School Improvement Plan

School Year 2016-2017
School: *Carney Academy*
Principal: *Karen Treadup*

Section 1. Set goals aligned to the AIP

Instructions: *Analyze EOY Galileo data from last year to help set your end-of-year goals for the current school year. You must set three student learning goals, which are aligned to the student learning goals in this year's AIP:*

1. *By EOY, the district will realize at least a 40% reduction in students not proficient or advanced in ELA and Math for grades K-5, and in ELA and Math for grades 6-12*
2. *BY EOY, the district will see at least 10% of students in warning move into needs improvement in ELA and Math*
3. *By EOY, the district will see at least 10% of students in proficient move into advanced in ELA and Math*

Note: Since EOY PARCC scores might not be available yet, please use EOY Galileo scores from last year as a substitute baseline proficiency level for planning purposes. You should have a system to revisit your student data throughout the year, as we get data from BOY Galileo, PARCC, MOY Galileo, and other assessments.

(a) Describe the goals you have for student outcomes, in terms of approximate number of students that you need to move to meet each of the three goals listed above.

By EOY, Carney Academy will realize at least a 40% reduction in students not proficient (Level 4) or advanced (Level 5) in ELA and Math for grades 3-5.

- 162 Grade 3-4-5 students did not score proficient (Level 4) or advanced (Level 5) on the PARCC ELA.
    - To decrease this number of students by 40%, 65 additional students will move into the proficient (Level 4) and/or advanced (Level 5) performance levels.
- 147 Grade 3-4-5 students did not score proficient (Level 4) or advanced (Level 5) on the PARCC Math.
    - To decrease this number of students by 40%, 60 additional students will move into the proficient (Level 4) and/or advanced (Level 5) performance levels.

By EOY, Carney Academy will see at least 10% of students in warning (Level 1 and 2) move into needs improvement in ELA and Math

- 53 students scored in the warning (Level 1 and 2) performance level on PARCC ELA.
    - To decrease this number by 10%, at least 6 less students will be warning (Level 1 and 2).
- 57 students scored in the warning (Level 1 and 2) performance level on PARCC Math.
    - To decrease this number by 10%, at least 6 less students will be warning (Level 1 and 2)

By EOY, Carney Academy will see at least 10% of students in proficient move into advanced in ELA and Math.

- 19 students scored in the advanced (Level 5) performance level on PARCC ELA.
    - To increase this number by 10%, at least 2 additional students will be advanced (Level 5)
- 33 students scored in the advanced (Level 5) performance level on PARCC Math.
    - To increase this number by 10%, at least 4 additional students will be advanced (Level 5).

By EOY, Carney Academy will see at least 80% of students demonstrating high growth in ELA and Math on the STAR Assessments

(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*

- **Students in grades 2-5 will be progressed monitored through the STAR 360 assessement system.**
- **Targeted interventions will be developed for students according to their individual needs as indicated by STAR assessments.**
- **Students in grades K-1-2 will be progressed monitored through DIBELs.**
- **Targeted interventions will be developed for students according to their individual needs as indicated by DIBELs assessments.**
- **Data walls will be constructed to track student progress from BOY to MOY to EOY.**
- **All students in grades K-5 will maintain data binders**
- **Teachers will use CCR Trackers, Performance Assessment trackers and writing assessment trackers to track classroom level Reading, Writing and Math data after each Reading Street weekly story and unit, and math topic to determine which standards have been mastered by which students and which standards need to be retaught to which students.**
- **TCTs will track the same data at the grade level and report it to the SILT.**
- **Grade level data will be tracked by the principal, assistant principal and TLS with a display of data in the office area.**

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

Instructions: *School leaders must analyze data in order to create a school-specific plan to meet the student learning goals established in Section 1. This section is intended to help you look at student work in a meaningful way and to help you identify your school's strengths and the areas you will focus on this year to improve student outcomes.*

Focus on analyzing your school's progress on work related to the four objectives in the AIP, as these are the key levers that the district believes will lead to change. Not every objective may be a focus area for every school. The district's four objectives are outlined on page 3.

