

School Improvement Plan

School Year 2016-2017

School: *John B. DeValles Elementary School*

Principal: *Joshua L. Almeida*

Instructional Leadership Team – Grade Level Teams

Section 1. Set goals aligned to the AIP

1. Literacy & Math (Grades 2 – 5)
 - By EOY the district will realize at least a 40% reduction in students in Levels 1, 2, and 3 in ELA & Math as measured by the STAR 360 Benchmark
 - By EOY the district will see at least 10% of students in Level 1 move into Level 2 or 3 in ELA & Math as measured by the STAR 360 Benchmark
 - By EOY the district will see at least 10% of students in Level 4 move into Level 5 as measured by the STAR 360 Benchmark
 - By MOY, 60% of students will score between a 40-60% student growth percentiles. By EOY, 80% of students will score between a 40-60% students growth percentiles.
2. Literacy (Kindergarten – Grade 2)
 - By MOY, John B. DeValles Elementary School will see at least 80% of its Kindergarten students meeting the benchmark in First Sound Fluency (FSF) and by the EOY see at least 80% of its Kindergarten students meeting the benchmark in Phoneme-Segmentation Fluency (PSF) as measured by the DIBELs assessment
 - By EOY, John B. DeValles Elementary School will see at least 80% of its students meeting the benchmark in Nonsense Word Fluency (CLS & WWR) and Oral Reading Fluency (DORF - Accuracy) in First Grade
 - By EOY, John B. DeValles Elementary School will see at least 80% of its students meeting the benchmark in Oral Reading Fluency (DORF – Fluency & Accuracy) in Second Grade

2015 – 2016 EOY Results & 2016 – 2017 EOY Goals

2015 – 2016 EOY Galileo Benchmark Summary Grade 2 – Now Grade 3 (Number of Students)					
Reading			Math		
Level	2015 – 2016 EOY Results	2016 – 2017 EOY Goal	Level	2015 – 2016 EOY Results	2016 – 2017 EOY Goal
Advanced	0	3	Advanced	3	6
Proficient	21	32	Proficient	21	30
NI	22	10	NI	24	13
Warning	12	10	Warning	6	5
Total	55	55	Total	54	54

2015 – 2016 EOY Galileo Benchmark Summary Grade 3 – Now Grade 4 (Number of Students)					
Reading			Math		
Level	2015 – 2016 EOY Results	2016 – 2017 EOY Goal	Level	2015 – 2016 EOY Results	2016 – 2017 EOY Goal
Advanced	1	4	Advanced	28	31
Proficient	28	38	Proficient	21	23
NI	32	19	NI	10	6
Warning	0	0	Warning	2	1
Total	61	61	Total	61	61

2015 – 2016					
EOY Galileo Benchmark Summary					
Grade 4 – Now Grade 5 (Number of Students)					
Reading			Math		
Level	2015 – 2016 EOY Results	2016 – 2017 EOY Goal	Level	2015 – 2016 EOY Results	2016 – 2017 EOY Goal
Advanced	6	9	Advanced	17	19
Proficient	25	27	Proficient	18	20
NI	12	7	NI	6	3
Warning	0	0	Warning	2	1
Total	43	43	Total	43	43

2014 – 2015					
EOY Galileo Benchmark Summary					
Current Grade 3 – 5 (Number of Students)					
Reading			Math		
Level	2015 – 2016 EOY Results	2016 – 2017 EOY Goal	Level	2015 – 2016 EOY Results	2016 – 2017 EOY Goal
Advanced	7	15	Advanced	48	54
Proficient	74	98	Proficient	60	74
NI	66	36	NI	40	21
Warning	12	10	Warning	10	9
Total	159	159	Total	158	158

2016-2017					
DIBELS Assessment Summary					
Current Grade K – 2					
	BOY	MOY Goal	Actual MOY	EOY Goal	Actual EOY
Kindergarten (FSF)	43%	62%		80%	
Kindergarten (PSF)	Not assessed on BOY			80%	
First Grade (CLS)	58%	69%		80%	
First Grade (WWR)	50%	65%		80%	
First Grade (DORF-Accuracy)	Not assessed on BOY			80%	
Second Grade (DORF-Fluency)	64%	72%		80%	
Second Grade (DORF-Accuracy)	60%	70%		80%	

Describe the system you will use to revisit student data throughout the year & track progress toward your goals as new data become available.

