

Worcester Public Schools  
Elementary Level  
School Improvement Plan  
November 2008 – November 2010

School:  
ELM PARK COMMUNITY SCHOOL

Vision Statement:

Elm Park Community School, through collaboration of home, school, and community, will foster in each student the ability to become a life-long learner, to respect the uniqueness of each individual, and to make a contribution to his or her community as the result of an academically challenging education.

School-wide Focus Statement:

Elm Park Community School's focus on reading comprehension is a collaborative effort to improve students' understanding of text with the ability to effectively summarize and retell across all curriculum areas. Through the implementation of a common set of school wide teaching strategies, student achievement will be measured by both formal and informal assessments.

Student Friendly Focus:

We Read for Meaning. We Read for Knowledge. We Read for Fun.

## School Profile Information

<b>Basic Information</b>	
Name of School	ELM PARK COMMUNITY SCHOOL
Address	23 NORTH ASHLAND STREET
	WORCESTER, MASSACHUSETTS 01609
Telephone	(508) 799-3568
Fax	(508) 799-8216
School Web Page URL	wpsweb.com
Principal	RUTHANN R. MELANCON
Phone, E-mail Address	melanconr@worc.k12.ma.us
Alternative Contact at School	Timothy O'Brien, Assistant Principal

## Worcester Public Schools Evidence Checklist

- # Copies of Worcester Public School curricula, including benchmark documents
- # Minutes of Instructional Leadership Team Meetings
- # Summary Protocol of work accomplished at teacher teams meetings (Looking At Student Work, Data Analysis)
- # School Staff FOCUS Bulletins and Ongoing Communication between Principal, ILT and Staff
- # Lesson Plan Templates
- # MCAS Data
- # MAP Data
- # DRA Data/Site-based assessment
- # DIBELS Data, including benchmark and progress monitoring schedule
- # MELA-O and MEPA data
- # Student Schedules, including intervention schedules
- # Information on Teacher Qualifications
- # Information on Staff Attendance
- # Principals Records of Classroom informal observations and Summary of School Base Learning Walks/  
Walkthroughs/Rounds
- # Attendance and discipline records
- # Information on participation in student assistance programs
- # Information on teacher training and professional development
- # EDM checklists, e.g. Unit/Quarter Class checklists, Unit/Quarter Individual Profile of Progress, Progress Indicator,  
Evaluating My Math Class, Math Logs
- # Worcester Public Schools ELA Portfolios
- # ISSPs
- # After School/Summer School Attendance
- # Professional development listing of teacher participation
- # Curriculum maps
- # Curricula scope and sequence (e.g. Houghton Mifflin Pacing Chart, Everyday Math Pacing Chart)

**Elementary School Staff Roster 2008-2009**

<b>Position</b>	<b>Personnel</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Signature</b>
Principal	Ruthann Melancon	488	
Assistant Principal	Timothy O'Brien	488	
Reading/Writing Coaches	Maria Palmieri/Toni Reidy	488	
Mathematics Coach	Debra Mantyla	488	
Pre School Teacher	Sheila Bjorkman	26	
Pre School Teacher (STEP)	Tracy Bombard	8	
Pre-School Instructional Assistants	Patricia Stone/Linda Feliciano		N/A
Kindergarten	Margaret Donovan	24	
Kindergarten	Karen Maney	26	
Kindergarten	Hermorne McConner	26	
Kindergarten Instructional Assistants	Joyanne Carter, Mary Daniels, Brenda Maxwell		N/A
First Grade	Sharon Dalzell	24	
First Grade	Patricia Riley	21	
First Grade	Kathy Sebok	23	
Second Grade	Rosalind Gonzalez	28	
Second Grade	Britt Richardson	32	
Third Grade	Amanda Freeman (Rhonda Miller)	26	
Third Grade	Dana Ramos	25	
Fourth Grade	Lori Degnan	31	
Fourth Grade	Francis Mahoney	30	
Fifth Grade	Stephanie (Erin) McCann	27	
Fifth Grade	Carol Puskas	25	
Sixth Grade	Deborha Dennison	23	
Sixth Grade	Rachel Henry	24	
Primary Special Education Teacher (Transitional Life Skills)	Doreen Laber	6	
Primary Special Education Teacher (STEP)	Kelle Lynch	13	

<b>Position</b>	<b>Personnel</b>	<b># of Students</b>	<b>Signature</b>
Intermediate Special Education Teacher (STEP)	Eric Peterson	14	
Primary Special Education Teacher	Elizabeth Buteau	23	
Intermediate Special Education Teacher	Kristina Pelczarski	25	
Intermediate Special Education Teacher	Tracy Smith	22	
Behavioral Inclusion Special Education Teacher	Sharon Rogan	21	
Special Education Instructional Assistant	Mary Chatfield		N/A
Special Education Instructional Assistant	Veronika Zhuri		N/A
Special Education Instructional Assistant	Sonia Maldonado		N/A
Special Education Instructional Assistant	Julianne Hirsh		N/A
Special Education Instructional Assistant	Carolyn Cass		N/A
Special Education Instructional Assistant	Lila Franzel		N/A
Special Education Instructional Assistant	Marydonna Lacilla		N/A
Special Education Instructional Assistant	Barbara Menard		N/A
Special Education Instructional Assistant	Judy O'Rourke		N/A
Special Education Instructional Assistant	Jessica Gribbons		N/A
Special Education Instructional Assistant	Joann Cook		N/A
Special Education Instructional Assistant	Linda Feliciano		N/A
Special Education Instructional Assistant	Katerina Roba		N/A
ESL LAB Teacher	Lisa Ansara	48	
ESL LAB Teacher	Karen Manseau	46	
Tutors	Roberta Silver, Roberta Kunen, Sharon Corrigan, Lorene Washburn		N/A
Music Teachers	Monica Blankenship/Peter Levesque		N/A
Art Teachers	Debra Aspen/Darya Kuruna		N/A
Physical Education Teacher	Colleen Paradis		N/A
Health Teacher	Mary Jane Regis		N/A
Office Staff	Mary Caforio/Amarias Silva		N/A
School Adjustment Counselor	Robert Pelczarski		N/A
School Psychologist	Joao Desa		N/A

### Enrollment, Enrollment History (October 1<sup>st</sup>)

2009	2008
	470

### Demographics

Race	100% of Students in School
White/Caucasian	28.1%
African American	17.0%
Hispanic	46.8%
Asian, Pacific Islander	7.2%
Native American	0.9%
Limited English Proficiency	46.4%
Eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch	87.2%
(Other as appropriate)	

### Student Information

	(470)	100 % of Students in School
Total number of registered students		
Number of regular education students	(362)	77%
Number of special education students	(108)	23%
Number of ESL or LEP students	(218)	46.4%
Number of eligible for free and reduced lunch	(410)	87.2%

### Baseline Cumulative Attendance

Year	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June
2007-2008	425	421	417	390	414	413	421	427	423	414
2008-2009	448	437	403	417						

### Mobility

	Inter		Intra		Total	
Entry Mobility Factor	27	5.74%	30	6.38%	57	12.13%
Exit Mobility Factor	11	2.34%	23	4.89%	34	7.23%
Combined Mobility Factor		8.09%		11.28%		19.36%

## 2008 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report Summary

District: Worcester Public School

School: Elm Park Community School

Did school make AYP for 2008:

Adequate Yearly Progress Designation:

ELA: No

Corrective Action

Aggregate & Subgroups

Math: Yes (Aggregate)

Math: No

Corrective Action

Subgroups

Attendance: Yes

Met Target

Overall AYP	English Language Arts			Math			Attendance	
	Met Target		CPI	Met Target		CPI	Met Target	%
	P	I	-3.8	P	I	5.3		
Aggregate	No	No	55.6	No	Yes	51.1	Yes	95.1
Students with Disabilities	No	No	33.0	No	No	24.5	Yes	95.8
Limited English Proficient	No	No	50.0	No	No	47.2	Yes	93.9
Low Income	No	No	55.7	No	Yes	50.8	Yes	95.2
African American/Black	-	-	64.3	-	-	51.6	-	-
Asian or Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	No	No	51.7	No	Yes	48.5	Yes	94.9
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	No	No	56.5	No	No	51.5	Yes	95.0

## Introduction/Executive Summary

Elm Park Community School is committed to educating all 487 students to achieve high academic standards. Our program provides services to accommodate the needs of students from diverse racial (72%), socio-economic backgrounds (87%) as well as students with a wide range of learning styles and academic needs both in structured therapeutic educational programs and in inclusive settings. Our school has seen an increase in English Language Learners (46.8%) where eighty-four students are receiving services in two English Language Laboratory and the balance of that population are served in inclusive settings. Because there was a decline in student performance in MCAS ELA/Reading and Open Response/short answer questions, our November 2008 – 2010 School Improvement Plan targets the instructional focuses of *vocabulary* and *reading comprehension*. This is not only evident in the aggregate but also within the subgroup populations. The teachers and staff collaboratively developed a working plan to ensure that the curriculum focuses on the skills and concepts from various strands to enhance student learning and proficiency in English Language Arts and Mathematics.