Answer questions (a) and (b) in the space provided. Potential data sources to use to answer these questions include:

Student performance data:

- *PARCC/MCAS item analysis, if available*
- *Final exams*
- *DIBELs*
- *Galileo*
- *Formative assessments*
- *Examples of student work*

Instructional data:

- *Observation data on curriculum and instruction*
- *Feedback to teachers*

Student indicator data:

- *Student attendance*
- *IEPs and 504s*
- *Disciplinary data*
- *SPED referrals*
- *Graduation/dropout data*
- *Intervention data*
- *Mobility*
- *Course failures*

Teacher data:

- *Teacher attendance*
- *Teacher evaluations*
- *Tiering of teachers*
- *TELL Massachusetts survey*

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

Carney moved in percentile rank last year, and though still Level 2, did rise to the 50th statewide percentile (increasing 8 percentiles) with 53% proficiency in ELA and 50% proficiency in Math. This reflected strong progress.

Preliminary 2016 PARCC data is mixed with stronger gains noted in Math than ELA and credible progress in Grade 3 but significant declines reflected in Grade 4 which is an area of concern as those students enter Grade 5.

2016 PARCC Preliminary Data:

ELA

According to the preliminary data from the 2016 ELA PARCC assessment, 47% of students in grades 3-4-5 met or exceeded grade level expectations scoring level 4 and above. This is a decrease of 6% from

the number of students who met or exceeded expectations on the 2015 ELA PARCC.
Further aggregated data indicates that grades 3 and 5 showed an increase in the percentage of students scoring Level 4 and Level 5. The percentage of grade 3 students increased from 47% to 54%; and grade 5 students increased slightly from 51% to 52%. The percentage of grade 4 students that scored level 4 and/or 5 decreased significantly from 61% in 2015 to 39% in 2016.
The data also indicates that the number of students who exceeded expecatations (level 5) in grades 3-4-5 decreased by 3% while the number of students who did not meet expectations (Level 1 and 2) increased by 6%.

In reviewing ELA cohort data:

- **The percentage of students scoring at Level 1 and 2 from Grade 3 last year to Grade 4 this year was flat with 24% of the students scoring at Level 1 and 2 last year in Grade 3 and 26% scoring at Level 1 and 2 this year in Grade 4.**
- **There was a significant increase from Grade 4 last year to Grade 5 this year in the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 and 2 increasing from 5% (Grade 4) last year to 10% this year (Grade 5) – a 5-pt. increase and doubling the number of students in the lowest levels of performance.**
- **There was a decrease in the percentage of students attaining proficiency and above proficiency in noting an increase in the percentage of students (47%) at Level 4 and 5 from last year in Grade 3 to 39% this year in Grade 4 – an 8-pt. increase.**
- **There was a decrease in the percentage of students attaining proficiency and above proficiency at Level 4 and 5 from Grade 4 last year (61%) to 53% this year Grade 5 – an 8 pt. decrease.**

In reviewing ELA proficiency levels:

- **There was a significant increase in the percentage of Grade 3 students scoring at the proficiency level this year (Level 4 and 5) from 47% to 54% - (+7).**
- **There was a severe drop in the percentage of Grade 4 students attaining proficiency this year (Level 4 and 5) from 61% to a very low 39% this year (-22).**
- **Flat performance was reflected in Grade 5 students attaining proficiency (Level 4 and 5) from 53% last year in Grade 4 to 52% (-1) this year in Grade 5.**

<u>ELA Assessments</u>

Overall DIBELS data declined between the last two years with EOY proficiency noted this year at 77% compared to last year at 84%.

- **Kindergarten students gained 15 percentage points between BOY and EOY (64-72-79). This is higher than the 2014-15 EOY K proficiency at 71%.**
- **Grade 1 students gained 21 percentage points between BOY and EOY (60-79-81). This year's Grade 1 EOY proficiency level at 81% was slightly lower than the 2014-15 proficiency at 84%.**
- **Grade 2 students (80-67-71) declined from beginning the year at 80% proficiency declining to 67% at MOY and making a small gain to 71% at EOY showing no real progress since the beginning of the year. Grade 2 warrants vigilance and review in the coming year. Grade 2**

2014-15 DIBELS proficiency was at 96%, a marked difference from this year. Grade 2 Galileo scores do demonstrate progress and EOY Galileo proficiency is comparable to the district Grade 2 average, but it is not clear how fluency and word recognition skills could have been leveraged more strongly to make even more pronounced gains in comprehension as measured by Galileo.