- A data monitoring tool has been created to monitor all student growth between the STAR 360 Benchmark BOY, MOY, & EOY using Microsoft Excel for Grades 2 through 5
 - Students will be identified by level
 - Student will be identified as CUSP target students based on EOY Galileo data and BOY STAR 360 data
 - Skill based SMART plans will be put into place to support CUSP target student in meeting their target goals as progress monitoring will be conducted using STAR 360
- A data monitoring tool has been created to identify Tier 2 and Tier 3 students using our EOY Galileo Benchmarks, the Reading Street Baseline Assessment, and the DRA2 toolkit for Grades 1 through 5
 - Progress monitoring will be conducted using the DRA2 assessment
 - Special Education Teachers, English Learner Teacher, & Reading Specialist
- A data monitoring tool has been created to monitor student performance on the Reading Street College and Career Readiness Weekly Assessments Grades K – 5
- Writing samples will be collected monthly in order to conduct a student work review protocol for Grades K – 5
- Math writing prompts collected monthly in order to conduct a student work review protocol for Grades K – 5
- DIBELs data will be collected on every student in Grades K, 1 & 2 as scheduled in our district assessment calendar.

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:

- MCAS 2.0
- STAR 360
- DIBELs
- DRA2
- 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
- Intervention data
- Mobility

Teacher data:

- Teacher attendance
- Teacher evaluations
- Tiering of support for teachers

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

2015 – 2016 EOY Galileo Performance Review based on 2015 – 2016 Goals

Goal 1: 40% reduction of students not scoring advanced or proficient from the BOY to EOY Galileo

Goal 2: 10% reduction of students scoring warning from the BOY to EOY Galileo

Goal 3: 10% increase of students scoring advance from BOY to EOY Galileo

Goal 4: 80%+ of Kindergarten Student meeting the benchmark for First Sound Fluency (FSF) and 80%+ of Grade 1 students meeting the benchmark for Nonsense Word Fluency (CLS)

	Goal 1 (40%)	Goal 2 (10%)	Goal 3 (10%)	Goal 4 (K)	Goal 4 (Gr. 1)		
ELA	Some Progress	Goal Met	Some Progress				
	18% reduction	16% reduction	6 to 8 (Goal: 14)				
Math	Significant Progress	Goal Not Met	Met				
	39% reduction	Increase	7 to 46 (Goal: 15)				
DIBELS						Met	Met

(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
 L.2.2a: Conventions of Standard English – 76.27% on EOY Galileo (1 question)
 L.2.4b: Vocabulary Acquisition & Use – 86.44% on EOY Galileo (1 question)

Grade 3 Students outperformed the district & scored 75% or higher on questions relating to the standards below
 RI.3.6: Craft & Structure – 80.65% on EOY Galileo (1 question)
 RI.3.7: Integration of Knowledge & Ideas – 85.48% on EOY Galileo (2 question)

Grade 4 Students outperformed the district & scored 75% or higher on questions relating to the standards below
 RL.4.1: Key Ideas & Details – 81.63% on EOY Galileo (4 question)
 RL.4.4: Craft & Structure – 85.71% on EOY Galileo (4 question)
 RI.4.1: Key Ideas & Details – 81.63% on EOY Galileo (4 question)
 RI.4.3: Key Ideas & Details – 89.80% on EOY Galileo (2 question)
 RI.4.4: Craft & Structure – 75.51% on EOY Galileo (2 question)
 RI.4.7: Integration of Knowledge & Ideas – 93.88% on EOY Galileo (2 question)

Grade 5 Students outperformed the district & scored 75% or higher on questions relating to the standards below
 RI.5.7: Integration of Knowledge & Ideas – 80.95% on EOY Galileo (4 questions)

In conclusion, in comparison to the district, Grade 3-5 demonstrated a strength with informational text. Potential reasons will be discussed further in our ongoing professional development sessions and administrative led meetings as we begin the our cycle of reviewing formative assessments.