Grade Level teams meet throughout the school year during monthly staff meetings to focus on student achievement and to collaboratively plan their lessons. They also meet to analyze formal and informal assessments, discuss strategies and share instructional techniques including differentiating instruction. In addition to daily writing opportunities utilized in the Houghton Mifflin and Everyday Math programs, teacher modeling using exemplar questions, and sample MCAS questions will increase students' abilities to respond to open response and short answer questions. MCAS, MAP, MELA-O, MEPA, DIBELS, DRA, Portfolios, Houghton Mifflin assessments, and Everyday Math assessments provide teachers, parents, and students with detailed information about students' strengths and weaknesses to design goals for improvement. The school's instructional focus was based upon staff and the ILT analyzing data from the formal and informal assessments that was finalized through a "grade level gallery walk" at a staff meeting.

Elm Park Community School reached AYP in Math for 2008 for the aggregate population. We did not make AYP for the subgroups in Math for 2008. We have not made AYP in ELA for the aggregate or subgroups since 2004. Cycle V, 2007 and 2008, places us -3.8 points below the target in English Language Arts and 5.3 in Math. The staff has implemented the Houghton Mifflin Reading Program to drive our instruction. Leveled Readers has helped to differentiate instruction for flexible groups, however, more support materials are needed to provide intensive instruction to ensure that all students achieve at high standards. The Everyday Math Program contains components and hands on activities to address diversity of learners and their learning styles. Cross curricular connections, re-teaching, enrichment activities, ESL Lab programs and materials, and special educational accommodations provide additional instructional support.

As our student population needs change, the School Improvement Plan will be updated to reflect those changes. New student performance data will provide teachers and the ILT with additional information upon which to make instructional and goal changes in this document.

The ILT will continue to meet on a weekly basis on Tuesday mornings to facilitate professional development, analyze data, and facilitate the leadership efforts for the school.

# English Language Arts Analysis

Student strengths and weaknesses were identified through formative and summative assessment data. DIBLES, DRA, MAPS, MCAS, Houghton-Mifflin Unit Tests, teacher observation, MELA-O, MEPA and ELA portfolios identified a school-wide weakness in Reading Comprehension. Each grade level analyzed their grade appropriate assessments to identify their students' needs.

The Kindergarten teachers analyzed DIBLES, DRA, Houghton-Mifflin assessments, and teacher observations to identify Letter Naming Fluency as a grade level need. DIBLES indicated 51% of students were in the At Risk and Some Risk categories while the DRA had 58% of the students at Below Benchmark.

First Grade teachers analyzed DIBLES, DRA, Houghton-Mifflin assessments and teacher observations to identify Blending Sounds as a grade level need. DIBLES indicated 58% of students were in the At Risk and Some Risk categories while the DRA had 53% of the students at Below Benchmark.

The Second Grade teachers analyzed MAP, Houghton-Mifflin assessments and teacher observations to identify Understanding Text as a grade level need. The Fall MAP mean RIT score was 168.5 with 61% of students scoring in the Low category.

The Third Grade analyzed MAP, MCAS, Houghton-Mifflin assessments and teacher observations to identify Vocabulary Concept Development as a grade level need. The Fall MAP mean RIT score was 176.5 with 71% of students scoring in the Low category. MCAS data shows last year students attained 60% of points possible in the Language portion, 51% of points in Reading and 59% of points Multiple Choice.

The Intermediate grades analyzed MCAS, MAP, Houghton-Mifflin assessments, ELA Portfolios; teacher observations identified their student needs.

Grade 4 identified Understanding Text as a grade level need. The Fall MAP mean RIT score was 193 with 59% of students scoring in the Low category. Analysis of the MCAS data indicated 60% of possible points were attained in Language, 51% in Reading, 59% in Multiple-Choice and 33% in Open-Ended Response.

Grade 5 identified Vocabulary Concept Development as a grade level need. The Fall MAP mean RIT score was 195.8 with 60% of students in the Low Category. Analysis of the MCAS data indicated 49% of possible points were attained in Language, 54% in Reading, 58% in Multiple-Choice and 46% in Open-Ended Response.

Grade 6 identified Vocabulary Concept Development as a grade level need. The Fall MAP mean RIT score was 204.5 with 54% of students in the Low Category. MCAS analysis indicated 59% of possible points were attained in Language, 55% in Reading, 62% in Multiple-Choice and 44% in Open-Ended Response.

2008-2009 School Improvement Action Plan  
 Improve reading instruction and accelerate student that are below grade level to reach grade level.  
 Overview of School's Reading and English Language Arts Program

ELA/Reading Program	Action Steps	Leader	Resources	Frequency
<b>Tier I</b> Houghton Mifflin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 90 minute uninterrupted reading instruction time</li> </ul>	Building Administrators Reading Coach ILT	Houghton Mifflin Program Components	Daily
<b>Tier II</b> Houghton Mifflin Strategies small groups	<p>Identify students needing supplemental instruction based on three tier model provide 30 minutes to small group (5 students or less) of supplemental instruction monitor individual student progress</p> <p>Adjust flexible groupings based on data</p> <p>Teams look at student work samples and data to help guide the modification and adjustments of instruction</p>	Building Administrators Reading Coach Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Reading Tutors Instructional Assistants ILT	Houghton Mifflin Program Components Classroom Libraries Leveled Readers	Daily
<b>Tier III</b> Interventions	<p>Identify students needing intensive instruction based on three tier model</p> <p>Provide 60 minutes to small groups (3 students or less) of intervention instruction</p> <p>Monitor individual student progress</p> <p>Adjust flexible groupings based on data</p>	Building Administrators Reading Coach Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Reading Tutors Instructional Assistants ILT	Wilson Materials Leveled Readers	Daily

<b>ELA/Program Objectives</b>	<b>Action Steps</b>	<b>Leader</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Frequency/Timeline</b>
Use data to improve reading instruction	Review of last year's data Develop grade level goals Use data to develop action plan for following year Team of teachers are involved in regular building Learning Walks and Walkthroughs organized by the Principal and Instructional Leadership team Principal will spend no less than two hours each day in classrooms doing informal visits	Building Administrators Reading Coach Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Reading Tutors Instructional Assistants ILT	NWEA Reports MCAS Data Building Level assessments	Monthly/Weekly

Continue to develop and utilize staff to coordinate resources and activities in the building for the literacy school wide models	Monthly grade level meetings Discuss curriculum issues Discuss scheduling issues Analyze Data Oversee, implement, and adjust intervention plans for students	Administrators Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Reading Coach Instructional Assistants ILT	NWEA Reports MCAS Data Building Level assessments	Monthly Weekly Daily
Provide resources that directly relate to grade level goals and school goals	Purchase supplemental instructional materials that support grade level goals	Reading Coach Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Building Administrators	Title One Administrators	Monthly Weekly Daily
Provide targeted PD in support of key teaching strategies related to the schools instructional focus	Staff training in Houghton Mifflin Provide vocabulary development workshops	Reading Coach Administrators ILT	Title One Administrators	Monthly

ELA/Program Objectives	Action Steps	Leader	Resources	Frequency/Timeline
Continue targeted professional development plan	Continue with the staff development plan which build expertise, ensures change in practices, monitors results and communicate progress to all staff and includes time for implementation, reflection, sharing with peers, and observation of peers Post data through and school to showcase school, grade level and classroom goals. Celebrate student success at meeting these goals One hour grade level meeting per month Monthly grade level meetings K-3 Monthly grade level meeting 4-6 DIBELS Progress Monitoring MAP Progress Monitoring	Reading Coach Administrators Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Instructional Assistants ILT	NWEA Reports MCAS Data Building Level assessments Learning Walks NWEA Web site DIBELS Reports DRA Reports Special Education Dept. ELL Dept. MESPA ASCD Worcester Consortium Online Courses	Monthly Weekly Daily
Provide staff development in the area of differentiating instruction	Training staff in the area of differentiating instruction	Reading Coach Administrators ILT	WPS Prof. Dev. Title One Ofc.	Monthly Weekly Daily
Encourage students to attend out-of-school time programs	Identify students Communicate with parents the benefits of after school and summer programs	Reading Coach Administrators ILT Classroom Teachers	21 <sup>st</sup> Century Programs SES Programs BBBS	Daily