<u>ELA EOY Galileo Data shows:</u>

- **Grade 2 increased 14 percentage points in proficiency between BOY and EOY (42-50-56). District proficiency was 55%. The EOY proficiency this year (56%) is significantly lower than the 2014-15 proficiency of 79%,**
- **Grade 3 increased 27 percentage points in proficiency between BOY and EOY (46-73-73) and this is considerably higher than the district average at 53%, Grade 3 made no progress between MOY and EOY. The EOY proficiency this year (73%) is relatively flat with the EOY 2014-15 proficiency from last year (74%) when there was a stronger trajectory throughout the year (45-52-74).**
- **Grade 4 increased 10 percentage points reaching an EOY proficiency of 60% (50-37-60). District proficiency was 59%. Though this is an improvement from last year's EOY proficiency of 46% (46-43-46), the significant drop at MOY is disconcerting.**
- **Grade 5 increased 28 percentage points reaching an EOY proficiency of 64% (36-61-64) with little credible progress noted between MOY and EOY. District proficiency was at 55%. The 2014-15 EOY proficiency was at 60% with a decline noted from MOY at 64% (55-64-60). Grade 5 should be showing far stronger performance.**

All grades at Carney were either equal or slightly higher than the ELA district proficiency averages. Of the 18 ELA classrooms, 8 classrooms maintained growth, 8 classrooms exceeded growth requirements and 2 classrooms did not meet growth targets. ELA Growth data met and/or came close to the goal: *At least 60% of students in each grade will have high growth reaching 80% with high growth by the end of the year* in Grade 3 and Grade 5. However, in Grade 5 there was a wider variation within classrooms.

- **Grade 2 – 40% in the high growth/high achievement category with the range showing 52%, 56%, 10%, 48%, and 38% of students in the high growth/high achievement category. It is noted that in the classroom with 52% HG/HA, 22% (6 students) were in the low growth/high achievement category indicating a lack of "push" for those students who have the skills but were not challenged effectively. In the classroom with only 10% in the HG/HA category, 24% (7 students were in the LG/HA group and 38% (11 students were in the LG/LA group 32% (10 students). Concern lies in the classrooms where only 10%, 48%, and 38% of the students attained high growth/high achievement. These classrooms needs a focused plan for the students moving on to Grade 3 and a careful observation schedule for the instruction that is taking place in those settings as well as those entering Grade 2 to deeply dive into Grade 2 instruction across the board so that there is not a repeat of lackluster performance in Grade 2 next year.**
- **Grade 3 – 61% in the high growth/high achievement category with a range of 60%, 48%, 60%, and 75% of students in Grade 3 classrooms attaining high growth/high achievement.**
- **Grade 4 – 35% in the high growth/high achievement category with ranges of 36%, 23%, 37%, 33%, and 48% with very high percentages of students in both the low growth/low achievement and low growth/high achievement categories in three (3) of the classrooms. Entering Grade 5 students from these classrooms will need very well-planned targeted attention and intervention.**
- **Grade 5 –59% in the high growth/high achievement category with the range reflected at 46%,**

85%, 64%, and 39% in that category in each of the four (4) classrooms.

Some progress was noted for ELL students in ELA with 41% of Grade 2 students (7 students) attaining proficiency, 50% of Grade 3 students (6 students) and 10% of Grade 4 students (1 student), and 30% of Grade 5 students (3 students) attaining ELA proficiency. Grade 4 and 5 need to be monitored as to the embedding of SEI strategies into literacy instruction.

<u>Math</u>

According to the preliminary data from the 2016 Math PARCC assessment, 53% of students in grades 3-4-5 met or exceeded grade level expectations in Math scoring Level 4 or above. This is an increase of 3% from the number of students who met or exceeded expecations on the 2015 Math PARCC. Further aggregated data indicates that the number of students in grade 3 that scored level 4 or above increased significantly from 46% in 2015 to 64% in 2016. The number of grade 5 students also increased from 48% in 2015 to 53% in 2016. However, the number of students in grade 4 that scored level 4 or above decreased significantly from 54% in 2015 to 43% in 2016.
The data also indicates that the number of students that exceeded grade level expectations (level 5) in grades 3-4-5 increased by 2% while the number of students that did not meet expectations (levels 1 and 2) increased by 4%.

