

School Improvement Plan

SY 2016-2017

Pulaski School

Principal: Melissa Rego

Assistant Principal: Crystal Burt

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

(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.

Goal #1:

From BOY 2016 to EOY 2017, all grade 2-5 teachers will reduce by 40% the # of students not proficient on Galileo ELA and Math.

GRADE	SY 15-16 EOY % of students NI/W	SY 16-17 Goal % of students NI/W	# of students to move out of NI/W during the SY 16-17
Grade 2 ELA	27.9% (26)	17%(16)	10
Grade 2 Math	19.6% (18)	12%(10)	8
Grade 3 ELA	35.1%(33)	21% (20)	13
Grade 3 Math	16% (15)	10% (9)	6
Grade 4 ELA	15.5%(15)	9% (9)	6
Grade 4 Math	14.4% (14)	9% (9)	5
Grade 5 ELA	30.1% (28)	18% (17)	11
Grade 5 Math	30.1% (28)	18% (17)	11

Goal #2:

From BOY 2016 to EOY 2017, all grade 2-5 teachers will increase the % of students scoring Advanced by 10% on Galileo ELA and Math.

GRADE	SY 15-16 EOY % of student Advanced	2016-2017 Goal % of students Advanced	# of students to move to Advanced during the SY 16-17
Grade 2 ELA	0 (0)	1% (1)	1
Grade 2 Math	41.3% (38)	45% (42)	4
Grade 3 ELA	5.3% (5)	6% (6)	1
Grade 3 Math	52.1% (49)	58% (54)	5
Grade 4 ELA	23.7% (23)	26% (26)	3
Grade 4 Math	61.9% (60)	68% (66)	6
Grade 5 ELA	19.4% (18)	21% (20)	2
Grade 5 Math	40.8% (38)	45% (42)	4

Goal #3:

From BOY 2016 to EOY 2017, all grade 2-5 teachers will decrease the % of student scoring Warning by 10% on Galileo ELA and Math.

GRADE	SY 15-16 EOY % of student Warning	2016-2017 Goal % of students Warning	# of students to Move out of Warning during the SY 16-17
Grade 2 ELA	7.53% (7)	6.7% (6)	1
Grade 2 Math	4.35 (4)	3.9% (3)	1
Grade 3 ELA	2.13% (2)	1.9% (1)	1
Grade 3 Math	1.06% (1)	0% (0)	1
Grade 4 ELA	0% (0)	0%	0
Grade 4 Math	4.12% (4)	3.7% (3)	1
Grade 5 ELA	0% (0)	0% (0)	0
Grade 5 Math	2.15% (2)	1.9% (1)	1

Goal #4:

From BOY 2016 to EOY 2017, teachers in grades K-2, will reduce by 40% the number of students not meeting benchmark on DIBELS.

GRADE	SY 15 -16 EOY % of students at Benchmark	SY 15 - 16 EOY % of students at Strategic	SY 15 - 16 EOY % of students at Intensive	SY 16 – 17 % of students at Benchmark
K	93% (74)	6%(5)	1% (1)	96% (77)
1	86% (94)	4% (4)	10% (11)	92% (100)
2	88% (88)	3% (3)	9% (8)	93% (93)
K-2	89% (248)	4%(12)	7% (20)	93% (261)

(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.

Data will be tracked at the school level by grade and at the teacher level by student.

School Level:

A data wall will be developed identifying at BOY, MOY, and EOY. Progress monitoring will be ongoing.

- District Benchmark (Grades 2-5): The % of students at each of the performance levels A, P, NI, and W.
- DIBELS (Grades K-2): The % of students scoring B, S, and I.

Teacher Level:

- Teachers will participate in individual data meetings and collaborative data cycles with the TLS/school administration to review and discuss data and next steps.
- Each teacher will maintain a data folder identifying how students are performing at BOY, MOY, and EOY.
- Teachers will identify cusp students and implement 6 week cycles that will provide students with interventions to support struggling students to get out of W/NI and provide accelerated work to get students from Proficient to Advanced.
- Teachers will maintain and submit CCR tracker and Envisions tracker to progress monitor student growth and progress.
- Teachers will implement DIBELS intervention cycles. Frequency of progress monitoring will be based on data indicating student performance.

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

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

District Benchmark Data:

ELA:

Goal 1:

- Grade 4 decreased the % of students not scoring proficient by 51% (EXCEEDED TARGET)

Goal 2:

- Grade 4 increased the % of students scoring in advanced by 88% and Grade 5 by 45% (EXCEEDED TARGET)

Goal 3:

- Grades 4 and 5 decreased the % of students scoring in warning by 100% (EXCEEDED THE TARGET)

Math:

Goal 1:

- Grade 4 decreased the % of students not scoring proficient by 40% (MET TARGET)

Goal 2:

- Grade 4 decreased the % of students scoring in advanced by 5% (DID NOT MEET TARGET) but still had 62% of students scoring advanced.