Mathematics –

Grade 2 Students outperformed the district & scored 75% or higher on questions relating to the standards below
Grade 2 did not outperform the district in a standard but did score 75% or higher in the following standards

OA.4: Operations & Algebraic Thinking – 77.19% on EOY Galileo (1 question)

NBT.1a: Number & Operations in Base Ten – 84.21% on EOY Galileo (1 question)

NBT.1b: Number & Operations in Base Ten – 78.95% on EOY Galileo (1 question)

MD.6: Measurement & Data – 77.19% on EOY Galileo (1 question)

Grade 3 Students outperformed the district & scored 75% or higher on questions relating to the standards below

OA.1: Operations & Algebraic Thinking – 98.36% on EOY Galileo (2 question)

OA.3: Operations & Algebraic Thinking – 91.80% on EOY Galileo (4 question)

OA.4: Operations & Algebraic Thinking – 93.44% on EOY Galileo (1 question)

OA.7: Operations & Algebraic Thinking – 91.80% on EOY Galileo (2 questions)

NBT.1: Number & Operations in Base Ten – 90.16% on EOY Galileo (1 question)

NBT.2: Number & Operations in Base Ten – 85.25% on EOY Galileo (5 questions)

NBT.3: Number & Operations in Base Ten – 78.69% on EOY Galileo (2 questions)

NF.1: Number & Operations-Fractions – 100.00% on EOY Galileo (1 question)

MD.4: Measurement & Data – 86.89% on the EOY Galileo (1 question)

MD.5: Measurement & Data – 93.44% on the EOY Galileo (1 question)

MD.6: Measurement & Data – 85.25% on the EOY Galileo (1 question)

MD.7d: Measurement & Data – 93.44% on the EOY Galileo (1 question)

G.1: Geometry – 83.61% on the EOY Galileo (1 question)

Grade 4 Students outperformed the district & scored 75% or higher on questions relating to the standards below

OA.1: Operations & Algebraic Thinking – 83.33% on EOY Galileo (2 question)

OA.5: Operations & Algebraic Thinking – 75.00% on EOY Galileo (1 question)

NBT.4: Operations & Algebraic Thinking – 79.17% on EOY Galileo (2 question)

NF.2: Number & Operations-Fractions – 77.08% on EOY Galileo (1 question)

NF.3a: Number & Operations-Fractions – 87.50% on EOY Galileo (2 question)

NF.3b: Number & Operations-Fractions – 100.00% on EOY Galileo (1 question)

NF.4b: Number & Operations-Fractions – 81.25% on EOY Galileo (1 question)

NF.5: Number & Operations-Fractions – 85.42% on EOY Galileo (1 question)

NF.6: Number & Operations-Fractions – 93.75% on EOY Galileo (1 question)

MD.4: Measurement & Data – 83.33% on the EOY Galileo (2 question)

MD.5: Measurement & Data – 81.25% on the EOY Galileo (1 question)

MD.6: Measurement & Data – 77.08% on the EOY Galileo (1 question)

MD.7: Measurement & Data – 85.42% on the EOY Galileo (1 question)

Grade 5 Students outperformed the district & scored 75% or higher on questions relating to the standards below

NF.7b: Number & Operations-Fractions – 78.05% on EOY Galileo (1 question)

MD.4: Measurement & Data – 75.61% on the EOY Galileo (1 question)

In conclusion, the strengths in mathematics across grade levels is not as consistent as the trends we see in Reading. With that being said, Grades 3 & 4 saw results that outperformed the district in most standards. Algebraic thinking and number & operations in base ten & fractions were specifically noted as areas of strength. Our team attributes this to allowing teachers to be departmentalized in Grades 3 & 4.

