School Improvement Plan

School Year 2016-2017
School: *Thomas R. Rodman Elementary School*
Principal: *Kim M. Marshall*

Section 1. Set goals aligned to the AIP
Instructions: Analyze EOY Galileo and Preliminary PARCC 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 in Levels 1, 2, and 3 in ELA and Math for grades K-5, and in ELA and Math for grades 6-12*
2. *BY EOY, the district realize at least 10% of students in Level 1 move into Levels 2 and 3 in ELA and Math*
3. *By EOY, the district will realize at least 10% increase of students in Level 4 move into Level 5 in ELA and Math*

(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.

Rodman will realize at least a 40% reduction in students in Levels 1, 2, and 3 on the PARCC (MCAS 2.0) Assessment and on Galileo assessments.

Rodman will realize at least a 10% reduction in Level 1 move into Levels 2 and 3 on the PARCC (MCAS 2.0) Assessment in the Spring and on Galileo assessments. In ELA Grade 5 needs to move 1 student, Grade 4 needs to move 1, and Grade 1 needs to move 1. In Math Grade 5 needs to move 1 student, Grade 4 needs to move 1, and Grade 3 needs to move 1.

Rodman will realize at least 10% of students in Level 4 move into Level 5 on the on the PARCC (MCAS 2.0) Assessment and on Galileo assessments. In ELA Grade 5 needs to move 4 students, Grade 4 needs to move 4, and Grade 3 needs to move 2. In Math Grade 5 needs to move 4 students, Grade 4 needs to move 3, and Grade 3 needs to move 2.

Rodman will realize at least a 40% reduction in students scoring Benchmark on the DIBELS assessment from BOY to EOY. Grade K needs to move 11 students, Grade 1 needs to move 3 students, and Grade 2 needs to move 4 students.

By MOY, at least 60% of students will be in the high growth and/or high achievement quadrants in ELA and Math as measured by the Galileo district benchmark. In ELA Grade 5 needs to move 6 students, Grade 4 needs to move 8, Grade 3 needs to move 4, and Grade 2 needs to move 6. In Math Grade 5 needs to move 6 students, Grade 4 needs to move 6, Grade 3 needs to move 4 and Grade 2 needs to move 4.

By EOY, at least 80% of students will be in the high growth and/or high achievement quadrants in ELA and Math as measured by the Galileo district benchmark.   In ELA Grade 5 needs to move 12 students, Grade 4 needs to move 16, Grade 3 needs to move 8, and Grade 2 needs to move 12. In Math Grade 5 needs to move 12 students, Grade 4 needs to move 12, Grade 3 needs to move 8, and Grade 2 needs to move 8.

PARCC Data Results   **59 Students Tested 2015**   **116 Students Tested 2016**

Grade Level	2015 % Level 5 (2 students)	2016 % Level 5 (18 students)	% Increased
Math 03	0% (0/21 students)	25% (10/40 students)	+25%
Math 04	4% (1/23 students)	10% (4/40 students)	+6%
Math 05	0% (0/16 students)	8% (3/36 students)	+8%
ELA 03	0% (0/21 students)	3% (1/40 students)	+3%
ELA 04	4% (1/23 students)	0% (0/40 students)	-4%
ELA 05	0% (0/16 students)	0% (0/36 students)	0%

Grade Level	2015 % Level 4 (37 students)	2016 % Level 4 (96 students)	% Increased
Math 03	33% (7/21 students)	40% (16/40 students)	+7%
Math 04	22% (5/23 students)	35% (14/40 students)	+13%
Math 05	13% (2/16 students)	47% (17/36 students)	+34%
ELA 03	33% (7/21 students)	45% (18/40 students)	+12%
ELA 04	39% (9/23 students)	35% (14/40 students)	-4%
ELA 05	44% (7/16 students)	47% (17/36 students)	+3%

Grade Level	2015 % Level 3 (47 students)	2016 % Level 3 (70 students)	% Increased/Decreased
Math 03	38% (8/21 students)	23% (9/40 students)	Decreased 15%
Math 04	39% (9/23 students)	25% (10/40 students)	Decreased 14%
Math 05	50% (8/16 students)	27% (10/36 students)	Decreased 22%
ELA 03	38% (8/21 students)	30% (12/40 students)	Decreased 8%
ELA 04	35% (8/23 students)	30% (12/40 students)	Decreased 5%
ELA 05	38% (6/16 students)	47% (17/36 students)	Increased 9%

Progress towards the District AIP goal and Rodman's SIP goal of a 40% decrease in students scoring needs improvement/warning from BOY to EOY on Galileo Benchmarks.