**School Goal 1 EXTERNAL**

One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in Reading as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 20% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 80% will show growth within their performance level. Our goal is to have 25% at Proficient in READING in 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Students will explain the process for solving open response problems both orally and in writing.  Best Practice: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (predicting, questioning, clarifying, & summarizing)	Houghton Mifflin strategies staff development Grade level meetings MCAS example review Exemplars review	Sept. 2008 through June 2010 Monthly staff meetings	State Frameworks Houghton Mifflin Core Program MCAS open response examples w/rubrics Exemplars Graphic Organizers Supplemental materials Learning Centers	Principal Classroom teachers Reading Coaches ESL teachers Special education teachers Reading tutors ILT	Review examples of student work including exemplars and open response rubric scored samples Review of Informal, formative, and MCAS data Teacher observation Student Portfolios
Teachers will implement explicit instruction of standards based vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit.  Best Practice:	Grade Level meetings Frayer Model staff development	September 2008 through 2010 Monthly staff meetings	State standards and Houghton Mifflin vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic Organizers Posted vocabulary	Principal Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Reading tutors Special Education Teachers ILT	Review of examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/Post assessments MCAS questions Exit Slips Teacher

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frayer Model for vocabulary development</li> <li>• Interactive Word Walls</li> </ul>			Learning Centers		Observation Student Portfolios
<p>Teachers will monitor daily student understanding of vocabulary and comprehension of reading lesson.</p> <p>Best Practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit slips</li> <li>• Think, Pair, &amp; Share</li> </ul>	Focused school wide Professional Development Plan Grade level meetings	September 2008 through June 2010	State Standards Differentiated Instruction flexible groupings and activities Think, Pair, & Share Exit Slips	Classroom teachers Reading Coaches ESL Teachers Special Education Teachers Reading tutors Principal ILT	Review examples of student work Exit Slips Houghton Mifflin Reading program assessments Think, Pair, & Share MCAS questions
Daily Independent Reading Practice to increase each student's reading level to meet grade level expectations. Monitor for understanding	Focused school wide professional development plan	September 2008 through June 2010	State Standards Think, Pair, & Share Exit Slips	Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Special Education Teachers Reading Tutors Principal ILT	Examples of student work Exit Slips Think, Pair, & Share MCAS questions
School day schedule will be modified to give more time for ELA/Reading	Focused school wide Professional Development Plan Grade level meetings Staff Meetings WPS Prof. Dev.	February 2009 through June 2009	State Frameworks Houghton Mifflin Core Program MCAS open response examples w/rubrics Exemplars Graphic Organizers Supplemental materials Learning Centers Title One	Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Special Education Teachers Reading Tutors Principal ILT	Review examples of student work including exemplars and open response rubric scored samples Review of Informal, formative, and MCAS data Teacher

					observation Student Portfolios
--	--	--	--	--	--------------------------------------

**School Goal 2 INTERNAL:**

A. One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in READING as demonstrated by the administration of MAP Assessment. No less than 30% of students will meet or exceed their growth scores. The remaining 70% will show growth in their overall RIT score from fall to spring. Our goal is to have no less than 25% at their grade level benchmark by June 2009.

B. One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in READING as measured by the administration of DIBELS. No less than 30% of students will move to the next level of performance. The remaining 70% will show growth within their performance level by increasing their individual score from fall to spring. Our goal is to have no less than 30% at their grade level benchmark by June 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Students will explain the process for solving open response problems both orally and in writing.  Best Practice: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (predicting, questioning, clarifying, & summarizing)	Houghton Mifflin strategies staff development Grade level meetings MCAS example review Exemplars review	Sept. 2008 through June 2010 Monthly staff meetings	State Frameworks Houghton Mifflin Core Program MCAS open response examples w/rubrics Exemplars Graphic Organizers Supplemental materials Learning Centers	Principal Classroom teachers Reading Coach ESL Lab Teachers Special education teachers Reading tutors ILT	Review examples of student work including exemplars and open response rubric scored samples Review of Informal, formative, and MCAS data Teacher observation Student Portfolios

<p>Teachers will implement explicit instruction of standards based vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit.</p> <p>Best Practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frayer Model for vocabulary development</li> <li>• Interactive Word Walls</li> </ul>	<p>Grade Level meetings Frayer Model staff development</p>	<p>September 2008 through 2010 Monthly staff meetings</p>	<p>State standards and Houghton Mifflin vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic Organizers Posted vocabulary Learning Centers</p>	<p>Principal Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Reading tutors Special Education Teachers ILT</p>	<p>Review of examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/Post assessments MCAS questions Exit Slips Teacher Observation Student Portfolios</p>
<p>Teachers will monitor daily student understanding of vocabulary and comprehension of reading lesson.</p> <p>Best Practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit slips</li> <li>• Think, Pair, &amp; Share</li> </ul>	<p>Focused school wide Professional Development Plan Grade level meetings</p>	<p>September 2008 through June 2010</p>	<p>State Standards Differentiated Instruction flexible groupings and activities Think, Pair, &amp; Share Exit Slips</p>	<p>Classroom teachers Reading Coaches ESL Teachers Special Education Teachers Reading tutors Principal ILT</p>	<p>Review examples of student work Exit Slips Houghton Mifflin Reading program assessments Think, Pair, &amp; Share MCAS questions</p>
<p>Daily Independent Reading Practice to increase each student's reading level to meet grade level expectations.</p>	<p>Focused school wide professional development plan</p>	<p>September 2008 through June 2010</p>	<p>State Standards Think, Pair, &amp; Share Exit Slips</p>	<p>Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Special Education Teachers</p>	<p>Examples of student work Exit Slips Think, Pair, &amp; Share</p>

Monitor for understanding				Reading Tutors Principal ILT	MCAS questions
---------------------------	--	--	--	------------------------------------	----------------

**School Goal 3 SUB GROUPS**

A. One hundred percent of our special education students will show improvement in Reading as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 20% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 80% will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in reading for Special Education subgroup is 0% proficient or above, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 10% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

B. One hundred percent of our ELL students will show improvement in reading as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 25 % of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 75% percent will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in reading for the ELL subgroup is 0% Proficient or Above on MCAS, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 10% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Teachers will implement Flexible group work to monitor and adjust intervention plans for phonics instruction and literacy development	ELL and Special Education Training Faculty Meetings Grade Level Meetings	February 2009-June 2009	Houghton Mifflin Program Components MELA-O/IPT NWEA Web site Classroom Libraries ESL Lab Materials	Classroom Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Administrators Reading Coach Special Education Teachers ILT Instructional Assistants	Formal and Informal Assessments Lexile Levels Descartes SSP Meetings 504 Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations MELA-O Assessments

Teachers will provide opportunities for Vocabulary building and comprehension strategies	ELL Training Special Education Training	November 2008 – June 2009	Houghton Mifflin Program Components MELA-O/IPT NWEA Web site Classroom Libraries ESL Lab Materials	Classroom Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Administrators Reading Coach Special Education Teachers ILT Instructional Assistants	Review of Work samples and responses Formal and Informal Assessments Lexile Levels Descartes
Teachers will increase oral reading opportunities to improve fluency, decoding, and sight word vocabulary	ELL Training Special Education Training	November 2008 – June 2009	Listening stations Leveled readers Big Books Choral Reading DRA Assessment Kit MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	Classroom Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Administrators Reading Coach Special Education Teachers ILT Instructional Assistants Volunteers	Running Records Lexile Levels DRA Continuum Guided reading Formal and Informal Assessments

**Kindergarten  
Goal I ELA/Reading:**

<b>DIBELS Assessment</b>	<i>Fall 2008 Performance</i>			<i>Actual Winter 2009</i>			<i>Outcome (Actual Spring 2009)</i>		
	<i># of Students</i>			<i># of Students</i>			<i># of Students</i>		
	<i>At Risk</i>	<i>Some Risk</i>	<i>No Risk</i>	<i>At Risk</i>	<i>Some Risk</i>	<i>No Risk</i>	<i>At Risk</i>	<i>Some Risk</i>	<i>No Risk</i>
<i>Initial Sound Fluency</i>	10	15	46						
<i>Letter Naming Fluency</i>	22	12	33						
<i>Phoneme Segmentation Fluency</i>									
<i>Nonsense Words</i>									
<i>Oral Fluency</i>									

<b>Kindergarten DRA Assessment</b>	<b>% Below Benchmark</b>	<b>% At Benchmark</b>	<b>% Above Benchmark</b>
<i>Reading Level</i>	58	10	0

**Kindergarten**

**School Goal 1 EXTERNAL :**

**ELA/Reading:** One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in Reading as demonstrated by the administration of the DIBELS. No less than 20% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 80% will show growth within their performance level. Our goal is to have 25% at Proficient in READING in 2009.