Concerns:

Reading/ELA –

- Grade 2 standards in which the gap between John B. DeValles Elementary and the district were the largest
 - RI.2.1: Key Ideas & Details – 21 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (2 questions)
 - RI.2.8: Integration of Knowledge & Ideas – 18 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
 - RL3.2: Key Ideas & Detail – 8 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (3 questions)
 - RL.3.5: Craft & Structure – 12 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
 - RI.4.5: Craft & Structure – 6 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (3 questions)
- Grade 5 standards in which the gap between John B. DeValles Elementary and the district were the largest
 - RL.5.5: Craft & Structure – 24 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (4 questions)
 - RL.5.3: Key Ideas & Details – 18 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (3 questions)
 - RI.5.2: Key Ideas & Details – 17 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (3 questions)

In conclusion, in comparison to the district, Grade 3-5 noted more concerns with literary text than with informational text. Our STAR360 benchmark will aid us in determining potential reasons which will be discussed further in our ongoing professional development sessions and administrative led meetings as we begin the cycle of reviewing formative assessments.

Mathematics –

- Grade 2 standards in which the gap between John B. DeValles Elementary and the district were the largest
 - OA.1: Operations & Algebraic Thinking – 30 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (2 questions)
 - NBT.3: Number & Operations in Base Ten – 26 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (2 questions)
 - G.3: Geometry – 30 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.2.a: Number & Operations-Fractions – 10 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (1 question)
 - MD.3: Measurement & Data – 5 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
 - NBT.1: Number & Operations in Base Ten – 8 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (1 questions)
 - NF.4.a: Number & Operations-Fractions – 7 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (1 questions)
- Grade 5 standards in which the gap between John B. DeValles Elementary and the district were the largest
 - OA.1: Operations & Algebraic Thinking – 20 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (2 questions)
 - NBT.6: Number & Operations in Base Ten – 20 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (1 question)
 - NBT.2: Number & Operations in Base Ten – 18 points below the district on the EOY Galileo (1 question)

In conclusion, Grades 2 & 5 observed larger gaps in multiple standards as it related to the district. These two grade levels will be a focus as we roll out our STAR360 benchmark & progress monitoring tool.

Section 3. Develop strategies/actions to address focus areas

Primary Focus Area:

- ***Literacy - Writing Across the Curriculum - Read to Know & Write to Show (Year 2)***
 - o ***JBD Staff & Students will build on the read comprehension skills we implemented last year and now shift our professional development to focus on writing in all content areas.***

Secondary Focus Areas

- ***Literacy - Vocabulary Acquisition & Use –***
 - ***Accountable Talk to support student writing before, during & after writing exercises***
- ***Mathematics – Conceptual Thinking – summarizing and modeling to explain thinking***

#1 Primary Focus Area: A school-wide focus on writing across the curriculum in an effort to increase every child's proficiency in finding key details and ability to support a claim.