Grade Level	Pretest % Needs Improvement/Warning	Posttest % Needs Improvement/Warning	% Decreased
Math 02	46 % (14 of 30 students)	20% (6 of 30 students)	26% (8 students moved)
ELA 02	40% (12 of 30 students)	33.3% (10 of 30 students)	6.7% (2 students moved)
Math 03	70% (29 of 41 students)	21.5% (9 of 42 students)	48.5% (20 students moved)
ELA 03	51% (21 of 41 students)	38.1% (16 of 42 students)	12.9% (5 students moved)
Math 04	53% (21 students of 40)	15.8% (13 0f 42 students)	37.2% (8 students moved)
ELA 04	48% (19 students of 40)	59.5% (25 0f 42 students)	-11.5% (6 student increase)
Math 05	72% (26 of 36 students)	25% (4 of 36 students)	42% (22 students moved)
ELA 05	64% (23 of 36 students)	36.1% (13 of 36 students)	27.9% (10 students moved)
Science 05	67% (24 of 36 students)	13.9% (5 of 36 students)	53.1% (19 students moved)

Progress towards the District AIP goal and Rodman's SIP goal of a 10% increase in students scoring proficient/advanced from BOY to EOY on Galileo Benchmarks.

Grade Level	Pretest % Needs Improvement/Warning	Posttest % Needs Improvement/Warning	% Decreased
Math 02	53% (16 of 30 students)	80% (24 of 30 students)	27% (8 students increased)
ELA 02	60% (18 of 30 students)	66.7% (20 of 30 students)	6.7% (2 students increased)
Math 03	29% (12 of 41 students)	78.6% (33 of 42 students)	49.6% (21 students moved)
ELA 03	49% (20 of 41 students)	61.9% (26 of 42 students)	12.9% (6 students increased)
Math 04	48% (19 students of 40)	69% (29 0f 42 students)	21% (10 students moved)
ELA 04	53% (21 students of 40)	40.5% (17 0f 42 students)	-12.5% (6 students decreased)
Math 05	27% (10 of 36 students)	88.9% (32 of 36 students)	61.9% (22 students moved)
ELA 05	37% (13 of 36 students)	63.9% (23 of 36 students)	26.9% (10 students increased)
Science 05	33% (12 of 36 students)	86.1% (31 of 36 students)	53.1% (19 students moved)

Dibels 2015/16

Progress towards the District AIP goal and Rodman's SIP goal of a 40% increase in students scoring benchmark on the DIBELS Composite Scores from BOY to EOY.

Grade Level	Pretest % Composite	Posttest % Composite	% Increased Benchmarked Students
K	43% (12 students of 28)	90% (28 students of 31)	+47% (16 students increased)
01	64% (23 students of 36)	86% (32 students of 37)	+22% (9 students increased)
02	86% (24 students of 28)	77% (24 students of 31)	-9% (o students moved)

Access 2015-2016 - Increases

# of Students that took the test	1st Time taking Access	-2	-1	Same Level	Gain +1 Level	Gain +2 Level	+ Gain +3 Level	Gain +4 Level	SPED/ ELL	Ready to Exit
47	51%	0%	0%	13%	25.5%	8.5%	0%	0%	-10.5%	8%

(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.

- *Provide continual PD and monitoring of the data collaboration cycle process in order to ensure teachers and principal are examining student work, providing interventions based on the analysis, and progress monitoring*

- *Tracking proficiency levels on unit assessments by grade level or classroom as well as tracking number of students demonstrating mastery by standard to help identify what parts of the content need re-teaching*

  - Data Walls will be displayed in depth in classrooms using post-it notes to track student progress using district benchmark assessments, unit assessments in both ELA and Math, CFA's, and will be tiered by colors. Staff will utilize the Data Collaboration Cycle which will enable teachers to track student work and mastery of standards weekly.
  - Staff will use District Benchmarks Galileo assessments and DIBELS results to maintain a classroom data binder to track their own students to ensure ownership of their student's progress.

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?