Goal 3:

- Grade 2 decreased the % of students scoring in warning by 52%, Grade 3 by 75%, Grade 4 by 53% and Grade 5 by 85% (EXCEEDED TARGET)

Goal 4: DIBELS:

- Grades K and 1 decreased by at least 40% the % of students not scoring benchmark (EXCEEDED TARGET)

SUMMARY:

DIBELS:

Overall, DIBELS data increased from 83% in 2015 EOY to 88% in 2016 EOY. Kindergarten students gained 28 percentage points between BOY and EOY (64-84-92). This is higher than the 2014-15 EOY K proficiency at 88%. Grade 1 students gained 30 percentage points between BOY and EOY (55-78-85). This year's Grade 1 EOY proficiency level at 85% was higher than the 2014-15 proficiency at 79%.

ELA EOY Galileo Data shows:

- Grade 2 increased 24 percentage points in proficiency between BOY and EOY, significantly higher than the district proficiency for Grade 2 at 55%. The 15 - 16 EOY proficiency (72%) is also higher than the 14-15 proficiency of 68%,
- Grade 3 increased 15 percentage points in proficiency between BOY and EOY and this is also higher than the district average at 53%. The 15 – 16 EOY proficiency (66%) is

lower than the EOY 2014-15 proficiency (78%).

- Grade 4 increased 23 percentage points reaching a 15 – 16 EOY proficiency of 85%. District proficiency was 59%. This is significantly higher than 14 - 15 EOY proficiency of 67
- Grade 5 increased 9 percentage points reaching a 15 - 16 EOY proficiency of 68% with flat performance noted between MOY and EOY. District proficiency was at 55%. The 2014-15 EOY proficiency was at 60%.

All grades at Pulaski were higher than the ELA district proficiency averages.

Of the 19 ELA classrooms, 7 classrooms maintained growth and 12 classrooms exceeded growth requirements.

Math EOY Galileo Data shows:

- Grade 2 increased significantly throughout the year with a 34 point-gain between 15 – 16 BOY and EOY. This was above the district average of 72% and above the 2014-15 EOY proficiency of 79%.
- Grade 3 increased 31 percentage points between 15 – 16 BOY and EOY achieving 84% proficiency at EOY significantly above the district average of 70% but below the EOY 2014-15 proficiency of 94%.
- Grade 4 increased 32 percentage points between 15 – 16 BOY and EOY achieving 86% proficiency at EOY significantly above the district average of 56% and considerably above the 2014-15 EOY proficiency of 74%.
- Grade 5 increased 23 percentage points between 15 – 16 BOY and EOY with an EOY proficiency at 68% reflecting a decline from last year's EOY performance of 78%. District proficiency was 53%.

All grades at Pulaski outpaced the district Math proficiency averages.

Of the 19 Math classrooms, 1 classroom maintained growth and 18 classrooms exceeded growth requirements.

- Grade 2 – 81% as the average in the high growth/high achievement category. The range of the four (4) classrooms all exceeded the 60% growth target.
- Grade 3 – 82% as the average in the high growth/high achievement category which across the grade reflected high growth in every one of the 5 classrooms.
- Grade 4 – 83% as the average in the high growth/high achievement category also reflecting high growth in all five of the Grade 4 classrooms.
- Grade 5 – 64% as the average in the high growth/high achievement category.

(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?

ELA:

Goal 1:

- Grade 2 decreased the % of students not scoring proficient by 3% and Grade 5 by 22% (DID NOT MEET TARGET)
- Grade 3 increased the % of students not scoring proficient by 13.4% (DID NOT MEET TARGET)

Goal 2:

- Grade 2 did not move any students into advanced (DID NOT MEET TARGET)
- Grade 3 decreased the % of students scoring advanced by 70% and Grade 5 by 36% (DID NOT MEET TARGET)

Goal 3:

- Grade 2 increased the % of students scoring warning by 20% and Grade 3 by 10% (DID NOT MEET TARGET)

Math:

Goal 1:

- Grade 2 decreased the % of students not scoring proficient by .44% (DID NOT MEET TARGET)
- Grade 3 increased the % of students not scoring proficient by 9.6% and Grade 5 by 51% (DID NOT MEET GOAL)

Goal 2:

- Grade 2 did not move any students into advanced (DID NOT MEET TARGET)

Goal 4: DIBELS

- Grade 2 decreased the % of student not scoring benchmark by 30% (DID NOT MEET TARGET)

EOY Galileo Data shows the following ELA standards that students struggled with.