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
Content Knowledge		
Engage staff in the analysis of the writing standard in order to build their understanding of the writing standards with the goal of identifying skills in order to create mini-lessons. (30-minutes)	Principal, TLS, ILT	On-going
Teacher will engage in the development and creation of a student friendly writing rubric and scoring criteria for each genre. Writing exemplars will be collected at all grade levels and shared with all staff members.	Principal, TLS, ILT	On-going
Staff will collaborate in order to build a library of writing prompts in addition to those already in Reading Street's Writing to Sources which go beyond grade level expectations as opportunities for enrichment.	Principal, TLS, ILT	On-going
Staff members will generate a list of common vocabulary used in our writing process (K – 5) and use this academic language when discussing writing (i.e. brainstorm, sensory words, etc.)	Principal, TLS, ILT	On-going
Supporting Students at All Levels		
Develop a schedule which includes the ability for teachers to provide specific interventions during the school day with the support of the Special Education Teachers, Reading Specialist, EL Teacher and other support staff.	Principal, TLS, ILT	By end of October
Staff will engage in the development and creation of writing templates that support all students in their ability to improve the organization of their thinking in response to answering a question accurately and completely.	Principal, TLS, ILT	By end of November
Culture – Making the Focus Meaningful for Students		
Classroom and hallway “showcases” will be samples of student writing prompts.	Principal, TLS, ILT	By end of December
Teachers will nominate one student to read their writing prompt over the school intercom system during morning announcements. Grade levels will rotate daily.	Principal, TLS, ILT	By end of November
Our 21 st CCLC afterschool programming will have an emphasis on a daily and weekly writing reflection describing the details of their experiences at the end of each day/week.	TLS	On-going
Assessment		
Develop formative assessments that align with target genres in order to collect and review work samples using the collaboration cycle in action protocol – (Potential formative assessments may include Reading Street Weekly Question #5 will be used to progress monitor writing skills in grades 2 – 5)	Principal, TLS, ILT	Monthly
Observations will be conducted to monitor the unpacking of writing standards, the delivery of lessons focused on writing and analysis of student work	Principal	On-going
Create a writing conference log/template to support students with targeted feedback –Students will be conference with 1 – 2 times per month about their writing and “What do I need to improve?”	Principal, TLS, ILT	On-going

#2 Secondary Focus Area: A school-wide focus on vocabulary acquisition through the implementation of accountable talk. This will assist in improving class discussions, student engagement and a student's ability to communicate their thoughts before, during and after their writing using more complex academic language and vocabulary.

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
Content Knowledge		
Staff will receive professional development on vocabulary requisition. (Frayer Model, Seven Step Vocabulary process, Reading Street Vocabulary, Accountable Talk)	Principal, TLS, ILT	By end of December
Professional Development will be provided in which JBD staff will be able to practice the implementation of the Seven Step Vocabulary Process and Accountable Talk with the assistance of coaching and the fish bowl protocol	Principal, TLS, ILT	By end of December
Supporting Students at All Levels		
Strategically identify 40% of students who have been identified as needing intensive support and assign them to the appropriate intervention group based on DIBELs and STAR360 (Grades K – 2)	Teachers	By end of November
Professional Development will be provided in which JBD staff will be able to collaborate with their peers in order to create classroom resources, visual aids and classroom lessons that support the implementation of the Frayer Model, Seven Step Vocabulary process, Accountable Talk	Principal, TLS, ILT	By end of December
Professional Development will be provided in which JBD staff will be able to collaborate in order to develop differentiate formative assessments with the primary focus being on vocabulary.	Principal, TLS, ILT	By end of December
Develop action plans focused on targeted interventions using STAR360 and supported by Reading Street RTI Kit and strategic groupings.	Teachers	On-going
Culture – Making the Focus Meaningful for Students		
Observations will be conducted to monitor the implementation of accountable talk into classroom discussions.	Principal	By end of December
Our 21 st CCLC afterschool programing will have an emphasis on vocabulary usage on their daily and weekly writing reflection.	TLS	On-going
Assessment		
As part of the writing conference log/template to support students with targeted feedback, teacher will focus a portion of the conversation on vocabulary usage. (encourage students to use a thesaurus	Principal, TLS, ILT	On-going
Teachers assess and monitor student progress as it relates to growth in identifying site words (Grades K – 2) and demonstrating an understanding of academic language (Grades 2 – 5)	Teachers	On-going

#3 Third Focus Area: A school wide focus on conceptual mathematics in an effort to equip students with multiple problem-solving strategies with an emphasis on reasoning, modeling, summarizing and explaining.

