

Vernon Public Schools

School Improvement Plan

School Name: Maple Street School

School Year: 2008-2010

School Principal: Dr. Lois Possell

Date: November 2009

Principal's Signature: _____

School Improvement Planning Team:

Name	Title
<u>Felicia Archie – Gr. 2 Teacher</u>	<u>Cassandra Perrett – Music Teacher</u>
<u>Courtney Berger – K Teacher</u>	<u>Lois Possell - Principal</u>
<u>Janice Bickford – K Teacher</u>	<u>Linda Redekas - Reading</u>
<u>Leah Boice – Gr. 2 Teacher</u>	<u>Lindsey Robbins – Gr. 1 Teacher</u>
<u>Denise Boutot – Special Education</u>	<u>Alicia Russell – Gr. 3 Teacher</u>
<u>Barbara Brahaney – Gr. 5 Teacher</u>	<u>Sarah Shapiro – Special Education</u>
<u>Kelly Browne - Reading</u>	<u>Kim Staba – Gr. 1 Teacher</u>
<u>Michelle Converse – Gr.4 Teacher</u>	<u>Jenifer Tuller – Special Education</u>
<u>Laura Corliss – School Psychologist</u>	<u>Amy Violette – Gr. 4 Teacher</u>
<u>Julie Culos – Reading/Math</u>	<u>Jeffrey Williams – Physical Education Teacher</u>
<u>Courtney Dussault – Speech Therapist</u>	<u>Kathleen Woodruff – Gr. 5 Teacher</u>
<u>Gayle Golas – Language Arts Consultant</u>	<u>Brian Woods – Gr. 3</u>
<u>Lauren Goric – Art Teacher</u>	
<u>Christina Kupec – Gr.4 Teacher</u>	
<u>Jaelyn Lackner – Gr.5 Teacher</u>	
<u>Deanna Murray – Gr.K Teacher</u>	
<u>Jessica Perkins – School Social Worker</u>	

1. DATA ANALYSIS/ASSESSMENT OF NEED:

Percent of Students At/Above Proficient by Subject – CMT Spring 2008:

Results indicate that achievement gaps between full paying and free-reduced paying lunch students have decreased overall, but still remains high in specific areas. This is most evident in the 4th grade scores.

	<u>Reading</u>	<u>Mathematics</u>	<u>Writing</u>
<u>Grade 3</u>			
Whole Group	45.3%	71.7% (+ 0.3%)	86.6% (+ 16.8%)
F/R Lunch	36.1%	66.7%	83.3% (+ 10.6%)
Full Price	64.7% (+ 12.1%)	82.4% (+ 8.7%)	94.1% (+ 30.9%)
<u>Grade 4</u>			
Whole Group	54.9% (+ 7.2%)	78.4% (+ 26.1%)	82.7% (+ 14.5%)
F/R Lunch	53.1% (+ 13.8%)	81.3% (up 42%)	81.8% (+ 24.7%)
Full Price	57.9%	73.7%	84.2%
<u>Grade 5</u>			
Whole Group	59.4%	75.8%	61.8%
F/R Lunch	59.1%	69.6%	58.3%
Full Price	60.0%	90.0%	70.0%

CMT AYP Proficiency Targets for 2010 Administration:

Reading = 79% Mathematics = 82% Writing = 70% At/Above Basic or Annual Improvement

Performance by Content Strands – Percent of Students At/Above Proficient

Writing: Results show that students continue to perform very well on the writing prompt portion of the CMT. Students continue to struggle with editing and revising, particularly the composing/revising portion.

	<u>Direct Assessment of Writing</u>	<u>Composing/Revising</u>	<u>Editing</u>
Grade 3	98.1%	21% (+ 10%)	68% (+ 12%)
Grade 4	98.1%	32%	62% (+ 3%)
Grade 5	88.2%	57%	67%

Reading: Scores reflect progress on strands 3 and 4, with the 5th grade performing well overall. Continued improvement on all four strands is needed.