Rodman School moved from a Level 3 School to a Level 2 School

DIBELS
- By the end of the year, 90% of K students scored at Benchmark on Dibels
- By the end of the year, 86% of 1st grade students scored at Benchmark on Dibels
- By the end of the year, 77% of 2nd grade students scored at Benchmark on Dibels

PARCC ELA
- increase in the percentage of Grade 3 students scoring at the proficiency level this year (Level 4 and 5) from 37% to 48% (+11).
- increase in the percentage of Grade 5 students scoring at the proficiency level this year (Level 4 and 5) from 44% to 47% (+3).

PARCC Math
- significant increase in the percentage of Grade 3 students scoring at the proficiency level this year (Level 4 and 5) from 37% to 65% (+28).
- significant increase in the percentage of Grade 4 students scoring at the proficiency level this year (Level 4 and 5) from 26% to 43% (+17).
- significant increase in the percentage of Grade 5 students scoring at the proficiency level this year (Level 4 and 5) from 13% to 55% (+42).

Galileo ELA
- Grade 5 increased 27 percentage points in proficiency between BOY and EOY (37% to 64%).

Galileo Math
- Grade 2 increased steadily throughout the year with a 37 point-gain between BOY and EOY (53% to 80%).
- Grade 3 increased steadily throughout the year with a 50 point-gain between BOY and EOY (29% to 79%).
- Grade 4 increased steadily throughout the year with a 21 point-gain between BOY and EOY (48% to 69%).
- Grade 5 increased steadily throughout the year with a 62 point-gain between BOY and EOY (27% to 89%).

   (b) What did students struggle with last year? Why? Please consider data by grade level and subject. Questions to consider include:

PARCC ELA
- Increase from Grade 3 last year to Grade 4 this year in the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 from 4% (Grade 3) to 10% this year (Grade 4).
- Decrease in last year's Grade 3 to Grade 4 this year in the percentage of students scoring Level 4 and 5 decreasing 7 percentage points from 43% in Grade 4 last year to 36% in Grade 5 this year.
- Lack of Level 5 student performance in all grades in ELA.

Section 3. Develop strategies/actions to address focus areas

> **Primary Focus Area:**
> **Build students capacity to access complex text in ELA by increasing comprehension and writing in grades K-5 utilizing the data collaboration cycle**
>
> **2-3 Secondary Focus Areas:**
> - **Build student capacity to attain conceptual knowledge and understanding of core level math standards utilizing the data collaboration cycle**
> - **Build RTI systems of support in all core content area**

#1 Build students capacity to access complex text in ELA by increasing comprehension and writing in grades K-5 utilizing the Data Collaboration Cycle

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
Deliver 4 PD's per month pertaining to the data collaboration cycle and examining student work	Administrator TLS, Unit a staff	4 per month September 2016 – June 2017
Teachers will plan utilizing the Curriculum Units of Study/Writing Guide in conjunction with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks to ensure priority standards being taught are connected to planning, instruction, and student learning	Classroom Teacher SPED Teacher TLS	Weekly September 6th, 2016- June 20, 2017
Based on classroom observations, provide timely growth producing feedback with a focus on examining student work, progress monitoring strategies, and the utilization of the data collaboration cycle	Administrator	Weekly September 6th, 2016- June 20, 2017
To ensure students are being provided with rigorous high-level tasks, collect and review student work samples during administrative planning time and measure progress by following the Data Collaboration Cycle along with Student Portfolio Tracking, CCR trackers, and Standards Tracker that teachers will use to determine mastery	Administrator SILT TCT's Teachers	Weekly September 6th, 2016- June 20, 2017

#2 Secondary Focus Area: Build student capacity to attain conceptual knowledge and understanding of core level math standards utilizing the data collaboration cycle

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
Provide classroom support for Grades K – 5 to ensure conceptual knowledge of content is tracked through the data collaboration cycle, monitoring student work, and RTI interventions are in place by standard.	Administrator TLS	Weekly September 6th, 2016- June 20, 2017
Use the enVisionmath materials to plan lessons that will bring students to mastery of specific skills and standards including the structure of whole group and small group interventions directly aligned to Common Core and District	Classroom Teacher SPED Teacher TLS	Weekly September 6th, 2016- June 20, 2017