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
Content Knowledge		
<i>Professional Development will be provided to JBD staff that will define conceptual mathematics and look-fors.</i>	<i>Principal, TLS, ILT</i>	<i>By end of January</i>
<i>Staff will collaborate and design a common problem solving process across grade levels (Grades 2 – 5)</i>	<i>TLS, ILT, Teachers</i>	<i>By end of January</i>
<i>Targeted professional development and learning walks will be scheduled to support the implementation of conceptual mathematics using the gradual release model, small group differentiation and accountable talk</i>	<i>TLS, ILT, Teachers</i>	<i>On-going</i>
Supporting Students at All Levels		
<i>Professional Development will be provided to the JBD staff in order to increase the implementation of enVisionMath2.0 resources with a focus on scaffolding materials for struggling learners and fluency</i>	<i>Principal, TLS, ILT</i>	<i>By end of January</i>
Culture – Making the Focus Meaningful for Students		
<i>Staff members will develop an event where students will compete as mathletes and represent their peers</i>	<i>TLS, ILT</i>	<i>By end of March</i>
Assessment		
<i>Observations will be conducted to monitor the use of enVisionMath2.0 resources, specifically the online components.</i>	<i>Principal</i>	<i>By end of January</i>
<i>Math writing folders and logs will be kept as a progress monitoring tool for feedback and conferences between teachers and students. This data point will be analyzed to determine effectiveness.</i>	<i>TLS, ILT</i>	<i>By end of February</i>

(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	<p>By November 1st,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 90% of students in grades 2 – 5 will be able to identify the genre of writing they are working on and identify one writing resource or strategy they use to support them in their writing. 2) 90% of students in grades 2 – 5 will independently be completing the Frayer Model and begin to implement the seven step vocabulary process in small groups. 3) 90% of students in grades 2 – 5 can accurately verbalize what math concept they are learning and how they know when they have met the expectation.
What I will see by <u>Feb. 1</u> to know that students are on track to meet the end-of-year goal	<p>By February 1st,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The percentage of students scoring Level 1 and 2 on the ELA STAR360 Benchmark will be reduced by 10% from the BOY to MOY as a result of students being required to summarize, and/or explain verbally a claim and supporting details. 2) The percentage of students using more complex vocabulary appropriately or synonyms for complex vocabulary will increase as measured by student writing folders and logs. 3) The percentage of students scoring Level 1 on the Math STAR360 Benchmark will be reduced by 10% from the BOY to MOY as a result of using strategies which support the conceptual understanding of mathematics.
What I will see by <u>May 1</u> to know that students are on track to meet the end-of-year goal	<p>By May 1st,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The percentage of students scoring Level 1 & 2 on the ELA STAR360 PM/Benchmark will be reduced by 15% from the BOY to EOY as a result of students being required to summarize, and/or explain verbally a claim and supporting details. 2) The percentage of students using more complex vocabulary appropriately or synonyms for complex vocabulary will increase as measured by student writing folders and logs. 3) The percentage of students scoring Level 1 & 2 on the Math STAR360 PM/Benchmark will be reduced by 15% from the BOY to EOY as a result of using strategies which support the conceptual understanding of mathematics.

