Normandin Middle School Improvement Plan

School Year 2016-2017
Stephen A. Farrell, Principal

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 <u>number</u> of students that you need to move to meet each of the three goals listed above.

	SY15-16 (Historical)			SY16-17 (Goals)		
	# of students not Proficient/ Advanced	**# of students in Warning**	**# of students in Proficient**	**# of students not Proficient/ Advanced**	**# of students moving from Warning to Needs Improvement**	**# of students moving from Proficient to Advanced**
ELA Grade 6	263	108	140	158	11	14
Math Grade 6	287	105	117	172	11	12
ELA Grade 7	262	116	80	157	12	8
Math Grade 7	255	97	78	153	10	8
ELA Grade 8	266	133	67	160	13	7
Math Grade 8	268	144	69	161	14	7
Science Grade 8	352	240	8	211	24	1

The data contained within this graph represents 2015-2016 NBPS Galileo EOY Benchmark Results

(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*

School-Wide Monitoring

Historically, the data wall monitoring student progress on Galileo for BOY, MOY, and EOY within the Office of Curriculum and Instruction has recorded student progress on our District Benchmarks. The Normandin SILT has shifted our focus on this wall to "attainment of standards" grouped by grade in English Language Arts, Math and Science using Galileo data. As student School-based, District common assessments are completed, the Normandin SILT will chart percentage of students achieving the targeted standards. Our teacher leaders, Literacy TLS and Math TLS who are part of the SILT committee will take this information to TCTs and disseminate the action steps required to maintain focus upon developing strong classroom instruction around these priority standards. These standards will be updated as data is collected through Galileo and CFA's.

Additionally, SILT will analyze results from PARCC and MCAS state testing in English language arts, math and science as this information is released by DESE. We will aggregate these priority standards and compare them with our Galileo results. These results will be disseminated to teachers through TCT.

Teacher-Level Monitoring

In addition to Galileo Benchmark testing, data from English and math CFAs, math unit tests, and science open response items will be collected by teachers. Continuous data cycles will be performed within TCT to address reteach needs and to monitor progress on priority standards identified through Galileo. This deeper examination of student learning outcomes will be conducted every 5 weeks or twice a marking period/quarter.

- Data from CFAs for ELA will be collected 3 times a year and data cycles with reteach plans will be initiated for each of these assessments. Data from reteach plans will be analyzed through TCTs.
- Data from math CFAs (pre and post) will be collected twice a year to show growth on priority standards identified through Galileo data. In addition to the CFAs, data from open response questions are collected twice during the year and data cycles with reteach plans are initiated with each. Additionally, at least two unit tests are given to continue to collect data on student progress in math. Data from these areas will be analyzed through TCTs
- In science, 8th grade, at least once a unit, teachers will collect data from open response questions and common assessments and then use the data cycle to create reteach plans. In 7th grade science, data from open response questions is collected at least twice a quarter and data from unit tests in 6th and 7th grade will be collected at least once a quarter. 6th grade is currently developing common assessments in science. Data will be analyzed through TCTs.
- Social Studies currently has common assessments in 7th and 8th grade. These will continue to be refined, and 6th grade will begin developing common assessments. These will be done for each major unit of study.

Additional data points for all grades and content areas will be further outlined through SILT throughout the year and updated within this plan.

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 onwork 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?

School-Wide Focus and PBIS

At the conclusion of Normandin Middle School's second year in a row, End-of-Year (EOY) District Benchmark assessment results fell significantly below the gains realized from the Middle-of-Year (MOY) testing.

Evaluation of released District Benchmark results and curriculum-based measurement concluded that many students are not able to read or did not read closely, comprehend academic as well as content specific language and articulate accurately a complete understanding of their knowledge effectively. During the 2014-2015 school year Normandin surveyed teachers during Teacher Collaboration Teams (TCT's) and identified elements of student learning linked to meeting or exceeding the learning standards of their content areas, resulting in a school-wide instructional focus:

Normandin Middle School students will deeply analyze complex texts in all content areas and be able to articulate their understandings through various means. These will be assessed through state assigned and teacher made rubrics.

This focus continues to be communicated to the greater Normandin community at-large as the instructional focus for the entire school, explaining that all content areas, not just math, English and science, are part of the solution to help students comprehend complex texts deeply and articulate their understanding of those texts. A continuum of professional development and focused communication illustrates to our community how all Normandin classrooms can require students to "Read to Know and Write to Show." Concretely, "this is how Normandin students learn." Our focus for this year in TCT and within classroom instruction will be the emphasis on using accountable talk to analyze texts across content areas and having students justify their answers utilizing evidence from various texts.