<i><b>Action Steps</b></i> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<i><b>Professional Development</b></i> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<i><b>Timeline/Date Completed</b></i> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<i><b>Resources</b></i> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<i><b>Person Responsible</b></i> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<i><b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b></i> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Analyze DIBELS data to develop and utilize staff/resources to improve reading instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Houghton Mifflin Strategies staff development</li> <li>• Grade level meetings</li> </ul>	November 2008 through June 2009 Monthly staff meetings Progress Monitoring in October, January, May and as needed	Mclassdibels.com DAB Support staff Reading Coach Palm Pilots Teacher Data Binder	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principal</li> <li>• Classroom Teachers</li> <li>• ELA/Reading Coach</li> <li>• Special Education Teachers</li> </ul>	Performance on DIBELS Subgroups Teacher Observations Anecdotal Notes
Analyze Unit Tests from Houghton Mifflin to monitor progress, adjust goals, and implement plans to improve reading instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade level meetings</li> <li>• Staff Meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• November 2008 through June 2009</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Frameworks</li> <li>• Houghton Mifflin Program Components</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrators</li> <li>• Classroom Teachers</li> <li>• Reading Coach</li> <li>• Special Education Teachers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher observation</li> <li>• Houghton Mifflin Assessments</li> <li>• Anecdotal Notes</li> <li>• Houghton Mifflin Pacing Chart</li> </ul>

Use teacher checklists and assessments to form differentiated instructional groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade Level Meetings</li> <li>• ELL Training</li> <li>• Special Education Training</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• November 2008 through June 2009</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher made assessments</li> <li>• Checklists</li> <li>• NWEA Website</li> <li>• MELA-O Assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrators</li> <li>• Classroom Teachers</li> <li>• Reading Coach</li> <li>• Special Education Teachers</li> <li>• ILT</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anecdotal Notes</li> <li>• Learning Center Writing</li> <li>• Teacher created assessments</li> <li>• MELA-O Performance</li> <li>• Lexiles Levels</li> <li>• Deacartes</li> </ul>
--	--	---	--	--	--

**Kindergarten**  
**School Goal 2 INTERNAL:**  
**ELA/Reading**

B. One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in READING as measured by the administration of DIBELS. No less than 30% of students will move to the next level of performance. The remaining 70% will show growth within their performance level by increasing their individual score from fall to spring. Our goal is to have no less than 30% at their grade level benchmark by June 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Teachers will implement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Houghton Mifflin</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• November 2008</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Houghton Mifflin</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrators</li> <li>• Classroom</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning Center</li> </ul>

Houghton Mifflin reading program Components for 90 minutes of literacy development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>strategies staff</li> <li>development</li> <li>Grade level meetings</li> <li>Shared Best Practices</li> <li>Monthly staff meetings</li> </ul>	through June 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program Components</li> <li>Classroom Libraries</li> <li>Listening Station</li> <li>Teacher Created Learning Centers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>teachers</li> <li>Reading Coach</li> <li>Special education teachers</li> <li>ILT</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work</li> <li>Informal, formative, Assessments</li> <li>Teacher observation</li> <li>Student Portfolios</li> <li>Lexile Levels</li> <li>Descartes</li> </ul>
Teachers will implement explicit instruction of standards based vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit.  Best Practice: Frayer Model for vocabulary development Interactive Word Walls	Grade Level meetings Frayer Model staff development	September 2008 through 2010 Monthly staff meetings	State standards and Houghton Mifflin vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic Organizers Posted vocabulary Learning Centers	Principal Classroom teachers Reading coaches Reading tutors Special Education Teachers ILT	Review of examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/Post assessments MCAS questions Exit Slips Teacher Observation Student Portfolios
Teachers will monitor daily student understanding of vocabulary and comprehension of reading lesson.  Best Practice: Exit slips Think, Pair, & Share	Focused school wide Professional Development Plan Grade level meetings	September 2008 through June 2010	State Standards Differentiated Instruction flexible groupings and activities Think, Pair, & Share Exit Slips	Classroom teachers Reading Coaches Special Education Teachers Reading tutors Principal ILT	Review examples of student work Exit Slips Houghton Mifflin Reading program assessments Think, Pair, & Share MCAS questions
Daily Independent Reading Practice to increase each student's reading level to meet	Focused school wide professional development plan	September 2008 through June 2010	State Standards Think, Pair, & Share Exit Slips	Classroom teachers Reading coaches Special Education Teachers	Examples of student work Exit Slips Think, Pair, &

grade level expectations. Monitor for understanding				Reading Tutors Principal ILT	Share MCAS questions
--	--	--	--	------------------------------------	-------------------------

**Kindergarten**

**School Goal 3 Sub Groups:**

**ELA/Reading**

A. One hundred percent of our special education students will show improvement in Reading as demonstrated by the administration of the DIBELS. No less than 20% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 80% will show growth within their performance level. Our goal is to have 30% at proficient in reading.

B. One hundred percent of our ELL students will show improvement in reading as demonstrated by the administration of the DIBELS. No less than 25 % of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 75% percent will show growth within their performance level. Our goal is to have 30% proficient in reading.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Teachers will implement Flexible group work to monitor and adjust intervention plans for phonics instruction and literacy development	ELL and Special Education Training Faculty Meetings Grade Level Meetings	February 2009-June 2009	Houghton Mifflin Program Components MELA-O/IPT NWEA Web site Classroom Libraries WPS Professional Development	Classroom Teachers Administrators Reading Coach Special Education Teachers ILT Instructional Assistants	Formal and Informal Assessments Lexile Levels Descartes SSP Meetings 504 Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations MELA-O Assessments

Teachers will provide opportunities for Vocabulary building and comprehension strategies	ELL Training Special Education Training	November 2008 – June 2009	Houghton Mifflin Program Components MELA-O/IPT NWEA Web site Classroom Libraries WPS Professional Development	Classroom Teachers Administrators Reading Coach Special Education Teachers ILT Instructional Assistants	Review of Work samples and responses Formal and Informal Assessments Lexile Levels Descartes
Teachers will increase oral reading opportunities to improve fluency, decoding, and sight word vocabulary	ELL Training Special Education Training	November 2008 – June 2009	Listening stations Leveled readers Big Books Choral Reading DRA Assessment Kit MELA-O/IPT	Classroom Teachers Administrators Reading Coach Special Education Teachers ILT Instructional Assistants Volunteers	Running Records Lexile Levels DRA Continuum Guided reading Formal and Informal Assessments

**Grade 1  
ELA/Reading**

<b>DIBELS Assessment</b>	<b>Fall 2008 Performance</b>			<b>Actual Winter 2009</b>			<b>Outcome (Actual Spring 2009)</b>		
	<b># of Students</b>			<b># of Students</b>			<b># of Students</b>		
	<b>At Risk</b>	<b>Some Risk</b>	<b>No Risk</b>	<b>At Risk</b>	<b>Some Risk</b>	<b>No Risk</b>	<b>At Risk</b>	<b>Some Risk</b>	<b>No Risk</b>
<b>Initial Sound Fluency</b>	-	-	-						
<b>Letter Naming Fluency</b>	15	23	24						
<b>Phoneme Segmentation Fluency</b>	13	41	13						
<b>Nonsense Words</b>	23	15	27						
<b>Oral Fluency</b>	-	-	-						

<b>Grade 1 DRA Assessment</b>	<b>% Below Benchmark</b>	<b>% At Benchmark</b>	<b>% Above Benchmark</b>
<i>Reading Level</i>	53	46	1

## Grade 1

### School Goal 1 **EXTERNAL**

**ELA/Reading:** One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in Reading as demonstrated by the administration of the DIBELS. No less than 20% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 80% will show growth within their performance level. Our goal is to have 25% at Proficient in READING in 2009.