Curriculum Maps		
Utilize on-line Practice Buddy, on-line IXL, Math Fluency, Manipulatives, exit tickets, and portfolio Intervention sheets to attain mastery of grade level standards	Classroom Teacher SPED Teacher TLS	Weekly September 26th, 2016- June 20, 2017
Assign appropriate interventions to students based on need. Work with sped teacher, paraprofessional, BBS to execute interventions.	Teachers	Oct (initial) then ongoing
Develop enrichment activities that will challenge advanced students, targeting higher order thinking skills	Teachers, TLS	Ongoing
Gradual release model will be used for math instruction.	Teachers	Ongoing
Develop enrichment activities that will challenge advanced students, targeting higher order thinking skills	Teachers, TLS	Ongoing
Exit tickets or quick check will be created and utilized at the end of every lesson. These tickets will be differentiated based on student achievement level.	Teachers, TLS	ongoing

#3 Build RTI systems of support in all core content areas

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
Strategically identify 40% of students who have been identified as needing intensive support and measure progress through RTI resources provided in Reading Street and enVisionmath kits.	Classroom Teacher Administrator	Weekly September 6th, 2016- June 20, 2017
Measure progress through student portfolios and identify student needs continually utilizing the data collaboration cycle to examine student work and move students to different levels of support as guided by this process in all content areas.	Administrator Teachers TLS	Weekly September 26th, 2016- June 20, 2017

(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 in <u>November</u> to know that students are on track to meet the end-of-year goal	**We will see classroom instruction being driven by:** *All students will be tiered according to PARCC, BOY Galileo, BOY DIBELS, Placements Tests in both ELA/Math, and DRA2 Scores *Data Collaboration Cycle (examining student work)being continually utilized and updated to ensure RTI strategies and progress monitoring are in place weekly *CFA (Curriculum Units of Instruction and Reading Street graphic organizers are being Utilized and align with standards being taught in order to check for understanding and progress monitor) *CFA: ensure enVisionmath RTI and progress monitoring is in place and teachers are able to support students without the TLS preparing interventions for them

	*Reading Street CCR Tracker *enVisionmath Performance Assessment Tracker *Exit Tickets *DIBELS (Progress Monitoring)
What I will see in <u>February</u> to know that students are on track to meet the end-of-year goal	**We will see classroom instruction being driven by:** *All ELA Lessons are aligned with the Curriculum maps and units of study in ELA *Staff is using RTI Intervention mini-lessons to re-teach and assess students not meeting expectations on standards *CFA (Increased Scores from BOY – MOY on Galileo assessments) *Embedded use of the data collaboration cycle and examining student work *BOY – MOY Galileo and DIBELS Scores will reflect 25% and 20% increase in students scoring Level 4 & 5 and scoring benchmark

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 <u>changes</u> in teacher practice related to this focus
Build students capacity to access complex text in ELA by increasing comprehension and writing in grades K-5 utilizing the Data Collaboration Cycle	Teachers will plan utilizing the Curriculum Units of Study/Writing Guide in conjunction with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks to ensure priority standards being taught are connected to planning, instruction, and student learning	Data Collaboration Cycle has been presented and is being utilized Students have been tiered according to EOY data, PARCC, Galileo, and BOY Baseline Testing	Teachers will have a deeper connection between planning with the Units of Study/Writing Guide in conjunction with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks Grade level embedded data cycles are completely weekly during administrative planning time Tiered students reviewed weekly and adjusted according to mastery of standards
Build student capacity to attain conceptual knowledge and understanding of core level math standards utilizing the data collaboration cycle	Teachers will plan utilizing the Curriculum Units of Study/Writing Guide in conjunction with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks to ensure priority standards being taught are connected to planning, instruction, and student learning	Data Collaboration Cycle has been presented and is being utilized Students have been tiered according to EOY data, PARCC, Galileo, and BOY Baseline Testing	Teachers will tie their lessons to rigorous objectives, emphasize conceptual understanding, and use the data collaboration cycle to continuously monitor and adjust their instruction Tiered students reviewed weekly and adjusted according to mastery of standards
Build RTI systems	Teachers will plan utilizing the	Data Collaboration Cycle has been	Teachers will tie their lessons to

of support in all core content areas	Curriculum Units of Study/Writing Guide in conjunction with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks to ensure priority standards being taught are connected to planning, instruction, and student learning	presented and is being utilized Students have been tiered according to EOY data, PARCC, Galileo, and BOY Baseline Testing Staff is becoming familiarized with the mini-lesson interventions in Reading Street and enVisionmath	rigorous objectives, emphasize conceptual understanding, and use the data collaboration cycle to continuously monitor and adjust their instruction