2nd Grade

- Key Ideas and Details:
RL 2.1/2.2/2.3
RI 2.1/2.2
- Phonics and Word Recognition
RF 2.3b/2.3f
- Craft and Structure
RL 2.6
RI 2.1/2.2/2.4

3rd Grade

- Key Ideas and Details

RL 3.2

RI 3.1/3.2/3.3

- Craft and Structure

RL 3.4/3.5/3.6

RI 3.4

4th Grade

- Key Ideas and Details

RL 4.2

RI 4.2

- Craft and Structure

RI 4.4/4.5/4.6

5th Grade

- Key Ideas and Details

RL 5.3/5.4

RI 5.1

- Craft and Structure

RL 5.4

RI 5.4/5.5

Areas for Improvement:

- *No students scoring in Advanced in Grade 2*
- *Fluency in Grade 2*
- *Proficiency and Growth in CBIP classrooms*
- *Low Growth/High Achievement % in ELA for Grades 2 and 4*
- *% of students scoring Warning in Grades 2 and 3 increased*
- *Minimal growth from MOY to EOY in ELA for Grade 5*
- *Decline in ELA proficiency in Grade 5*
- *Comprehension of text*

Possible reasons why students are struggling:

- *Key Ideas and Details were only focused on during Unit 1 and 2.*
- *Craft and Structure was not taught in 5th grade due to only getting through Unit 3 in Reading Street*
- *Overall, grade 2 students (81-87-87) had a smaller gain of 6 percentage points from BOY to EOY at 87% but still higher than the 2014-15 EOY proficiency for Grade 2 at 83%. It is noted that for the last two years, flat performance was evident between MOY and EOY in Grade 2 with no progress made between those two junctures. Possible reasons could be the lack of opportunities for students to practice their reading fluency.*
- *As a whole, there seems to be a heavier focus on remediating and intervening with students who struggle, but students who are proficient are not often challenged as evidenced in low growth/high achievement data specifically for Grades 2 and 4 in ELA*
- *Lack of a focused writing program.*

Section 3. Develop strategies/actions to address focus areas

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

Continuous Improvement Through Differentiation

#1 Primary Focus Area: Build Student Capacity to comprehend complex text

#2 Secondary Focus Area: Build student capacity to access complex text by increasing fluency (grades pre k- 2)

#3 Secondary Focus Area: Build students’ writing capacity by responding to complex text utilizing the three genres (Narrative, Argumentative/ literary analysis and Research Simulation)

#1 Primary Focus Area: Build Student Capacity to comprehend complex text.

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
I. Utilize Units of Study and Curriculum Maps to plan effective lessons focusing on target skills.	School Administration TLS Teachers	Ongoing from September 2016 – June 2017
II. Teachers will pre-plan for and implement the use of specific comprehension strategies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reciprocal Teaching • Close reading with annotated text • SEI strategies 	School Administration TLS Teachers	Ongoing from September 2016 – June 2017
III. Teachers will provide opportunities for deeper, more sustained discussion of content from text. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective use of the gradual release model • Accountable talk • Utilize blooms taxonomy to create levels of questioning • Checklist to monitor an document real time data 	School Administration TLS Teachers	Ongoing from September 2016 – June 2017
IV. Students will be assessed utilizing the weekly assessments to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading Street weekly reading assessments • Reading Street weekly CCR assessments • Common Formative Assessments 	School Administration TLS Teachers	Ongoing from September 2016 – June 2017

	within the curriculum units of study (graphic organizers).		
V.	Data collected from weekly CCR will be used to differentiate small groups.	School Administration TLS Teachers	Ongoing from September 2016 – June 2017
VI.	Analyze student performance on Galileo and provide interventions, reteach plans and enrichment focused on identified priority standards through a Reteach and Enrich Block.	School Administration TLS Teachers	BOY/MOY/EOY

#2 Secondary Focus Area: *Build student capacity to access complex text by increasing fluency (grades pre-k- 2)*

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
I. Teachers will watch DIBELS Webinar and create progress monitoring cycles based on the Pathway to Literacy.	School Administration TLS Teachers	September 2016
II. Teachers will use data to create a data wall that will be monitored and updated at MOY and EOY	School Administration TLS Teachers	October 2016 February 2017 June 2017
III. Teachers will complete SMARTe Goals Organizer to identify which students they are moving up and out.	TLS Teachers	October 2016 February 2017
IV. Analyze DIBELS data utilizing the <i>Using Data to Drive Action</i> form from Focused Schools - Teachers will plot all students on the graph to visually display cusp students. - Identify and plot students in subgroups.	School administration TLS Teachers	October 2016 February 2017
V. Reteach and Enrich daily block will be implemented. This will enable students to get a double dose of targeted reading instruction	School Administration TLS Teachers	Start at MOY