<b><i>Action Steps</i></b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b><i>Professional Development</i></b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b><i>Timeline/Date Completed</i></b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b><i>Resources</i></b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b><i>Person Responsible</i></b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b><i>Monitoring Effectiveness</i></b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Students will explain their process for solving open response problems both orally and in writing.  BEST PRACTICE: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (predicting, questioning, clarifying, summarizing)	Houghton Mifflin Strategies staff development Grade level meetings MCAS example review Exemplars review	September 2008 through June 2010 Monthly staff meetings	State Frameworks Houghton Mifflin Core Program MCAS open response examples w/ rubrics Exemplars Graphic Organizers Supplemental Materials Manipulatives	Principal Classroom Teachers ELA/Reading Coaches ESL Teachers Special Education Teachers Reading Tutors	Examples of student work (to include exemplars and open response samples) Teacher observation Informal assessments Rubric scored samples Exit Slips MCAS/MAP data

<p>Explicit instruction of standards based vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit.</p> <p><b>BEST PRACTICE:</b> Frayer Model for vocabulary development Interactive word walls</p>	<p>Grade level meetings Frayer Model staff development</p>	<p>September 2008 through June 2010 Monthly staff meetings</p>	<p>State Frameworks Houghton Mifflin Core Program MCAS open response examples w/ rubrics Exemplars Graphic Organizers Supplemental Materials Manipulatives</p>	<p>Principal Classroom Teachers ELA/Reading Coaches ESL Teachers Special Education Teachers Reading Tutors</p>	<p>Examples of student work(to include exemplars and open response samples) Teacher observation Informal assessments Rubric scored samples Exit Slips MCAS/MAP data</p>
<p>Monitor daily student understanding of reading lesson</p> <p><b>BEST PRACTICE:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit Slips</li> <li>• Think, Pair, Share</li> </ul>	<p>Focused School wide Professional Development Plan Grade level meetings</p>	<p>September 2008 through June 2010</p>	<p>State Standards Differentiated Instruction flexible groupings and activities Think, pair, share strategy Exit Slips</p>	<p>Principal Classroom Teachers ELA/Reading Coaches ESL Teachers Special Education Teachers Reading Tutors</p>	<p>Examples of student work Exit Slips Houghton Mifflin End of Unit assessments Think, Pair, Share MCAS questions</p>

**Grade 1**

**School Goal 2 INTERNAL:**

ELA\Reading

A. One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in READING as demonstrated by the administration of DIBELS Assessment. No less than 30% of students will meet or exceed their growth scores. The remaining 70% will show growth in their overall RIT score from fall to spring. Our goal is to have no less than 25% at their grade level benchmark by June 2009.

B. One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in READING as measured by the administration of DIBELS. No less than 30% of students will move to the next level of performance. The remaining 70% will show growth within their performance level

by increasing their individual score from fall to spring. Our goal is to have no less than 30% at their grade level benchmark by June 2009.

<b><i>Action Steps</i></b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b><i>Professional Development</i></b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b><i>Timeline/Date Completed</i></b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b><i>Resources</i></b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b><i>Person Responsible</i></b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b><i>Monitoring Effectiveness</i></b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
<p>Students will explain the process for solving open response problems both orally and in writing.</p> <p>Best Practice: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (predicting, questioning, clarifying, &amp; summarizing)</p>	<p>Houghton Mifflin strategies staff development Grade level meetings MCAS example review Exemplars review</p>	<p>Sept. 2008 through June 2010 Monthly staff meetings</p>	<p>State Frameworks Houghton Mifflin Core Program MCAS open response examples w/rubrics Exemplars Graphic Organizers Supplemental materials Learning Centers</p>	<p>Principal Classroom teachers Reading Coach ESL Lab Teachers Special education teachers Reading tutors ILT</p>	<p>Review examples of student work including exemplars and open response rubric scored samples Review of Informal, formative, and MCAS data Teacher observation Student Portfolios</p>
<p>Teachers will implement explicit instruction of standards based vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit.</p> <p>Best Practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frayer Model for vocabulary development</li> </ul>	<p>Grade Level meetings Frayer Model staff development</p>	<p>September 2008 through 2010 Monthly staff meetings</p>	<p>State standards and Houghton Mifflin vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic Organizers Posted vocabulary Learning Centers</p>	<p>Principal Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Reading tutors Special Education Teachers ILT</p>	<p>Review of examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/Post assessments MCAS questions Exit Slips Teacher Observation Student Portfolios</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interactive Word Walls</li> </ul>					
<p>Teachers will monitor daily student understanding of vocabulary and comprehension of reading lesson.</p> <p>Best Practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exit slips</li> <li>Think, Pair, &amp; Share</li> </ul>	<p>Focused school wide Professional Development Plan Grade level meetings</p>	<p>September 2008 through June 2010</p>	<p>State Standards Differentiated Instruction flexible groupings and activities Think, Pair, &amp; Share Exit Slips</p>	<p>Classroom teachers Reading Coaches ESL Teachers Special Education Teachers Reading tutors Principal ILT</p>	<p>Review examples of student work Exit Slips Houghton Mifflin Reading program assessments Think, Pair, &amp; Share MCAS questions</p>
<p>Daily Independent Reading Practice to increase each student's reading level to meet grade level expectations. Monitor for understanding</p>	<p>Focused school wide professional development plan</p>	<p>September 2008 through June 2010</p>	<p>State Standards Think, Pair, &amp; Share Exit Slips</p>	<p>Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Special Education Teachers Reading Tutors Principal ILT</p>	<p>Examples of student work Exit Slips Think, Pair, &amp; Share MCAS questions</p>

**Grade 1**

**School Goal 3 Sub Groups:**

One hundred percent of our special education students will show improvement in Reading as demonstrated by the administration of the DIBELS. No less than 20% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 80% will show growth within their performance level. Our goal is to have 30% proficient in reading in June 2009.

One hundred percent of our ELL students will show improvement in reading as demonstrated by the administration of the DIBELS. No less than 25% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 75% percent will show growth within their performance level. Our goal is to have 30% proficient in reading in June 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Teachers will implement Flexible group work to monitor and adjust intervention plans for phonics instruction and literacy development	ELL and Special Education Training Faculty Meetings Grade Level Meetings	February 2009-June 2009	Houghton Mifflin Program Components MELA-O/IPT NWEA Web site Classroom Libraries ESL Lab Materials	Classroom Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Administrators Reading Coach Special Education Teachers ILT Instructional Assistants	Formal and Informal Assessments Lexile Levels Descartes SSP Meetings 504 Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations MELA-O Assessments
Teachers will provide opportunities for Vocabulary building and comprehension strategies	ELL Training Special Education Training	November 2008 – June 2009	Houghton Mifflin Program Components MELA-O/IPT NWEA Web site Classroom Libraries ESL Lab Materials	Classroom Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Administrators Reading Coach Special Education Teachers ILT Instructional Assistants	Review of Work samples and responses Formal and Informal Assessments Lexile Levels Descartes
Teachers will increase oral reading opportunities to improve fluency, decoding, and sight word vocabulary	ELL Training Special Education Training	November 2008 – June 2009	Listening stations Leveled readers Big Books Choral Reading DRA Assessment Kit	Classroom Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Administrators Reading Coach Special Education Teachers	Running Records Lexile Levels DRA Continuum Guided reading Formal and Informal

			MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	ILT Instructional Assistants Volunteers	Assessments
--	--	--	-----------------------------	--	-------------

Grade 2 Goal 1 ELA/Reading: Data	FALL 2008				WINTER 2009				SPRING 2009			
Grade 2 MAP Assessment	MEAN RIT	%LO	%AV	%HI	MEAN RIT	%LO	%AV	%HI	MEAN RIT	%LO	%AV	%HI
<i>Lang: Vocab/Concept Dev.</i>	169.5	50.8	27.8	21.3								
<i>Understand Text Imag/Lit</i>	168.9	60.6	14.7	24.5								
<i>Understand Text Inform/Expos</i>	170.1	55.7	21.3	22.9								
<i>Genre/Fiction/Nonfiction</i>	171.1	55.7	18.0	26.2								
<i>Style &amp; Language</i>	172.3	54.0	27.8	18.0								

Grade 2 DRA Assessment	% Below Benchmark	% At Benchmark	% Above Benchmark
<i>Reading Level</i>	-	-	-

## Grade 2

### School Goal 1 **EXTERNAL:**

#### ELA\Reading:

One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in Reading as demonstrated by the administration of the DRA. No less than 20% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 80% will show growth within their performance level. Our goal is to have 25% at Proficient in READING in 2009.