In reviewing Math cohort data:

- **There was an increase from Grade 3 last year to Grade 4 this year in the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 and 2 increasing from 21% last year (Grade 3) to 28% this year (Grade 4) – a 7 pt. increase.**
- **There was also an increase from Grade 4 last year to Grade 5 this year in the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 and 2 increasing from 11% (Grade 4) to 14% this year (Grade 5) – a 3 pt. increase.**
- **There was a decline in the percentage of students attaining proficiency and above proficiency at Level 4 and 5 and from Grade 3 last year (46%) to 43% this year in Grade 4 – a 3 pt. decrease.**
- **Relatively flat performance was reflected in Grade 5 students attaining proficiency (Level 4 and 5) from 55% last year to 53% in Grade 4 this year – a 2 pt. decline.**

In reviewing Math proficiency levels:

- **There was a significant increase in the percentage of Grade 3 students scoring at the proficiency level this year (Level 4 and 5) from 46% to 63% (+17).**
- **There was a dramatic decrease in the percentage of Grade 4 students attaining proficiency this year (Level 4 and 5) from 55% to 43% (-12).**
- **There was an increase in Grade 5 students attaining proficiency this year (Level 4 and 5) from 48% to 53% (+5).**
- **Grade 3 and 5 had 11% and 15% of its students respectively scoring at Level 5 in Math – doubling and tripling the percentage of students in the highest performing category.**

Math EOY Galileo Data shows:

More promising results are noted in Math than ELA.

- **Grade 2 increased significantly throughout the year with a 34 point-gain between BOY and EOY (35-57-69). This was slightly below the district average of 72% and was below the 2014-15 EOY proficiency of 80%.**
- **Grade 3 increased 38 percentage points between BOY and EOY (47-75-85) achieving 85% proficiency at EOY significantly above the district average of 70% and slightly below the 2014-15 proficiency of 92%.**
- **Grade 4 increased 11 percentage points between BOY and EOY (38-40-49) achieving 49% proficiency at EOY below the district average of 56% and considerably lower than the 2014-15 EOY proficiency of 60%. It is noted that accelerated gains were not made between BOY and EOY as reflected in the other grades.**
- **Grade 5 increased 28 percentage points between BOY and EOY (42-75-70) with an EOY proficiency at 70% reflecting a decline from last year's EOY performance of 75% and a slight decline between MOY and EOY (75-70). District proficiency was 53%.**
- **Grade 2, 3 and 5 outpaced the district Math proficiency averages.**

Of the 18 Math classrooms, 4 classrooms maintained growth and 14 classrooms exceeded growth requirements. Growth data met and/or came close to the goal: *At least 60% of students in each grade will have high growth reaching 80% with high growth by the end of the year* in all grades except in some classrooms in Grade 4 and Grade 5, where a significant discrepancy is noted in three (3) Grade 4 classrooms and one (1) Grade 5 classroom.

- **Grade 2 – 60% in the high growth/high achievement category. With the exception of one classroom at 34% with 21% of the students (6 students) in the low growth/high achievement category and 31% of the students (9 students) in the low growth/low achievement category, the four (4) other classrooms came close or exceeded the 60% growth target (81%, 74%, 52%, 58%)**
- **Grade 3 – 80% in the high growth/high achievement category which across the grade reflected high growth in every one of the 4 classrooms (92%, 68%, 80%, 79%).**
- **Grade 4 – 52% in the high growth/high achievement category. Ranges were 32% with 50% (14 students) of the students in that classroom in the low growth/low achievement, 15% with 46% (12 students) in the low growth/low achievement category, and 41% with 37% (10 students in the low growth/low achievement category. The two other classrooms showed very high growth with 100% and 70% of students in each of these classrooms in the high growth/high achievement quadrant.**
- **Grade 5 – 68% in the high growth/high achievement category. Ranges were 67%, 39%, 100%, and 64% in the high growth/high achievement category. The classroom with only 39% of the students in that category also had 39% (9 students) in the low growth/low achievement category.**

Math gains were noted more prominently in some grades for ELL students than ELA with 57% of Grade 2 students (10 students), 83% of Grade 3 students (10 students), only 10% of Grade 4 students (only 1 student) and 50% of Grade 5 students (5 students) attaining proficiency . SEI strategy implementation needs to be assessed and monitored in Grade 4 and Grade 5 due to noted lack of progress for ELL students in both ELA and Math.

ACCESS data indicates that out of 95 identified ELL students with 31.5% taking ACCESS for the first time, 3% more students (0 to 3)) declined one level in English proficiency than last year. Twenty-one percent (21%) remained at the same level compared to last year moving from 0 students last year to

20 students this year. However, 36.5% more students increased one level of proficiency this year (increasing from 1 student last year to 19 students this year) and 4.5% more students increased two levels of proficiency (from 1 student to 6 students). It is commendable to see 15% more ELL students ready to exit ESL services from 0 students last year to 14 students this year.

