice by LASW.		SILT and math TLS
November PD 1 & 2	Modeling and guided practice of close reading/KNSA of a range of math		SILT and math TLS

	problems from various grade levels' UoS. Further review of evidence of this practice by LASW.	
December PD 1& 2	Review of student work to analyze progress and proficiency levels of classes with regard to close reading/annotation (KNSA) practice with multi-step word problem.	SILT, TCT products, and TLS
January PD 1 January 23 rd PD	Review of annotation practice and its connection to exemplar MCAS solutions and exemplar math CFA student responses. Modeling and guided practice of this problem solving.	SILT, Math TLS, and TCT
February PD 1 & 2	Guided practice for deeper understanding of proficient and exemplar KNSA annotation per the KNSA template.	SILT and Math TLS
March PD 1 & 2	Guided practice for deeper understanding of proficient and exemplar solutions/responses per the DESE math rubric.	SILT and Math TLS
April PD 1 & 2	Focus on high leverage areas of instruction (KNSA and multi-step solution strategies) based on MOY and CFA data. Additional focus on target students' data through LASW.	SILT, TLS, and admin
May PD 1 & 2	Continued focus on high leverage areas based on data to prepare for Galileo EOY. Plan to implement highly motivating school-wide PBIS incentives/event to encourage effort and performance on EOY assessment.	SILT, math TLS, and PBIS committee
June PD 1 & 2	Review of instructional focus, specifically with regard to KNSA impact on achievement in order to finish year strong as well as prepare for launch next year.	SILT and Math TLS