<p><b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?</p>	<p><b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?</p>	<p><b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.</p>	<p><b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?</p>	<p><b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?</p>	<p><b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?</p>
<p>Students will explain the process for solving open response problems both orally and in writing.</p> <p>Best Practice: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (predicting, questioning, clarifying, &amp; summarizing)</p>	<p>Houghton Mifflin strategies staff development Grade level meetings MCAS example review Exemplars review</p>	<p>Sept. 2008 through June 2010 Monthly staff meetings</p>	<p>State Frameworks Houghton Mifflin Core Program MCAS open response examples w/rubrics Exemplars Graphic Organizers Supplemental materials Learning Centers</p>	<p>Principal Classroom teachers Reading Coaches ESL teachers Special education teachers Reading tutors ILT</p>	<p>Review examples of student work including exemplars and open response rubric scored samples Review of Informal, formative, and MCAS data Teacher observation Student Portfolios</p>
<p>Teachers will implement explicit instruction of standards based vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit.</p> <p>Best Practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frayer Model for</li> </ul>	<p>Grade Level meetings Frayer Model staff development</p>	<p>September 2008 through 2010 Monthly staff meetings</p>	<p>State standards and Houghton Mifflin vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic Organizers Posted vocabulary Learning Centers</p>	<p>Principal Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Reading tutors Special Education Teachers ILT</p>	<p>Review of examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/Post assessments MCAS questions Exit Slips Teacher Observation</p>

<p>vocabulary development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interactive Word Walls</li> </ul>					Student Portfolios
<p>Teachers will monitor daily student understanding of vocabulary and comprehension of reading lesson.</p> <p>Best Practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exit slips</li> <li>Think, Pair, &amp; Share</li> </ul>	<p>Focused school wide Professional Development Plan Grade level meetings</p>	<p>September 2008 through June 2010</p>	<p>State Standards Differentiated Instruction flexible groupings and activities Think, Pair, &amp; Share Exit Slips</p>	<p>Classroom teachers Reading Coaches ESL Teachers Special Education Teachers Reading tutors Principal ILT</p>	<p>Review examples of student work Exit Slips Houghton Mifflin Reading program assessments Think, Pair, &amp; Share MCAS questions</p>
<p>Daily Independent Reading Practice to increase each student's reading level to meet grade level expectations. Monitor for understanding</p>	<p>Focused school wide professional development plan</p>	<p>September 2008 through June 2010</p>	<p>State Standards Think, Pair, &amp; Share Exit Slips</p>	<p>Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Special Education Teachers Reading Tutors Principal ILT</p>	<p>Examples of student work Exit Slips Think, Pair, &amp; Share MCAS questions</p>
<p>School day schedule will be modified to give more time for ELA/Reading</p>	<p>Focused school wide Professional Development Plan Grade level meetings Staff Meetings</p>	<p>February 2009 through June 2009</p>	<p>State Frameworks Houghton Mifflin Core Program MCAS open response examples w/rubrics Exemplars Graphic Organizers Supplemental materials Learning Centers</p>	<p>Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Special Education Teachers Reading Tutors Principal ILT</p>	<p>Review examples of student work including exemplars and open response rubric scored samples Review of Informal, formative, and</p>

			Title One WPS Prof. Dev.		MCAS data Teacher observation Student Portfolios
--	--	--	-----------------------------	--	--

## Grade 2

### School Goal 2 **INTERNAL:** ELA/Reading:

A. One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in READING as demonstrated by the administration of MAP Assessment. No less than 30% of students will meet or exceed their growth scores. The remaining 70% will show growth in their overall RIT score from fall to spring. Our goal is to have no less than 25% at their grade level benchmark by June 2009.

B. One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in READING as measured by the administration of DRA. No less than 30% of students will move to the next level of performance. The remaining 70% will show growth within their performance level by increasing their individual score from fall to spring. Our goal is to have no less than 30% at their grade level benchmark by June 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Students will explain the process for solving open response problems both orally and in writing.	Houghton Mifflin strategies staff development Grade level meetings	Sept. 2008 through June 2010 Monthly staff meetings	State Frameworks Houghton Mifflin Core Program MCAS open response examples	Principal Classroom teachers Reading Coach ESL Lab Teachers Special education	Review examples of student work including exemplars and open response rubric scored

Best Practice: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (predicting, questioning, clarifying, & summarizing)	MCAS example review Exemplars review		w/rubrics Exemplars Graphic Organizers Supplemental materials Learning Centers	teachers Reading tutors ILT	samples Review of Informal, formative, and MCAS data Teacher observation Student Portfolios
Teachers will implement explicit instruction of standards based vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit.  Best Practice: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frayer Model for vocabulary development</li> <li>• Interactive Word Walls</li> </ul>	Grade Level meetings Frayer Model staff development	September 2008 through 2010 Monthly staff meetings	State standards and Houghton Mifflin vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic Organizers Posted vocabulary Learning Centers	Principal Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Reading tutors Special Education Teachers ILT	Review of examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/Post assessments MCAS questions Exit Slips Teacher Observation Student Portfolios
Teachers will monitor daily student understanding of vocabulary and comprehension of reading lesson.  Best Practice: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit slips</li> <li>• Think, Pair, &amp; Share</li> </ul>	Focused school wide Professional Development Plan Grade level meetings	September 2008 through June 2010	State Standards Differentiated Instruction flexible groupings and activities Think, Pair, & Share Exit Slips	Classroom teachers Reading Coaches ESL Teachers Special Education Teachers Reading tutors Principal ILT	Review examples of student work Exit Slips Houghton Mifflin Reading program assessments Think, Pair, & Share MCAS questions
Daily Independent Reading Practice to increase each student's reading level to meet grade level expectations.	Focused school wide professional development plan	September 2008 through June 2010	State Standards Think, Pair, & Share Exit Slips	Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Special Education Teachers	Examples of student work Exit Slips Think, Pair, & Share

Monitor for understanding				Reading Tutors Principal ILT	MCAS questions
---------------------------	--	--	--	------------------------------------	----------------

**Grade 2**

**School Goal 3 SUB GROUPS:**

**ELA\Reading:**

One hundred percent of our special education students will show improvement in Reading as demonstrated by the administration of the DRA and MAP. No less than 20% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 80% will show growth within their performance level. Our goal is to have 30 % at proficient in Reading in 2009.

One hundred percent of our ELL students will show improvement in reading as demonstrated by the administration of the DRA and MAP. No less than 25 % of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 75% percent will show growth within their performance level. Our goal is to have 30% at proficient in Reading in 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Teachers will implement Flexible group work to monitor and adjust intervention plans for phonics instruction and literacy development	ELL and Special Education Training Faculty Meetings Grade Level Meetings	February 2009-June 2009	Houghton Mifflin Program Components MELA-O/IPT NWEA Web site Classroom Libraries ESL Lab Materials	Classroom Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Administrators Reading Coach Special Education Teachers ILT Instructional Assistants	Formal and Informal Assessments Lexile Levels Descartes SSP Meetings 504 Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations MELA-O Assessments

Teachers will provide opportunities for Vocabulary building and comprehension strategies	ELL Training Special Education Training	November 2008 – June 2009	Houghton Mifflin Program Components MELA-O/IPT NWEA Web site Classroom Libraries ESL Lab Materials	Classroom Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Administrators Reading Coach Special Education Teachers ILT Instructional Assistants	Review of Work samples and responses Formal and Informal Assessments Lexile Levels Descartes
Teachers will increase oral reading opportunities to improve fluency, decoding, and sight word vocabulary	ELL Training Special Education Training	November 2008 – June 2009	Listening stations Leveled readers Big Books Choral Reading DRA Assessment Kit MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	Classroom Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Administrators Reading Coach Special Education Teachers ILT Instructional Assistants Volunteers	Running Records Lexile Levels DRA Continuum Guided reading Formal and Informal Assessments

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b>FALL 2008</b>				<b>WINTER 2009</b>				<b>SPRING 2009</b>			
<b>Grade 3 MAP Assessment</b>	<b>MEAN RIT</b>	<b>%LO</b>	<b>%AV</b>	<b>%HI</b>	<b>MEAN RIT</b>	<b>%LO</b>	<b>%AV</b>	<b>%HI</b>	<b>MEAN RIT</b>	<b>%LO</b>	<b>%AV</b>	<b>%HI</b>
<i>Lang:Vocab/Concept Dev.</i>	176.5	71%	20%	9%								
<i>Understand Text Imag/Lit</i>	181.9	57%	22%	21%								
<i>Understand Text Inform/Expos</i>	178.6	61%	27%	12%								
<i>Genre/Fict/Nonfiction</i>	179.7	62%	20%	18%								
<i>Style &amp; Language</i>	183.9	57%	35%	8%								

**Grade 3 MCAS**

**Data Synopsis for last year's grade 3 students**

**Reading/ELA Subject Sub-Scores**

<p><i>Language:</i> 60% of possible points attained/State average was 77% of possible points</p>
<p><i>Reading and Literature:</i> 51% of possible points attained/ State average was 70% of possible points</p>
<p><i>Item Analysis (Multiple Choice &amp; Open Response):</i> Multiple Choice: 59% of possible points attained/ State average was 78% of possible points</p>