Deliberate emphasis upon embedding tiered classroom instruction and intervention models to support student learning and behavior expectations contributed to a smooth start to the 2016-2017 school year with an average daily attendance of . Branding our school code "Work Hard, Be Nice & Stay Safe" with our school-wide instructional focus "Read to Know & Write to Show" perpetuated the continued growth of Normandin's culture which celebrates the learning and character development efforts of our entire learning community.

Attendance

Normandin Middle School maintained a high expectation for daily student attendance throughout the 2014-2015 school year. Our students consistently achieved an average daily attendance of 94.54% (-0.06). Normandin sustained its 2014-2015 student attendance in the PARCC and MCAS assessment participation at a rate of 99-100%. Our 2015-2016 PARCC Assessment attendance was, 99%, 95%, and 99% respectively.

Behavioral Incidents and Office Referrals

2012-2103 = 16.5 incidents/day

2013-2014 = 12.3 incidents/day

2014-2015 = 5.1 incidents/day

2015-2016 = 14.64 incidents/day +287.05%

This data is representative of student incidents as recorded by teachers submitting referrals for support to school administration. The data is collected and recorded in the New Bedford Public Schools (NBPS) ASPEN Student Information System. Following the NBPS discipline protocol, and as required by Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) regulation all student suspensions are reported to NBPS and DESE at time of incident via ASPEN.

Suspension rates for Normandin students have remained consistent, during the 2014-2015 school year 116 suspensions were reported to DESE and during the 2015-2016 school year 122 suspensions were reported. Normandin Middle School continues to employ restorative practices to reduce the employment of suspension from learning except in incidents where student safety mandates a student's temporary exclusion. Should we outline Restorative Practices to reduce discipline?

The significant increase of student behavioral incidents is a direct result of the addition of the District-Wide Behavioral program (CBIP) being moved to Normandin for the 2015-2016 school year, as well as, an increase to our student population that swelled class sizes in grade 6 to an average of 27-30 students.

(a) 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?**

Although students showed gains in Galileo MOY, that trend did not continue with EOY for a second straight year.

Reading

2015-16 NMS data is of great concern. ELA Galileo data show relatively flat performance between the last two school years with very low levels of proficiency and a decrease in Grade 8 performance. In Mathematics, the data is more encouraging showing an increase in Grade 7 math but a significant decrease in Grade 6 proficiency and a slight increase noted in Grade 8. These "ups and downs" in improvement reflect a lack of consistent effective instruction across the school. The trends among data are disconcerting as they relate to low student levels of proficiency and do not indicate accelerated improved student academic outcomes.

2016 PARCC Data:
The 2016 overall PARCC results are of significant concern. In 2015 NMS moved from the 5th percentile in overall statewide performance to the 9th percentile. While the 9th percentile is certainly not where the school needs to be the progress and growth were indicators that the school was moving in the proper direction. In 2016, the data is of major concern as it relates to both student growth and proficiency levels. Below are the results:
Grade 6 ELA Level 1 students increased by 3 percent leaving 6 percent in warning level. Level 2 saw an increase of 5 percent with 21 percent of students partially meeting expectations. However, Levels 4 and 5 saw a decrease by 5 percent from 2015 leaving only 40 percent of students meeting or exceeding expectations. Level 1 students increased in mathematics by 4 percent while Level 2 increased by 18 percent. That is a 22 percent increase in students not meeting or partially meeting expectations. While Levels 4 and 5 saw a major reduction of 18 percent. This is a very concerning trend as only 24 percent of Grade 6 students are in the Levels 4 and 5 in higher performing levels.

Grade 7 ELA saw an increase of 6 percent in level 1 leaving 12 percent of the 7th graders in the "did not meet expectations" category. Levels 4 and 5 saw a reduction of 2 percent. That leaves only 44 percent of students meeting or exceeding expectations. Mathematics also demonstrated concerning results. Level 1 increased by 4 percent, while Level 2 was reduced by 2 percent leaving 12 percent of students in Level 1 and 28 percent of students in level 2. Collectively, 40 percent of NMS Grade 7 students did not meet or partially met expectations. This is of incredible concern, especially since NMS was provided with an additional TLS last year who was focused only on mathematics. Levels 4 and 5, although showing slight movement, still showed very low and bleak levels of proficiency with only 27 percent of students at Level 4 and only 1 percent at Level 5. This leaves 73 percent of NMS

Grade 7 students not meeting expectation in math.