	Reading Comprehension Strands			
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>
Grade 3	53%	66%	43%	55%
Grade 4	73%	51%	51%	55%
Grade 5	69%	63%	38%	81%
Total Grades 3-5	65%	60%	44%	63.6%

Strand 1 = Forming a General Understanding
 Strand 2 = Developing Interpretation
 Strand 3 = Making Reader/Text Connections
 Strand 4 = Examining the Content and Structure

Mathematics: Scores listed are those strands where less than 70% of students scored proficient or higher. Scores in bold reflect improvement over 2007 results. This analysis will help target specific areas of need. The 3rd grade performed well overall.

Strands with <70% Proficient

<u>Strand</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Grade 3</u>	<u>Grade 4</u>	<u>Grade 5</u>
3	Equivalent Fractions, Decimals, Percents	NT	33%	45%
5	Models for Operations			67%
7	Computation with Whole #s and Decimals			64%
9	Solve Word Problems		*	58%
10	Numerical Estimation Strategies	55%		
11	Estimating Solutions to Problems	47%	27%	42%
14	Time		45%	58%
15	Approximating Measures	62%	45%	36%
16	Customary and Metric Measures		61%	61%
17	Geometric Shapes and Properties		69%	67%
20	Statistics and Data Analysis	NT	NT	48%
22	Patterns	*	*	39%
23	Algebraic Concepts	NT	*	
24	Classification and Logical Reasoning		*	27%
25	Mathematical Applications	30%	*	

* = Score has improved from last year and is now 70% or higher
 NT = Not tested at that grade level
Bold type = Score is an improvement over previous year

Class Comparison (“same class” over different years)

		<u>Mathematics</u>	<u>Reading</u>	<u>Writing</u>
2008	Grade 3	71.4%	52.4%	86.6%
2009	Grade 4	78.4%	54.9%	82.7%

2007	Grade 3	60.0%	54.0%	72.0%
2008	Grade 4	52.3%	47.7%	68.2%
2009	Grade 5	75.8%	59.4%	61.8%

Related School-Level Factors: The percent of students eligible for free or reduced lunch has increased steadily since 2002.

- Percent Eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch

2002-2003	35.4%
2003-2004	49.9%
2004-2005	52.9%
2006-2007 (as of 10/30/06)	55.6%
2007-2008 (as of 10/17/07)	66.8%
2008-2009 (as of 11/6/08)	64.2%
2009-2010 (as of 11/23/09)	64.1%

Other Student Academic Indicators:

- Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Reading Assessment - September 2009: Percentage of students beginning the school year reading at or above grade-level expectations.

	<u>% Scoring At/Above Grade-Level Target</u>	
Grade 1:	31.9%	
Grade 2	72.5%	
Grade 3	47.6%	School Total: 46.3%
Grade 4:	41.5%	
Grade 5:	37.8%	

- Universal Screening Results – Fall 2009:

Grade K – 58 students	<u>High Risk</u>	<u>Medium Risk</u>	<u>Low Risk</u>
Letter Naming Fluency	33%	22%	45%
Letter Sound Fluency*	83%	16%	2%
Number Identification	43%	24%	22%

Grade 1 – 42 students	<u>High Risk</u>	<u>Medium Risk</u>	<u>Low Risk</u>
Nonsense Word Fluency	38%	29%	33%
Word Identification Fluency*	50%	12%	38%
Quantity Discrimination	7%	48%	45%
Computation	57%	12%	31%

Grade 2 – 37 students	<u>High Risk</u>	<u>Medium Risk</u>	<u>Low Risk</u>
Oral Reading Fluency*	60%	19%	22%
Total Accuracy %	68%	16%	16%
MAZE	No Cut Score Available for the Fall		
Computation	65%	32%	3%
Concepts and Applications	54%	30%	14%

Grade 3 – 41 students	<u>High Risk</u>	<u>Medium Risk</u>	<u>Low Risk</u>
Oral Reading Fluency	29%	24%	46%
Total Accuracy %	27%	15%	59%
MAZE*	No Cut Score Available for the Fall		
Computation	68%	22%	10%
Concepts and Applications	61%	10%	29%

Grade 4 – 51 students	<u>High Risk</u>	<u>Medium Risk</u>	<u>Low Risk</u>
Oral Reading Fluency	24%	26%	51%
Total Accuracy %	12%	14%	75%
MAZE*	20%	0%	80%
Computation	53%	33%	14%
Concepts and Applications	47%	30%	24%