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

(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
Writing Across the Curriculum	<p>Teachers will unpack writing standards, create mini-lessons in order to fill writing gaps, and collaborate calibrating scores in order to create clear next steps and scoring criteria.</p> <p>Teachers will model the use of writing templates to support the organization of thoughts</p> <p>Students will be able to efficiently and independently decide on an appropriate writing template based on the prompt to assist in the organization of their thoughts before writing.</p> <p>Students will be observed summarizing and explaining their thinking in all content areas daily.</p>	<p>Implementation of rubrics.</p> <p>Multiple opportunities for writing across content areas.</p> <p>Modeling using the release of responsibility model is a common practice.</p>	<p>Unpacking of writing standards to identify skills and create mini-lessons based on the standards and student work samples</p> <p>Implementation of a scoring criteria</p> <p>Adoption of a common writing templates across grades 2 – 5</p>
Vocabulary Use & Acquisition	<p>Teachers will model the implementation of a Frayer Model, the Seven Step Vocabulary process and accountable talk.</p> <p>Students will use the Frayer Model, the Seven Step Vocabulary process and accountable talk as a support before, during and after their writing.</p>	<p>Modeling and implementation of the Frayer Model</p> <p>Some modeling and implementation of the Seven Step Vocabulary process</p>	<p>Full implementation of the Seven Step Vocabulary process in grades 2 – 5</p> <p>Full implementation of accountable talk in classroom discussion before, during and after writing exercises</p>
Conceptual Mathematics	<p>Teachers will design lessons that support conceptual understanding of mathematics through the implementation of centers and questioning.</p> <p>Students will be able to apply their conceptual understanding of mathematics in order to improve their results on the district STAR360 assessment.</p>	<p>Collaboration and unpacking of math standards in grades 3 – 5</p>	<p>Implementation of online resources and scaffolding for grades 2 – 5</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:	Writing Across the Curriculum		
Instructional strategy:	Best practices in writing	Approximate dates:	6 – 8 weeks spiraling
Meeting	Learning objectives for teachers		Support needed
Oct./Nov. Admin. Led Mtg.	Unpacking of Writing Standard Part 1		
Oct./Nov. Admin. Led Mtg.	Unpacking of Writing Standard Part 2		
Oct./Nov. Admin. Led Mtg.	Developing & creating a student friendly writing rubric		
Oct./Nov. Admin. Led Mtg.	Developing & creating a scoring criteria		
Oct./Nov. Admin. Led Mtg.	Looking at Student Work Protocol (Analyzing Student Work Samples)		
Focus area 2:	Vocabulary Acquisition & Use		
Instructional strategies:	Close reading and summarizing	Approximate dates:	4 – 6 weeks spiraling
Meeting	Learning objectives for teachers		Support needed
Dec./Jan. Admin. Led Mtg.	Review of Frayer Model and Best Practices		
Dec./Jan. Admin. Led Mtg.	Seven Step Vocabulary Process video reflection		
Dec./Jan. Admin. Led Mtg.	Protocol – implementation of Seven Step in small groups		
Dec./Jan. Admin. Led Mtg.	Accountable Talk video reflection		
Dec./Jan. Admin. Led Mtg.	Development of Accountable Talk classroom resources and visuals		
Dec./Jan. Admin. Led Mtg.	Protocol – implementation of Accountable Talk		
Dec./Jan. Admin. Led Mtg.	Using writing folders and logs to monitor vocabulary usage and feedback		
Dec./Jan. Admin. Led Mtg.	Modeling student conferencing and feedback		

Focus area 3:	Conceptual Mathematics		
Instructional strategies:	Conceptual Mathematics	Approximate dates:	4 – 6 weeks spiraling
Meeting	Learning objectives for teachers		Support needed
Feb./March Admin. Led Mtg.	Procedural vs. Conceptual – Acknowledging the important of math fluency		
Feb./March Admin. Led Mtg.	Close reading in mathematics		
Feb./March Admin. Led Mtg.	Reasoning & Modeling in mathematics		
Feb./March Admin. Led Mtg.	Summarizing and Explaining in mathematics		
Feb./March Admin. Led Mtg.	STAR360 & Progress Monitoring data analysis & action planning		
Feb./March Admin. Led Mtg.	Math writing folders – developing a criteria and library of prompts (Part 1)		
Feb./March Admin. Led Mtg.	Math writing folders – developing a criteria and library of prompts (Part 2)		
Feb./March Admin. Led Mtg.	Pearson Realize – Student resources		
Feb./March Admin. Led Mtg.	Pearson Realize – Student resources		