(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?**

According to both PARCC and Galileo EOY data, grades 3 and 5 showed overall growth in both ELA and Math. However, the students who are "on level" displayed the most growth, while the advanced students and the struggling students did not show as much growth. This indicates that core instruction is geared to the "middle." In order for all students to grow, instruction across all standards must be differentiated and tailored to meet student needs. Advanced students must be challenged and struggling students must received targeted interventions.

According to both PARCC and Galileo EOY data, grade 4 students showed the least amount of growth. The percentage of students who met grade level expectations decreased significantly from 2015-2016. The core instruction at this grade level was ineffective. This cohort of students are currently in grade 5. Grade 5 teachers will need to provide targeted instruction to this cohort to fill in the gaps from grade 4 while also teaching the grade 5 standards.

Section 3. Develop strategies/actions to address focus areas

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

Once you have developed these focus areas, identify <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 <u>not</u> 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 Areas:

- Literacy / Writing
- Math

2-3 Secondary Focus Areas:

- Student Wellness
- Family/Community Engagement

#1 Primary Focus Area: *Literacy/Writing*

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
Use STAR Reading Benchmarks, Progress Monitoring, and CCRS tests to monitor student progress in literacy.	Teachers, TLS, Principal, Asst. Principal	Sept - June
Utilize DIBELS to progress monitor oral reading fluency.	Teachers	October-June
Identify student levels (advanced, on-level, strategic and intensive) through data analysis during SILT and TCT	SILT, TCT	October-June
Utilize student data binders for students to track their own progress on CCRS, STAR, and DIBELs	Teachers, TLS, Students	September - June
Create flexible homogeneous groupings based on data to target individual student needs. Progress monitor and adjust groups as needed.	Teachers, TLS, Principal, Asst. Principal	Sept –June 6-8 week cycles
Provide extra supports and interventions for students struggling in phonics, phonemic awareness and fluency utilizing research based reading interventions such as Visual Phonics, Lively Letters, and My Sidewalks.	Teachers, Paraprofessionals	Sept - June
Incorporate SEI strategies into daily instruction for reading and writing.	Teachers, TLS, ESL	Sept-June
Incorporate vertical team planning into administrative prep periods	Teachers, TLS, Principal, Asst. Principal	October-June
Establish a collaboration cycle to present data on specific standards, look at student work and discuss best practices/suggestions for improvement.	Teachers, TLS, Principal, Asst. Principal	Sept - June
Share resources and provide PD on visible thinking strategies, close reading and higher order thinking skills for teachers to develop their repertoire of instructional strategies.	Teachers, TLS, Principal, Asst. Principal	Sept - June
Provide the opportunity for teachers to participate in learning walks within the school to gain insight of best practices and instructional strategies. Expand walks to include other schools in the district.	Teachers, TLS, Principal, Asst. Principal	October-June
Unpack common core writing standards and create mini lessons based upon the skills needed to master the standard.	Teachers, TLS, Principal, Asst. Principal	October - June
Focus on monthly writing prompt during “Looking At Student Writing” to determine strengths, weaknesses and trends. Plan/adjust instruction based upon the data.	Teachers, TLS, Principal, Asst. Principal	2x Monthly
Collect writing samples from students to develop writing portfolios to demonstrate growth.	TLS, Principal, Asst. Principal	Monthly

#2 Primary Focus Area: *Math*

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
Use STAR Math Benchmarks, Progress Monitoring, and performance assessments to monitor student progress in math.	Teachers, TLS, Principal, Asst. Principal	Sept-June 6-8 week cycles
Identify student levels (advanced, on-level, strategic and intensive) through data analysis during SILT and TCT	SILT, TCT	September - June
Track student progress through the administration of topic pre/post tests and performance assessments.	Teachers, TLS, Principal, Asst. Principal	September - June
Incorporate vertical team planning into administrative prep periods	Teachers, TLS, Principal, Asst. Principal	October-June
Develop math fact fluency by utilizing "math mad minutes" in grades 1-5. Students will track individual progress in data binders. Teacher will track class progress. TLS will track grade level progress through a visual display	Teachers, TLS, Principal, Asst. Principal	October-June
Communicate math problem solving as a school-wide priority	TLS, Principal, Asst. Principal	September-October
Incorporate manipulatives (i.e. fraction bars, base ten materials), mental math, basic fact strategies, and problem solving strategies into math lessons during a 90 minute math block.	Teachers, Paraprofessionals	September - June
Use Math journals at all grade levels (2-5) to record math vocabulary and problem solving strategies	Teachers, Paraprofessionals	September - June
Provide the opportunity for teachers to participate in learning walks within the school to gain insight of best practices and instructional strategies. Expand walks to include other schools in the district.	TLS, Principal, Asst. Principal	October - June
Use of Math graphic organizers to answer math word problems	Teachers, Paraprofessionals	September - June