Grade 5 – 52 students	<u>High Risk</u>	<u>Medium Risk</u>	<u>Low Risk</u>
Oral Reading Fluency	31%	27%	42%
Total Accuracy %	4%	17%	79%
MAZE	15%	0%	85%
Computation	46%	31%	21%
Concepts and Applications	50%	12%	37%

* Key reading indicator at that grade-level

2. Annual, Measurable Objective(s)/Tier II Indicators:

2008-2009 Goals:

(1) Mathematics: Based on the AYP report unadjusted figures, the percent of students in grades 3, 4 and 5 scoring proficient or higher on the 2009 CMT will increase from 68.7 % to 72%. **ACHIEVED** – 75.3% of students scored proficient or higher.

- The percent of economically disadvantaged students scoring proficient or higher will increase from 64.9% to 69%. **ACHIEVED** – 72.5% of economically disadvantaged students scored proficient or higher.

(2) Reading: Based on the AYP report unadjusted figures, the percent of students in grades 3, 4 and 5 scoring proficient or higher on the 2009 CMT will increase from 58% to 63%. **NOT ACHIEVED** – 53.2% of students scored proficient or higher.

- The percent of economically disadvantaged students scoring proficient or higher in reading will increase from 54.6% to 60%. **NOT ACHIEVED** – 49.4% of economically disadvantaged students scored proficient or higher.

- The percent of white students scoring proficient or higher in reading will increase from 64.6% to 69%. – **NOT ACHIEVED BUT PROGRESS NOTED** – 66.9% of while students scored proficient or higher.

(3) Writing: The percent of students scoring proficient or higher on the Editing portion of the 2009 CMT will increase from 60.7% to 65%. **NOT ACHIEVED** – 60% of students scored proficient or higher on the Editing portion.

The percent of students scoring proficient or higher on the Composing/Revising section of the 2009 CMT will increase from 33.3% to 38%. **NOT ACHIEVED BUT PROGRESS NOTED** – 35.3% students scored proficient or higher on Composing/Revising section.

2009-2010

(1) Mathematics: Based on the AYP report unadjusted figures, the percent of students in grades 3,4, and 5 scoring proficient or higher on the 2010 CMT will increase from 72.7% to 75%.

(2) Reading: Based on the AYP report unadjusted figures, the percent of students in grades 3,4, and 5 scoring proficient or higher on the 2010 CMT will increase from 50.8% to 56%.

- The percent of economically disadvantaged students scoring proficient or higher in reading will increase from 46.5% to 52%

- The percent of white students scoring proficient or higher in reading will increase from 63.6% to 67%.

(3) Writing: The percent of students scoring proficient or higher on the Editing portion of the 2010 CMT will increase from 60% to 63%. The percent of students scoring proficient or higher on the Composing/Revising section of the 2010 CMT will increase 35.3% to 38%.

3. Actions/Strategies/Interventions	Timeline	Person(s) Responsible	Means of Evaluation
<p><i>Scheduling/Structural</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Common planning time during the school day for each grade level at least once a week. - Bi-weekly data team meetings to examine data, discuss & select instructional strategies & set achievement goals. - Quarterly meetings with classroom teachers to monitor each student's progress, identify areas of need, and plan interventions. 	<p>August 2008 and 2009</p> <p>September 2008 - June 2009</p> <p>September 2008- June 2010</p>	<p>Principal</p> <p>Classroom Teachers, Support Staff, Principal</p> <p>Principal Classroom Teachers</p>	<p>Specialty Area Schedule</p> <p>Record of Data Team Meeting minutes</p> <p>Student Map, Action Plan Worksheet</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Display exemplary student work & post data team results. - Utilize grading system Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, Not Yet for daily work and tests. Provide additional instruction for students in the Not Yet category and reassess. - Universal Screenings for mathematics and reading 	<p>September 2008- June 2010</p> <p>September 2008- June 2010</p> <p>September 2009, January and June 2010</p>	<p>Classroom Teachers, Principal</p> <p>Teachers</p> <p>District Screening Team and School Reading Team</p>	<p>Examination of bulletin boards</p> <p>Examination of student work</p> <p>Screening results – cut scores identifying students at low, medium, and high risk</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Positive Behavioral Supports (PBS): Full implementation of PBS strategies - Summer school offered to all students. Teachers encourage participation for students with particular needs. - Supplemental Education Services offered to qualified students outside of school hours 	<p>Sept 2008-June 2010</p> <p>July 2009, July 2010</p> <p>December 2010</p>	<p>PBS School Team, Entire Staff</p> <p>Classroom Teachers, Principal</p> <p>Principal, SES providers</p>	<p>Minutes of Monthly Team Meetings, Examination of monthly behavioral data.</p> <p>Summer school progress reports</p> <p>Progress reports</p>
---	---	---	--