Unfortunately, the Grade 8 results are even bleaker as they relate to both growth and proficiency levels when compared to 2015. The percent of students in Level 1, or not meeting expectations, climbed from 9 percent in 2015 to 17 percent. Levels 4 and 5 dropped from 44 percent to 30 percent showing a 14 percent reduction in student proficiency. In mathematics Level 1 students increased from 14 percent to 24 percent- a 10 percent increase, while Level 2 students are also at 24 percent. This means that NMS is sending 48 percent of its students to high school not meeting the Grade 8 mathematics expectations. This is very concerning for many reasons. It is now up to the high school, entering its third year of turnaround, to remediate almost half of the students it is receiving from NMS.

ELA EOY Galileo Data shows:
Grade 6 showed a peak in proficiency at MOY but declined by EOY (51% to 60% to 42%). District EOY proficiency was 44%. The EOY 2014-15 data showed 42% proficiency, which is flat with this year's results.
Grade 7 demonstrated no increase in proficiency between BOY and EOY with declining scores (46% to 47% to 31%) from the beginning of the year to the end of the year. District EOY proficiency was 31%. The EOY 2014-15 data showed 27% proficiency showing no progress this year over last year.
Grade 8 decreased in proficiency between BOY and EOY (41% to 33% to 30%). District EOY proficiency was 30%. The EOY 2014-15 data showed 50% proficiency. This year's Grade 8 EOY shows a significant decrease in proficient students from last year's results with a significant decrease now reflected in students leaving with strong high school readiness.
All NMS 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- Grade 6 proficiency (51% compared to 41%), Grade 7 proficiency (46% compared to 31%), and Grade 8 (41% compared to 30%.) Every grade level declined.

Math EOY Galileo Data shows:
Grade 6 showed gains in proficiency from BOY to EOY (46% to 44% to 57%). District EOY proficiency was 59%. The EOY 2014-15 data showed 66% proficiency, which was significantly higher than this year's results.
Grade 7 also demonstrated steady gains in proficiency between BOY and EOY (31% to 45% to 58%). District EOY proficiency was 50%. The EOY 2014-15 data showed 38% proficiency. This year's EOY proficiency levels are higher than last year's and the strongest when compared to the other grade levels.
Grade 8 shows a different pattern demonstrating flat results from BOY to EOY (33% to 29% to 35%). District EOY proficiency was 34%. The EOY 2014-15 data showed 33% proficiency. This year's EOY is flat with last year's results, leaving only a third of Grade 8 students entering high school with the necessary Math skills. The Math data shows stronger outcomes in proficiency but still a declining trend in student performance from Grade 6 to Grade 7 to Grade 8.

ACCESS Data indicates that of the 167 identified ELL students with 45% taking ACCESS for the first time, 3% declined one level of English proficiency, 0% declined two levels, and 33% remained at the same level of proficiency. Seventeen percent (17%) moved up one level and .5% moved up two levels with .5% moving up three levels. Only five percent (5%) of Normandin students are noted as ready to exit ESL services. The results were mixed. NMS saw an increase in students staying on the same level (up 31% from last year), but an increase of 17% of students moving up one level, and an increase in .5% of students moving up two levels. Finally, there was a 5% increase in students from the year before who are now ready to exit ELL services. This data clearly shows some progress. However, there is a definite need to deepen the use of SEI practices in core instruction and more teacher "ownership" over NMS ELL students.

Section 3.Develop strategies/actions to address focus areas

Instructions:*Based on your analysis of student needs in Section 2,especially question (b), identify 2-4focus 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 thisfocus area to raise student achievement.*

Once you have developed these focus areas, identify <u>one</u> benchmark that you will use to measure student progress by November 1, February 1, and May 1. These benchmarks should be based on student work—not adults' actions.

They will be used as part of the focus areas that you discuss with your instructional liaison. You do 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:

1. **Literacy across all content areas**
   - **a. Accountable Talk to analyze a variety of texts and justification with evidence.**
   - **b. KNSA (Mathematics, Science)**
   - **c. Looking at topics with more depth in all content areas.**

Secondary Focus Areas:

2. **Math Fluency**
3. **Instructional Frameworks**
4. **PBIS**

#1 Primary Focus Area: Literacy across the content areas

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
Analyze data from BOY, PARCC and MCAS to determine updates to priority standards in ELA, Math and Science	Admin, TLS, SILT	11/2016, then every 5 weeks
Provide PD on Accountable Talk and justification in all content areas (as part of school-wide focus)	Admin, TLS, SILT	10/2016
Provide PD on writing strategies in all content areas (as part of school-wide focus)	Admin, TLS, SILT	11/2016
Provide PD on Keys to Literacy and KNSA question annotation strategies	Admin, TLS, SILT	11/2016
Provide PD on student-developed HOT questions as part of close reading	Admin, TLS, SILT	12/2016
Provide PD on accommodations for general and special ed.	Admin, TLS, SILT	Ongoging
Provide PD on student conferencing to help students take ownership of learning	Admin, TLS, SILT	12/2016
Make the instructional focus visible throughout the school	Teachers, TLS, Admin	Ongoing
Update data wall to reflect BOY, MOY, and EOY data	TLS, Teachers	Ongoing
Track ongoing student progress with classroom activities and assessments in TCT	Teachers	ongoing
Teachers conference with students to discuss progress at least once a quarter	Teachers	ongoing
Develop formative assessments in core content areas for all grades	TLS, Teachers	Ongoing
Conduct learning walks to gather data on the implementation of school-wide focus	Admin	Ongoing
Analyze data to determine effectiveness of Accountable Talk strategies.	Admin, TLS, SILT	Ongoing
Conduct data cycle of CFAs and other assessments in TCT	Teachers	Ongoing
Analyze data after reteach to determine effectiveness	Teachers, TLS	Ongoing

#2 Secondary Focus Area: Math fluency

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
Teachers will identify areas of weakness that students need to build fluency.	Teachers	Every 5 weeks
Teachers will create quick warm-ups to build fluency with problem standards.	Teachers	Ongoing

Teachers will design anchoring activities and homework activities to address fluency issues.	Teachers	Ongoing
Teachers will monitor progress of fluency issues and discuss data during TCT	Teachers and TLS	Ongoing
Learning walks to observe fluency activities in the classroom	Admin	Ongoing

#3 Secondary Focus Area: Instructional Frameworks

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
Provide feedback to teachers on lesson plans	Admin	ongoing
Provide PD on Instructional Frameworks (lesson planning) using the Gradual Release model	Admin, TLS, SILT	Ongoing
Provide PD on differentiation	Admin, TLS, SILT	1/2017
Provide PD on grouping students and using accountable talk strategies	Admin, TLS, SILT	Ongoing
Provide PD on ELL strategies	Admin, TLS, SILT	Ongoing
Provide PD on strategies related to special education student needs	Admin, TLS, SILT	9/2016
Develop activities and strategies that utilize skills learned in PD to allow for gradual release	Teachers	Ongoing
Develop differentiated lessons to reach special education students, ELL students and advanced learners using strategies learned in PD	Teachers	Ongoing
Develop activities and graphic organizers to aid students with accountable talk strategies	Teachers	Ongoing
Update data wall to reflect BOY, MOY, and EOY data	TLS, Teachers	Ongoing

#4 Secondary Focus Area: PBIS

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
NMS joins DESE PBIS training Cohort #3	Admin, TLS, Wrap-Coordinator	9/2016
Provide staff with opportunities to voice opinions on protocols and procedures of PBIS through surveys	Admin, TLS, SILT	ongoing
Provide feedback on PBIS protocols and procedures through surveys	Teachers	ongoing
Review data from surveys to make changes to the program as necessary	Admin, TL	Ongoing
Analyze behavioral data to determine hotspots and trends	Admin	ongoing
Initiate Roll Out of Code Cards	Admin,	9/2016
Provide refresher PD to staff	Admin, TLS, SILT	1/2017
Learning walks to observe PBIS "Look Fors"	Admin, TLS, SILT	ongoing
Provide PD on tier 1 and 2 supports	Admin, TLS, SILT	ongoing
Provide PD on incentives	Admin, TLS, SILT	ongoing
Increase PBIS visibility of the Code	Admin, TLS, SILT, Teachers	ongoing
Implement common expectations of The Code throughout the school.	All staff	ongoing

(b) How will you measure student progress along the way? Please list at least <u>one</u> way you will measure <u>student progress</u> by November 1, February 1, and May 1.

	Benchmark
What I will see by <u>Nov. 1</u> to know that students are on track to meet the end-of-year goal	• **Data from CFAs, Data Cycles, and reteach plans** • **Lesson planning using gradual release and school-wide focus** • **BOY data to determine areas of focus** • **Data Wall-Standards to get an "snap-shot" of where we**

	are currently. • **PARCC Data** • **MCAS science data** • **Notes from TCT meetings** • **Notes from SILT to help determine direction of TCTs.** • **PBIS survey data** • **Behavioral data**
What I will see by <u>Feb. 1</u> to know that students are on track to meet the end-of-year goal	• **Data from CFAs, Unit tests, open response questions, Data Cycles, and reteach plans** • **Lesson planning using gradual release and school-wide focus** • **MOY data (if available)-compare changes** • **Data Wall-compare changes** • **Notes from TCT meetings** • **Notes from SILT to help determine direction of TCTs.** • **PBIS survey data** • **Behavioral data**
What I will see by <u>May 1</u>to know that students are on track to meet the end-of-year goal	• **Data from CFAs, Unit test, open response questions, Data Cycles, and reteach plans** • **Lesson planning using gradual release and school-wide focus** • **Data Wall** • **Notes from TCT meetings** • **Notes from SILT to help determine direction of TCTs.** • **PBIS survey data** • **Behavioral data**