#3 Secondary Focus Area: *Student Wellness*

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
Implement Second Step curriculum in K-5 classrooms	SACs	September - June
Participate in the "Breakfast in the Classroom" Program	Teachers, Principal, Asst. Principal, Cafeteria Staff	September - June
Develop a behavioral system that focuses on positive behaviors. (PBIS)	Behaviorist, SACs, Teachers, Principal, Asst. Principal	October
Track student attendance. Celebrate attendance achievements (perfect attendance, highest attendance rate)	SACs, Teachers, Principal, Asst. Principal, Attendance Officer	September-June
Provide Safety Care Training /CPI to staff who work directly with the ASD population	SACs, Teachers, Principal, Asst. Principal	November-May
Incorporate "Mindfullness" into the daily morning routine and health/physical education curriculum.	SACs, Teachers, Principal, Asst. Principal	October-June

Partner with UMass to teach nutrition education lessons to grades K-3	Teachers, UMass	November
Provide services to ELL students and SPED students to provide them with access to the curriculum.	ESL Teacher, SEI Teachers, Sped Teachers, Paraprofessionals	September - June
Celebrate diversity through student created projects, assemblies focusing on a theme per month	Teachers, Principal, Asst. Principal	October - June
Schedule a "graduation walk" where former Carney and other students who will be graduating from NBHS process through the halls of Carney Academy.	Principal, Community Relations Manager, High School Graduation Facilitators	June
Establish a visual representation of the various colleges that former Carney Academy students have attended.	Principal, Asst. Principal, Art Teacher	May

#4 Secondary Focus Area: *Family / Community Engagement*

Activities	Person(s) Responsible	By when
Develop a monthly newsletter/calendar with school events	Principal, Asst. Principal, PTO	September - June
Distribute weekly evaluations to students Grades K-5	Teachers	September - June
UMass Dartmouth college students will be assigned as tutors to classrooms to provide positive role models for Carney students.	Asst. Principal, UMass Coordinator, Teachers	September - December January - May
Schedule family oriented events along with the PTO at the school such as Literacy Nights, Math Nights, Carney Carnival, Movie Night, Winter Wonderland, Passport Around the World, etc	Principal, Asst. Principal, PTO	September - June
Continue partnership with the New Bedford Council on Aging which places "foster grandparents" in the classrooms	Principal, Asst. Principal, Council on Aging Representative, Foster Grandparents	September - June
Continue partnership with the Whaling City Alternative Program for students to serve as mentors and interns with Carney Academy students and teachers.	Principal, Asst. Principal, SACs, Teachers, Whaling City Staff and Students	October - June
Utilize the Blackboard Connect phone messaging system to relay information to families through an automated phone message.	Principal	September - June

(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	STAR Progress monitoring Grade Level CCR/Performance Assessments Grade Level Unit Assessments Student Work Samples DIBELs (Progress Monitoring) DRA

What I will see by <u>Feb. 1</u> to know that students are on track to meet the end-of-year goal	MOY DIBELs MOY ELA/Math STAR Benchmarks Grade Level CCR/Performance Assessments Grade Level Unit Assessments Student Work Samples STAR Progress Monitoring DIBELs Progress Monitoring DRA
What I will see by <u>May 1</u> to know that students are on track to meet the end-of-year goal	STAR Progress monitoring Grade Level CCR/Performance Assessments Grade Level Unit Assessments Student Work Samples DIBELs (Progress Monitoring) DRA

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/Math (Differentiation)	Teachers: • Evidence of strategies and supports addressed in PD during classroom observations. • Continous checking for student understanding • Scaffolding/differentiating instruction Students: • Engaged in productive struggle • Working in differentiated small groups	• Teachers are more comfortable with the curriculum units of study and Reading Street and enVisions • Teachers are using the standards to drive instruction.	• Teachers checking for understanding and immediately adjusting practice • Small group enrichment/intervention groups based on student needs as refected by data analysis
Writing	Teachers: • Unpacking writing standards and creating mini-lessons. • Using collaboration cycle to look at student writing and determine next steps • Utilizing SEI strategies such as "Write-Around" and "Cut and Grow" • Conferencing with students to provide feedback on their writing	• Teachers are meeting in grade level groups to calibrate writing expectations and look at student work	• Teachers will unpack writing standards to identify skills needed for mastery and will develop mini-lessons to teach students.