2. Annual, Measurable Objective(s)/Tier II Indicators:

(1) Mathematics: Based on the AYP report unadjusted figures, the percent of students in grades 3, 4 & 5 scoring proficient or higher on the 2010 CMT will increase from 72.7% to 75%.

3. Actions/Strategies/Interventions	Timeline	Person(s) Responsible	Means of Evaluation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - .8 Title I teacher provides math support teacher for grades 2, 3, 4 & 5 (.6 of .8 time devoted to math support). Additional math support provided by kindergarten teacher and another Title I staff. - Math Fact Intervention for students in need of additional practice 	<p>September 2008- June 2010</p> <p>November 2009- June 2011</p>	<p>Principal, .8 Title I teacher, K teacher, second Title I teacher</p> <p>Principal, Specialty Area Teachers, variety of support staff, parent volunteers</p>	<p>Record of students who are receiving assistance</p> <p>Student performance on re-assessments</p> <p>Record of facts known/need to learn</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Re-teach and re-assess students who scored in the Not Yet proficient range on grade-level data team post-tests and math unit tests. 	<p>September 2008- June 2010</p>	<p>Classroom teachers and support teachers</p>	<p>Assessment data</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implement <i>Everyday Math Program</i> 	<p>September 2008- June 2010</p>	<p>Classroom & support teachers</p>	<p>Unit Tests</p> <p>Quarterly Benchmark Assessments</p>

2. Annual, Measurable Objective(s)/Tier II Indicators:

(2) Reading: Based on the AYP report unadjusted figures, the percent of students in grades 3, 4 and 5 scoring proficient or higher on the 2009 CMT will increase from 50.8% to 56%.

- The percent of economically disadvantaged students scoring proficient or higher will increase from 46.5% to 52%.
- The percent of white students scoring proficient or higher will increase from 63.3% to 67%.

3. Actions/Strategies/Interventions	Timeline	Person(s) Responsible	Means of Evaluation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2-hour uninterrupted Literacy Block for grades 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement <i>Treasures Reading Program</i> • ½ hour daily whole class instruction on grade-level • 1 ½ hours of flexible grouping time to include small reading groups, literacy centers, independent work and reading • Students reading below grade-level receive double 	September 2009-June 2010	Principal	Academic Schedule Classroom Walk Throughs Formal and informal observations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Administration of Fountas & Pinnell (F&P) benchmark assessment to accurately group students by instructional level 	October 2008, Jan & May 2009; October 2009, Jan. and May 2010	Teachers Grades 1-5 (K teachers in May 2009 and May 2010)	Assessment results
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Flexible grouping in grades 1-5 using leveled texts. Students reading below grade level receive double reading instruction daily. - Multi-sensory approach to reading (Wilson Reading Program) to address decoding and fluency issues of targeted students. - Great Leaps Intervention for targeted students - Rewards Intervention for targeted students 	September 2008-June 2010 September 2008-June 2010 September 2009-June 2010	Classroom teachers & support staff Special education staff Literacy Coaches and other support staff, interventionists	Classroom Walk Throughs Formal and informal observations Data Team assessments F&P levels Bi-weekly Progress Monitoring

2. Annual, Measurable Objective(s)/Tier II Indicators:

(3) Writing: The percent of students scoring proficient or higher on the editing portion of the 2009 CMT will increase from 60% to 63%. The percent of students scoring proficient or higher on the Composing/Revising section of the 2009 CMT will increase from 35.3% to 38%.