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

Focus area 1:	Build students capacity to access complex text in ELA by increasing comprehension and writing in grades K-5 utilizing the data collaboration cycle		
Instructional strategy:	Utilizing the Curriculum Units of Study/Writing Guide in conjunction with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks to ensure priority standards being taught are connected to planning, instruction, and student learning	Approximate dates:	September 2016- June 2017
Meeting	**Learning objectives for teachers**		**Support needed**
9/26/16	• Analyze Preliminary PARCC Data, EOY Galileo, and DIBELS and look for standards not being met at grade levels to see if there are trends or gaps • Locate/Understand the various Response to Intervention (RTI) materials available for struggling students (Tier 2 and Tier 3) • Explore/Understand the writing curriculum and how the units of study and curriculum frameworks are implemented together		Principal/SILT Members/TLS/ESL
10/26/16	• Utilizing Reading Street and enVisionmath intervention kits teachers will create mini-lessons based on standards not being met on BOY Dibels, Galileo, and baseline assessments • Staff will understand the writing curriculum and how the units of study and curriculum frameworks work together in order to plan rigorous lessons that engage and are differentiated for all students • Analyze BOY data from Galileo and DIBELS to aligned teacher tiered groups to actual scores		Principal/Teachers/TLS/ESL
11/16/16	• Implementation of the Data Collaboration Cycle to examine student work and plan RTI mini-lessons • Grade level data analysis teams completed and interventions in collaboration with student portfolios in place and being utilized		Principal/Teachers/TLS/ESL
12/13/16	• Implementation of the Data Collaboration Cycle to examine student work and plan RTI mini-lessons/Report Card Input		Principal/SILT Members/TLS/ESL

2/1/16	When, Where and How to Reteach? • Teachers will discuss/plan multiple ways/times to reteach concepts taught during the week. • Principal will emphasis the importance of reteaching the CCSS concepts and how reteaching will reflect in our PARCC/MCAS 2.0 results • Utilize ELL/SPED/partner teacher during morning planning to create intervention groups (ex: some students can switch classes during small group time) • Tracking reteach results that will ensure students now grasp the concepts in their student portfolios	Principal/Teachers/TLS/ESL
3/8/16	Continue: • Utilizing Reading Street and enVisionmath intervention kits teachers will create mini-lessons based on standards not being met on MOY Dibels, Galileo, CCR, and enVisionmath Assessments • Staff will understand the writing curriculum and how the units of study and curriculum frameworks work together in order to plan rigorous lessons that engage and are differentiated for all students	Principal/Teachers/TLS/ESL
5/10/16	• Staff will present student growth examples from targeted tiered students and RTI strategies they provided during PD and Administrative Planning time 20 examples of the Data Collaboration Cycle to examine student work and RTI mini-lessons will be shared to build upon for the next school year	Principal/Teachers/TLS/ESL
6/1/16	• Analyze Student Galileo/DIBELS Data to see if we met the learning goal of student reduction of 40% in students scoring Levels 1, 2, and 3. We will see at least 10% of students in Level 1 move into Level 2 or 3, and at least 10% of students in Level 4 move into Level 5 on Galileo and DIBELS EOY assessments Staff will present success stories of targeted tiered students and how monitoring and RTI's provided improved student growth from BOY - EOY	Principal/Teachers/TLS/ESL

Focus area 2:	Build student capacity to attain conceptual knowledge and understanding of core level math standards utilizing the data collaboration cycle		
Instructional strategies:	Utilization of the data collaboration cycle to examine student work and prepare response to intervention mini-lessons	Approximate dates:	September 2016- June 2017
Meeting	**Learning objectives for teachers**		**Support needed**
9/26/16	- Examine student work from all grades and review their data collaboration cycle documentation, RTI, and monitoring systems and provide feedback to staff - PD Session 1, 2, 3, & 4 – During Administrative Planning Time Implementation of the Data Collaboration Cycle to examine student work and plan RTI mini-lesson for interventions based on standards not being met - Implementation of the Data Collaboration Cycle to examine student work and plan RTI mini-lessons		Principal/Teachers/TLS/ESL
10/26/16	Implementation of the Data Collaboration Cycle to examine student work and plan RTI mini-lessons		Principal/Teachers/TLS/ESL
11/16/16	Grade level data analysis teams completed and interventions in collaboration with student portfolios in place and being utilized		Principal/Teachers/TLS/ESL
12/13/16	Implementation of the Data Collaboration Cycle to examine student work and plan RTI mini-lessons/Report Card Input		Principal/SILT Members/TLS/ESL
2/1/16	- SILT Analyze Student Galileo/DIBELS Data to see if we met the learning goal of student reduction of 25% in students scoring Levels 1, 2, and 3. We will see at least 10% of students in Level 1 move into Level 2 or 3, and at least 10% of students in Level 4 move into Level 5 on Galileo and DIBELS MOY assessments - Staff will examine student scores on MOY assessments, to determine priority standards, and which students need RTI. If time allots we will create mini-lessons - Implementation of the Data Collaboration Cycle to examine		Principal/Teachers/TLS/ESL