#3 Secondary Focus Area: Build students' writing capacity by responding to complex text utilizing the three genres (Narrative, Argumentative/ literary analysis and Research Simulation)

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
<p>I. Utilize Districts' Writing Resource Guide to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unpack the three writing genres of Common Core State Standards to identify targeted skills to determine future writing mini-lessons • While unpacking the writing standard, look back to previous grade standard to identify skills that students have already been taught vs the new skills that have been added to the current grade level and will now be taught • Unpack the rubric identified in the District's grade specific Writing Resource Guide and develop criteria for success • Develop a checklist of skills that is needed to meet the CCSS standard • Plan and execute focused mini lessons on identified targeted skills 	<p>School Administration TLS Teachers</p>	<p>Ongoing from September 2016 – June 2017</p>
<p>II. Utilized the focused mini lesson checklist to differentiate instruction to monitor real time data to immediately adjust practice.</p>	<p>School Administration TLS Teachers</p>	<p>Ongoing from September 2016 – June 2017</p>
<p>III. Teachers will use the student work protocol to analyze and determine next steps in writing instruction</p>	<p>School Administration TLS Teachers</p>	<p>Ongoing from September 2016 – June 2017</p>
<p>IV. Teachers will track student progress using checklists and District's Writing CFA.</p>	<p>School Administration TLS Teachers</p>	<p>Ongoing from September 2016 – June 2017</p>

(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	
<p><i>What I will see by <u>Nov. 1</u> to know that students are on track to meet the end-of-year goal</i></p>	<p><u>Data:</u> <i>Teachers have identified the students targeted for growth including 40% of NI/W, 10% of proficient, and 10% of warning.</i></p> <p><u>Writing:</u> <i>40% of classrooms will show mini lessons that focus on skills that have been identified through unpacking of standards and backwards design</i></p> <p><u>Differentiation of Instruction:</u> <i>At least 50% of classrooms are differentiating instruction for struggling students and proficient students as evidenced through classroom observations and lesson plans.</i></p>
<p><i>What I will see by <u>Feb. 1</u> to know that students are on track to meet the end-of-year goal</i></p>	<p><u>Data:</u> <i>When comparing BOY to MOY, the % of students:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Scoring NI/W will reduce by at least 20%.</i> <i>• Scoring advanced will increase by 5%</i> <i>• Scoring warning will decrease by 5%</i> <i>• 60%of students will be in the high growth/high achievement category</i> <p><u>Writing:</u> <i>60% of classrooms will implement mini lessons that focus on skills that have been identified through unpacking of standards and backwards design</i></p> <p><u>Differentiation of Instruction:</u> <i>At least 65% of classrooms are differentiating instruction for struggling students and proficient students as evidenced through classroom observations and lesson plans.</i></p> <p><u>Deep Analysis of Complex Text:</u> <i>At least 80% of all classrooms will engage students in</i></p>

	<p><i>deep analysis of text as evidenced through the use of annotated notes and classroom observations.</i></p> <p><u>Priority Standards/Cycles:</u> <i>All classroom teachers will start to establish a reteach/enrichment block within their day to target an identified priority standard in ELA and track progress with pre/post assessments.</i></p>
<p><i>What I will see by <u>May 1</u> to know that students are on track to meet the end-of-year goal</i></p>	<p><u>Data:</u> <i>When comparing BOY to EOY, the % of students:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Scoring NI/W will reduce by at least 40%.</i> • <i>Scoring advanced will increase by 10%</i> • <i>Scoring warning will decrease by 10%</i> • <i>80%of students will be in the high growth/high achievement category</i> <p><u>Writing:</u> <i>80% of classrooms will implement mini lessons that focus on skills that have been identified through unpacking of standards and backwards design</i></p> <p><u>Differentiation of Instruction:</u> <i>At least 80% of classrooms will differentiate instruction for struggling students and proficient students as evidenced through classroom observations and lesson plans.</i></p> <p><u>Deep Analysis of Complex Text:</u> <i>At least 80% of all classrooms will engage students in deep analysis of text as evidenced using annotated notes and classroom observations.</i></p> <p><u>Priority Standards/Cycles:</u> <i>100% of classrooms teachers will establish a reteach/enrichment block within their day to target an identified priority standard in ELA and track progress with pre/post assessments.</i></p>

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.