	Students: • Use rubrics /checklists to guide writing • Participating in the peer editing process • Applying feedback from their teacher conference into their writing		
Student Wellness (PBIS)	Teachers: • Implementing a school wide tiered behavior system • Focus on positive behaviors of students Students: • Making positive choices and holding themselves accountable for their behaviors.	• Teachers work as a team to hold all students accountable	• School wide understanding of the tiered behavioral system and what constitutes a tier 3 behavior intervention.

(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 & 2:	Literacy / Math		
Instructional strategies:	Differentiation (Checks for Understanding and Accountable Talk) Data Analysis	**Approximate dates:**	August, October and January PD Admin periods throughout the school year

Meeting	**Learning objectives for teachers**	**Support needed**
August 29	Teachers will develop knowledge of accountable talk strategies to use across all content areas	
Sept. 6	Teachers will analyze Reading Street Baseline Data and enVisions Math placement test data	
Sept. 7 & 14	Teachers will learn about the assessments and reports in STAR 360	
Sept. 13 & 20	SILT will meet to develop SIP 2016-2017	
Sept. 21 & 22	Grade level teams will analyze BOY STAR reading and DIBELs	
Sept. 27	PARCC data review	
Sept. 29	Grade level teams will analyze BOY STAR math	
Oct 27 (full day)	STAR progress monitoring training	
Nov 9 (60 min)	Teachers will develop differentiated instruction according to STAR progress monitoring data	
Jan 23 (full day)	Differentiation – Teachers will create differentiated lessons for Reading and Math	
Feb 1 (60 min)	Differentiation – Teachers will create differentiated lessons for Reading and Math	
Mar 8 (60 min)	Differentiation – Teachers will create differentiated lessons for Reading and Math	
Apr 12 (60 min)	Differentiation – Teachers will create differentiated lessons for Reading and Math	

Focus area 1:	Writing		
Instructional strategies:	Unpacking writing standards Creating Mini-lessons LASW	**Approximate dates:**	1 hour monthly after school PD Admin periods 2x monthly (LASW)

Meeting	**Learning objectives for teachers**	**Support needed**
September 14 (60 min PD)	Teachers will unpack narrative writing standard and create mini-lessons based upon the skills needed to master the standard.	
Oct. 4 & 18	LASW – Looking at Student Writing (narratives)	
Oct 25 & Oct 26	Teachers will unpack informative/explanatory writing standard and create mini-lessons based upon the skills needed to master the standard. (W.2)	
Nov 1 & Nov 15	LASW – Looking at Student Writing (informative/explanatory)	
Dec 6 & Dec 7	(K-3) Teachers will unpack opinion writing standard and create mini-lessons based upon skills needed to master the standard (W.3)	
Dec 6 & Dec 7	(4-5) Teachers will unpack the literary analysis standard and create mini-lessons to master the standard. (W4.9 + W5.9)	
Jan 11 & 24 & Feb 7	LASW – Looking at Student Writing (opinion/literary analysis)	
Jan 31	Teachers will unpack research writing standard and create mini-lessons based upon skills needed to master the standard (W.7)	
Mar 7 & 21	LASW – Looking at Student Writing (research)	
April TBD	LASW – Looking at Student Writing (narrative)	
May TBD	LASW – Looking at Student Writing (opinion/literary analysis)	
June TBD	LASW – Looking at Student Writing (research)	

Focus area 3:	Student Wellness		
Instructional strategies:	PBIS BBST	**Approximate dates:**	Admin periods throughout the school year
Meeting	**Learning objectives for teachers**		**Meeting**
Various admin periods throughout the school year	Behavior support team will meet to develop school-wide tiered PBIS behavior system		
Various admin periods throughout the school year	Building Based Support Team will meet to discuss at risk students and what supports/interventions can be put in place for them		