	student work and plan RTI mini-lessons	
3/8/16	• Examine student work. Each teacher will bring a piece of student work from Math, ELA, and Writing during Administrative Planning Time or PD. Staff will be aligned vertically to compare grade level expectations and ensure students are prepared for the next grade	Principal/Teachers/TLS/ESL
5/10/16	• Staff will present student growth examples from targeted tiered students and RTI strategies they provided during PD and Administrative Planning time • 20 examples of the Data Collaboration Cycle to examine student work and RTI mini-lessons will be shared to build upon for the next school year	Principal/Teachers/TLS/ESL
6/1/16	• Analyze Student Galileo/DIBELS Data to see if we met the learning goal of student reduction of 40% in students scoring Levels 1, 2, and 3. We will see at least 10% of students in Level 1 move into Level 2 or 3, and at least 10% of students in Level 4 move into Level 5 on Galileo and DIBELS EOY assessments • Staff will present success stories of targeted tiered students and how monitoring and RTI's provided improved student growth from BOY - EOY	Principal/Teachers/TLS/ESL

Focus area 3:	Build RTI systems of support in all core content areas		
Instructional strategies:	Tiered Level interventions will be monitored through the data collaboration cycle,	Approximate dates:	September 2016- June 2017
Meeting	Learning objectives for teachers		Support needed
9/26/16	• Examine student work from all grades and review their data collaboration cycle documentation, RTI, and monitoring systems		Principal/Teachers/TLS/ESL

	and provide feedback to staff	
10/26/16	When, Where and How to Reteach? This will be documented through the data collaboration cycle regularly (2 times per month) • Teachers will discuss/plan multiple ways/times to reteach concepts taught during the week. • Principal will emphasis the importance of re-teaching the CCSS concepts and how re-teaching will reflect in our PARCC/MCAS 2.0 results	Principal/ESL
11/16/16	• Continual Implementation of the Data Collaboration Cycle to examine all student work and plan RTI mini-lessons • Adjust tiered groups as necessary	Principal/Teachers/TLS/ESL
12/13/16	• Implementation of the Data Collaboration Cycle to examine student work and plan RTI mini-lessons/Report Card Input	Principal/SILT Members/TLS/ESL
2/1/16	• Analyze Student Galileo/DIBELS Data to see if we met the MOY learning goal of student reduction of 40% in students scoring Levels 1, 2, and 3. We will see at least 10% of students in Level 1 move into Level 2 or 3, and at least 10% of students in Level 4 move into Level 5 on Galileo and DIBELS EOY assessments • Based on standards that weren't met with a score of 75% or higher, interventions need to be administered	Principal/Teachers/TLS/ESL
3/8/16	• Examine student work. Each teacher will bring a piece of student work from Math, ELA, and Writing. Staff will be aligned vertically to compare grade level expectation and ensure student are prepared for the next grade	3/8/16
5/10/16	• Staff will present student growth examples from targeted tiered students and RTI strategies they provided during PD and Administrative Planning time • 20 examples of the Data Collaboration Cycle to examine student work and RTI mini-lessons will be shared to build upon for the next school year	Principal/Teachers/TLS/ESL
6/1/16	• Analyze Student Galileo/DIBELS Data to see if we met the learning	Principal/Teachers/TLS/ESL

	goal of student reduction of 40% in students scoring Levels 1, 2, and 3. We will see at least 10% of students in Level 1 move into Level 2 or 3, and at least 10% of students in Level 4 move into Level 5 on Galileo and DIBELS EOY assessments • Staff will present success stories of targeted tiered students and how monitoring and RTI's provided improved student growth from BOY - EOY	