**Grade 3**

**School Goal 1 EXTERNAL:** One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in Reading as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 20% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 80% will show growth within their performance level. Our goal is to have 25% at Proficient in READING in 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
<p>Students will explain the process for solving open response problems both orally and in writing.</p> <p>Best Practice: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (predicting, questioning,</p>	<p>Houghton Mifflin strategies staff development Grade level meetings MCAS example review Exemplars review</p>	<p>Sept. 2008 through June 2010 Monthly staff meetings</p>	<p>State Frameworks Houghton Mifflin Core Program MCAS open response examples w/rubrics Exemplars Graphic Organizers Supplemental</p>	<p>Principal Classroom teachers Reading Coaches ESL teachers Special education teachers Reading tutors ILT</p>	<p>Review examples of student work including exemplars and open response rubric scored samples Review of Informal, formative, and MCAS data</p>

clarifying, & summarizing)			materials Learning Centers		Teacher observation Student Portfolios
Teachers will implement explicit instruction of standards based vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit.  Best Practice: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frayer Model for vocabulary development</li> <li>• Interactive Word Walls</li> </ul>	Grade Level meetings Frayer Model staff development	September 2008 through 2010 Monthly staff meetings	State standards and Houghton Mifflin vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic Organizers Posted vocabulary Learning Centers	Principal Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Reading tutors Special Education Teachers ILT	Review of examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/Post assessments MCAS questions Exit Slips Teacher Observation Student Portfolios
Teachers will monitor daily student understanding of vocabulary and comprehension of reading lesson.  Best Practice: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit slips</li> <li>• Think, Pair, &amp; Share</li> </ul>	Focused school wide Professional Development Plan Grade level meetings	September 2008 through June 2010	State Standards Differentiated Instruction flexible groupings and activities Think, Pair, & Share Exit Slips	Classroom teachers Reading Coaches ESL Teachers Special Education Teachers Reading tutors Principal ILT	Review examples of student work Exit Slips Houghton Mifflin Reading program assessments Think, Pair, & Share MCAS questions
Daily Independent Reading Practice to increase each student's	Focused school wide professional development plan	September 2008 through June 2010	State Standards Think, Pair, & Share	Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers	Examples of student work Exit Slips

reading level to meet grade level expectations. Monitor for understanding			Exit Slips	Special Education Teachers Reading Tutors Principal ILT	Think, Pair, & Share MCAS questions
School day schedule will be modified to give more time for ELA/Reading	Focused school wide Professional Development Plan Grade level meetings Staff Meetings	February 2009 through June 2009	State Frameworks Houghton Mifflin Core Program MCAS open response examples w/rubrics Exemplars Graphic Organizers Supplemental materials Learning Centers Title One WPS Prof. Dev.	Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Special Education Teachers Reading Tutors Principal ILT	Review examples of student work including exemplars and open response rubric scored samples Review of Informal, formative, and MCAS data Teacher observation Student Portfolios

### Grade 3

**School Goal 2 INTERNAL:**

**ELA\Reading:**

A. One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in READING as demonstrated by the administration of MAP Assessment. No less than 30% of students will meet or exceed their growth scores. The remaining 70% will show growth in their overall RIT score from fall to spring. Our goal is to have no less than 25% at their grade level benchmark by June 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b>	<b>Professional Development</b>	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b>
What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	How will staff acquire the	When will this strategy or action	What are the existing and new resources that will	Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	What ongoing formative evidence

	necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	be used to accomplish the activity?		will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
<p>Students will explain the process for solving open response problems both orally and in writing.</p> <p>Best Practice: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (predicting, questioning, clarifying, &amp; summarizing)</p>	<p>Houghton Mifflin strategies staff development Grade level meetings MCAS example review Exemplars review</p>	<p>Sept. 2008 through June 2010 Monthly staff meetings</p>	<p>State Frameworks Houghton Mifflin Core Program MCAS open response examples w/rubrics Exemplars Graphic Organizers Supplemental materials Learning Centers</p>	<p>Principal Classroom teachers Reading Coach ESL Lab Teachers Special education teachers Reading tutors ILT</p>	<p>Review examples of student work including exemplars and open response rubric scored samples Review of Informal, formative, and MCAS data Teacher observation Student Portfolios</p>
<p>Teachers will implement explicit instruction of standards based vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit.</p> <p>Best Practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frayer Model for vocabulary development</li> <li>• Interactive Word Walls</li> </ul>	<p>Grade Level meetings Frayer Model staff development</p>	<p>September 2008 through 2010 Monthly staff meetings</p>	<p>State standards and Houghton Mifflin vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic Organizers Posted vocabulary Learning Centers</p>	<p>Principal Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Reading tutors Special Education Teachers ILT</p>	<p>Review of examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/Post assessments MCAS questions Exit Slips Teacher Observation Student Portfolios</p>

<p>Teachers will monitor daily student understanding of vocabulary and comprehension of reading lesson.</p> <p>Best Practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit slips</li> <li>• Think, Pair, &amp; Share</li> </ul>	<p>Focused school wide Professional Development Plan Grade level meetings</p>	<p>September 2008 through June 2010</p>	<p>State Standards Differentiated Instruction flexible groupings and activities Think, Pair, &amp; Share Exit Slips</p>	<p>Classroom teachers Reading Coaches ESL Teachers Special Education Teachers Reading tutors Principal ILT</p>	<p>Review examples of student work Exit Slips Houghton Mifflin Reading program assessments Think, Pair, &amp; Share MCAS questions</p>
<p>Daily Independent Reading Practice to increase each student's reading level to meet grade level expectations. Monitor for understanding</p>	<p>Focused school wide professional development plan</p>	<p>September 2008 through June 2010</p>	<p>State Standards Think, Pair, &amp; Share Exit Slips</p>	<p>Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Special Education Teachers Reading Tutors Principal ILT</p>	<p>Examples of student work Exit Slips Think, Pair, &amp; Share MCAS questions</p>

**Grade 3**

**School Goal Sub Groups:**

**ELA\Reading**

One hundred percent of our special education students will show improvement in Reading as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 20% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 80% will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in reading for Special Education subgroup is 0% proficient or above, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 10% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

One hundred percent of our ELL students will show improvement in reading as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 25 % of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 75% percent will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in reading for the ELL subgroup is 0% Proficient or Above on MCAS, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 10% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Teachers will implement Flexible group work to monitor and adjust intervention plans for phonics instruction and literacy development	ELL and Special Education Training Faculty Meetings Grade Level Meetings	February 2009-June 2009	Houghton Mifflin Program Components MELA-O/IPT NWEA Web site Classroom Libraries ESL Lab Materials	Classroom Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Administrators Reading Coach Special Education Teachers ILT Instructional Assistants	Formal and Informal Assessments Lexile Levels Descartes SSP Meetings 504 Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations MELA-O Assessments
Teachers will provide opportunities for Vocabulary building and comprehension strategies	ELL Training Special Education Training	November 2008 – June 2009	Houghton Mifflin Program Components MELA-O/IPT NWEA Web site Classroom Libraries ESL Lab Materials	Classroom Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Administrators Reading Coach Special Education Teachers ILT Instructional Assistants	Review of Work samples and responses Formal and Informal Assessments Lexile Levels Descartes
Teachers will increase oral reading opportunities to improve fluency, decoding, and sight word vocabulary	ELL Training Special Education Training	November 2008 – June 2009	Listening stations Leveled readers Big Books Choral Reading DRA Assessment Kit MELA-O/IPT	Classroom Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Administrators Reading Coach Special Education Teachers ILT	Running Records Lexile Levels DRA Continuum Guided reading Formal and Informal Assessments

			ESL Materials	Instructional Assistants Volunteers	

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b>FALL 2008</b>				<b>WINTER 2009</b>				<b>SPRING 2009</b>			
<b>Grade 4 MAP Assessment</b>	<b>MEAN RIT</b>	<b>%LO</b>	<b>%AV</b>	<b>%HI</b>	<b>MEAN RIT</b>	<b>%LO</b>	<b>%AV</b>	<b>%HI</b>	<b>MEAN RIT</b>	<b>%LO</b>	<b>%AV</b>	<b>%HI</b>
<i>Lang: Vocab/Concept Dev.</i>	<b>192</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>17%</b>								
<i>Understand Text Imag/Lit</i>	<b>194.7</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>31%</b>								
<i>Understand Text Inform/Expos</i>	<b>193.3</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>22%</b>								
<i>Genre/Fict/Nonfiction</i>	<b>193.4</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>17%</b>								
<i>Style &amp; Language</i>	<b>194.1</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>22%</b>								