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
Literacy	Teachers will utilize accountable talk to help students analyze a variety of texts throughout various content areas. Students will justify their answers through using evidence from the text.	Teachers understand the school-wide focus and can see how a text can be something other than an article or story based on the content area.	Teachers will engage students with probing, deeper questioning requiring a progression of greater student articulation in a variety of assessed modalities.
Instructional Frameworks	Teachers will be able to plan lessons that are clear, rigorous and well thought out in order to better reach all students. They will utilize the gradual release model and accountable talk strategies in order to engage all students and have them think deeper about topics they are grappling with.	Many teachers utilize some form of grouping for student work and some teachers use the gradual release model. Differentiation does occur but it is usually for the lower levels.	Lessons will allow the "heavy lifting" to be done by students, be differentiated for all levels, and will be consistently utilizing the gradual release model.
PBIS	Teachers provide positive reinforcement for all students exhibiting The Code values and provide appropriate consequences for students who do not follow school expectations. The PBIS protocols will be followed by all staff members and be consistent from grade to grade. Teachers will also be trained in restorative practices to help them deal with situations before they escalate and require assistance from administration.	Many teachers do follow the PBIS protocols.	All staff follow PBIS protocols and the Code Card and other positive activities are embedded within the school culture. Teachers utilize restorative practices in order to reduce the need for administrative assistance.

(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:	**Literacy**		
Instructional strategies:	Annotation and Close Reading Strategies	**Approximate dates:**	
Meeting	**Learning objectives for teachers**		**Support needed**
Close Reading	Teachers will better understand. How to help students have a deeper understanding of complex texts.		Connection of framework to instruction, templates and graphic organizers, Exemplars, Concrete modeling, SILT Planning
Math Fluency	Teachers will better understand. How to help students have a deeper understanding of complex texts.		Connection of framework to instruction, templates and graphic organizers, Exemplars, Concrete modeling, SILT Planning
Writing strategies with all content	Better understand different types of writing as outlined by commas.		Connection of framework to instruction, templates and graphic organizers, Exemplars, Concrete modeling, SILT Planning level
Graphic organizers and strategies	Have better understanding of writing tools to support students in reading.		Connection of framework to instruction, templates and graphic organizers, Exemplars, Concrete modeling, SILT Planning
Hot questions and student generated questions	Have better understanding of how to release responsibility to student.		Connection of framework to instruction, templates and graphic organizers, Exemplars, Concrete modeling, SILT Planning
Students conferencing	Teachers will be able to learn how to release through student conferencing, to empower students, to increase ownership of academic progress.		Connection of framework to instruction, templates and graphic organizers, Exemplars, Concrete modeling, SILT Planning

Focus area 2:	**Instructional Frameworks**		
Instructional strategies:	**Lesson planning, gradual release, group work strategies, accountable talk, differentiation, and ELL Strategies**	**Approximate dates:**	
Meeting	**Learning objectives for teachers**		**Support needed**
Gradual release	Teachers will be able to plan lessons that empower students to greater ownership of learning.		Connection to the standards, templates & graphic organizers, exemplars, curriculum maps.
Special Ed Differentiation/ELL Strategies	Address unique learning styles and abilities to access the curriculum.		Connection to the standards, templates & graphic organizers, exemplars, curriculum maps.
Accountability Talk	Better plan lessons that empower students to have academic conversations.		Connection to the standards, templates & graphic organizers, exemplars, curriculum maps.

Focus area 4:	**Dissemination of feedback to students and families**		
Instructional strategies:	Collaboration of the entire Normandin Learning Community disseminating a powerful messages with transparency of Achievement & Teamwork	**Instructional strategies:**	9/2016 – 6/2017
Meeting	**Learning objectives for teachers**		**Meeting**
Aug - Sept	Normandin Documentation, messaging, automated calling, announcements, Open House planning and branding		Admin, SILT, TLS
September SILT	Dissemination of Instructional Focus to Parents & Community		Admin, SILT, TLS
September – June	Teacher contact with parents		Admin & Faculty
May 2017	Parent and Normandin Community “Summer and Extended Learning Opportunities at Normandin Middle School”		Admin, Faculty, TLS