3. Actions/Strategies/Interventions	Timeline	Person(s) Responsible	Means of Evaluation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implement Grammar and Writing components of the <i>Treasures Program</i> 	September 2009- June 2010	Classroom Teachers and support staff	Weekly Assessments Unit Assessments

4. MILESTONES, BENCHMARKS, and EVALUATIONS

- Writing:
 - Four writing prompt scores for Grades 2-5
 - Three writing prompt scores for Grade 1
- Math:
 - Data Team Assessments
 - Quarterly Benchmark Assessments
 - Universal Screenings 3x
- Reading/Language Arts:
 - Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessments – 3x for Grades 1-5; 2x for Grade K
 - Data Team Assessments
 - Universal Screenings – 3x

5. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- Positive Behavioral Supports (PBS) – in third year of training; second full year of implementation – training received by the three PBS coaches.
- Data Team training – Four staff received training in the fall 2009. A total of 20 staff have received training to date.
- *Everyday Math* inservices – Classroom teachers and special education teachers have participated.
- *Treasures* inservice – attended by regular education and support staff

6. PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

- Family Activities
 - Spaghetti Dinner
 - McDonald's Night
 - School Fair/Tag Sale
- Learning Events
 - Student Showcase
 - Learning Fair
- Communication of Progress and Expectations
 - Monthly newsletter highlighting academic successes and ways families can contribute to the school and student learning
 - Report card comments communicate student progress toward specific standards
- Parents/guardians are invited annually to participate in forming the school's parent involvement policy (see attached) which is presented at a parent-teacher organization (PTO) meeting.

7. DISTRICT SUPPORT

- Continued movement toward creating a standards-based curriculum and report card
- Focused professional development
- Teacher mentoring program (see attached)
- State support (see attached)

MAPLE STREET SCHOOL PARENT INVOLVEMENT POLICY

The goal of the Maple Street School Parent Involvement Policy is to provide a way for all children to reach a high level of academic achievement and social development through the combined efforts of parents and school personnel.

1. The Maple Street School Parent Involvement Policy will be reviewed annually. Parents will be notified of meetings to revise and improve this policy to meet the changing needs of our school.

Each September the policy will be sent home for families to review.

The Home/School Compact will also be given to each student at the beginning of the school year to be read, signed, and returned to the school.

2. Maple Street School is committed to a strong family partnership. The staff will work to involve all parents/guardians in educating their children. We will facilitate communication between our school and parents/guardians through the following means:
 - A. Report cards will be sent home quarterly, with optional midterm reports available if needed.
 - B. Formal parent conferences will be held with all parents after the first quarter report cards are issued. Another formal conference may be held after the third quarter report cards are issued, if it is requested by either the teacher or parent/guardian.
 - C. Additional conferences can be scheduled at any time at the request of the parent/guardian or teacher.
 - D. Assignment books will go home daily with students in grades 2-5.
 - E. Teachers and the principal will respond promptly to parent requests for communication.
 - F. Monthly Parent-Teacher Organization (PTO) meetings will be held.
3. In order to build capacity for strong parental involvement, Maple Street School will:
 - A. Invite parents/guardians to volunteer to assist in classrooms, chaperone field trips, and assume leadership positions with PTO sponsored events.
 - B. Hold an annual Open House in the fall where parents/guardians visit their child's classroom and teachers discuss curriculum and ways for parents/guardians to help their child succeed in school.
 - C. Hold a Student Showcase in the spring where classes showcase topics and skills the students have been learning. The Showcase also features displays of student artwork, a third grade musical presentation, a band presentation, and a physical education presentation.
4. Communication of school policies will occur via:
 - Student handbooks given to students at the start of each school year.
 - The Maple Street School Home/School Compact
5. Ongoing communication will occur via:
 - A monthly school newsletter that includes a calendar of events at our school.
 - Grade-level or class news.

6. Communication about academic expectation will occur via:
- School academic goals will be posted in the school newsletter
 - Academic successes and honors, both for grade-levels and individual students, will be posted in the newsletter and on the main bulletin board outside the main office.
 - Students will be informed in advance when major tests will occur (i.e., writing prompts, theme tests, chapter and unit tests, Connecticut Mastery Testing)

We value parent involvement and understand that for students to succeed academically, socially, and behaviorally, a strong partnership between school and home is essential.