**Grade 4 MCAS Data Synopsis for this year's class (use last year's Grade 3 scores)  
Reading/ELA Subject Area Sub-scores**

*Language: 60% of possible points compared with the state average of 77%*

*Reading and Literature: 51% of possible points attained compared with state average of 70%*

**Item Analysis (Multiple Choice & Open Response):**

*Multiple Choice- 59% of possible points compared with state average of 78% possible points*

*Open Response- 33% of possible points attained compared with the state average of 50% of possible points*

MCAS Score Analysis of last year's Grade 3 scores for this year's Grade 4 students			
How many scored?		How many scored?	
36-40	2	N/A	
30-35	8	34-35	
22-29	8	27-29	
0-21	14	19-21	

**Grade 4 MCAS Data Synopsis for last year's grade 4 students**  
**Reading/ELA Subject Area Sub-scores**

<i>Language: 62% of possible points attained compared to 78% at the state level</i>
<i>Reading and Literature: 42% of possible points attained compared at the state level</i>
<i>Item Analysis (Multiple Choice &amp; Open Response): 54% of possible points attained compared to 79% at the state level 27% of possible points attained compared to 49% at the state level</i>

**Grade 4**

**School Goal 1 EXTERNAL:**

**ELA/Reading:**

One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in Reading as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 20% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 80% will show growth within their performance level. Our goal is to have 25% at Proficient in READING in 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Students will explain the process for solving open response problems both orally and in writing.	Houghton Mifflin strategies staff development Grade level	Sept. 2008 through June 2010 Monthly staff meetings	State Frameworks Houghton Mifflin Core Program MCAS open	Principal Classroom teachers Reading Coaches ESL teachers	Review examples of student work including exemplars and open response

Best Practice: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (predicting, questioning, clarifying, & summarizing)	meetings MCAS example review Exemplars review		response examples w/rubrics Exemplars Graphic Organizers Supplemental materials Learning Centers	Special education teachers Reading tutors ILT	rubric scored samples Review of Informal, formative, and MCAS data Teacher observation Student Portfolios
Teachers will implement explicit instruction of standards based vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit.  Best Practice: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frayer Model for vocabulary development</li> <li>• Interactive Word Walls</li> </ul>	Grade Level meetings Frayer Model staff development	September 2008 through 2010 Monthly staff meetings	State standards and Houghton Mifflin vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic Organizers Posted vocabulary Learning Centers	Principal Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Reading tutors Special Education Teachers ILT	Review of examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/Post assessments MCAS questions Exit Slips Teacher Observation Student Portfolios
Teachers will monitor daily student understanding of vocabulary and comprehension of reading lesson.  Best Practice: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit slips</li> <li>• Think, Pair, &amp; Share</li> </ul>	Focused school wide Professional Development Plan Grade level meetings	September 2008 through June 2010	State Standards Differentiated Instruction flexible groupings and activities Think, Pair, & Share Exit Slips	Classroom teachers Reading Coaches ESL Teachers Special Education Teachers Reading tutors Principal ILT	Review examples of student work Exit Slips Houghton Mifflin Reading program assessments Think, Pair, & Share MCAS questions
Daily Independent Reading Practice to	Focused school wide professional	September 2008 through June 2010	State Standards Think, Pair, &	Classroom teachers Reading coaches	Examples of student work

increase each student's reading level to meet grade level expectations. Monitor for understanding	development plan		Share Exit Slips	ESL teachers Special Education Teachers Reading Tutors Principal ILT	Exit Slips Think, Pair, & Share MCAS questions
School day schedule will be modified to give more time for ELA/Reading	Focused school wide Professional Development Plan Grade level meetings Staff Meetings	February 2009 through June 2009	State Frameworks Houghton Mifflin Core Program MCAS open response examples w/rubrics Exemplars Graphic Organizers Supplemental materials Learning Centers Title One WPS Prof. Dev.	Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Special Education Teachers Reading Tutors Principal ILT	Review examples of student work including exemplars and open response rubric scored samples Review of Informal, formative, and MCAS data Teacher observation Student Portfolios

#### Grade 4

##### School Goal 2 **INTERNAL**:

##### ELA/Reading:

A. One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in READING as demonstrated by the administration of MAP Assessment. No less than 30% of students will meet or exceed their growth scores. The remaining 70% will show growth in their overall RIT score from fall to spring. Our goal is to have no less than 25% at their grade level benchmark by June 2009.

<i>Action Steps</i> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<i>Professional Development</i> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to	<i>Timeline/Date Completed</i> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if	<i>Resources</i> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the	<i>Person Responsible</i> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<i>Monitoring Effectiveness</i> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is

	implement the activity?	this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	activity?		making a difference in student outcome?
<p>Students will explain the process for solving open response problems both orally and in writing.</p> <p>Best Practice: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (predicting, questioning, clarifying, &amp; summarizing)</p>	<p>Houghton Mifflin strategies staff development Grade level meetings MCAS example review Exemplars review</p>	<p>Sept. 2008 through June 2010 Monthly staff meetings</p>	<p>State Frameworks Houghton Mifflin Core Program MCAS open response examples w/rubrics Exemplars Graphic Organizers Supplemental materials Learning Centers</p>	<p>Principal Classroom teachers Reading Coach ESL Lab Teachers Special education teachers Reading tutors ILT</p>	<p>Review examples of student work including exemplars and open response rubric scored samples Review of Informal, formative, and MCAS data Teacher observation Student Portfolios</p>
<p>Teachers will implement explicit instruction of standards based vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit.</p> <p>Best Practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frayer Model for vocabulary development</li> <li>• Interactive Word Walls</li> </ul>	<p>Grade Level meetings Frayer Model staff development</p>	<p>September 2008 through 2010 Monthly staff meetings</p>	<p>State standards and Houghton Mifflin vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic Organizers Posted vocabulary Learning Centers</p>	<p>Principal Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Reading tutors Special Education Teachers ILT</p>	<p>Review of examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/Post assessments MCAS questions Exit Slips Teacher Observation Student Portfolios</p>
<p>Teachers will monitor daily student understanding of vocabulary and comprehension of reading lesson.</p>	<p>Focused school wide Professional Development Plan Grade level meetings</p>	<p>September 2008 through June 2010</p>	<p>State Standards Differentiated Instruction flexible groupings and activities Think, Pair, &amp;</p>	<p>Classroom teachers Reading Coaches ESL Teachers Special Education Teachers Reading tutors</p>	<p>Review examples of student work Exit Slips Houghton Mifflin Reading program assessments</p>

Best Practice: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exit slips</li> <li>Think, Pair, &amp; Share</li> </ul>			Share Exit Slips	Principal ILT	Think, Pair, & Share MCAS questions
Daily Independent Reading Practice to increase each student's reading level to meet grade level expectations. Monitor for understanding	Focused school wide professional development plan	September 2008 through June 2010	State Standards Think, Pair, & Share Exit Slips	Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Special Education Teachers Reading Tutors Principal ILT	Examples of student work Exit Slips Think, Pair, & Share MCAS questions

#### Grade 4

#### School Goal **Sub Groups:**

A. One hundred percent of our special education students will show improvement in Reading as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 20% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 80% will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in reading for Special Education subgroup is 0% proficient or above, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 10% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

B. One hundred percent of our ELL students will show improvement in reading as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 25% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 75% percent will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in reading for the ELL subgroup is 0% Proficient or Above on MCAS, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 10% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

<b>Action Steps</b>	<b>Professional Development</b>	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b>
What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?

Teachers will implement Flexible group work to monitor and adjust intervention plans for phonics instruction and literacy development	ELL and Special Education Training Faculty Meetings Grade Level Meetings	February 2009-June 2009	Houghton Mifflin Program Components MELA-O/IPT NWEA Web site Classroom Libraries ESL Lab Materials	Classroom Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Administrators Reading Coach Special Education Teachers ILT Instructional Assistants	Formal and Informal Assessments Lexile Levels Descartes SSP Meetings 504 Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations MELA-O Assessments
Teachers will provide opportunities for Vocabulary building and comprehension strategies	ELL Training Special Education Training	November 2008 – June 2009	Houghton Mifflin Program Components MELA-O/IPT NWEA Web site Classroom Libraries ESL Lab Materials	Classroom Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Administrators Reading Coach Special Education Teachers ILT Instructional Assistants	Review of Work samples and responses Formal and Informal Assessments Lexile Levels Descartes
Teachers will increase oral reading opportunities to improve fluency, decoding, and sight word vocabulary	ELL Training Special Education Training	November 2008 – June 2009	Listening stations Leveled readers Big Books Choral Reading DRA Assessment Kit MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	Classroom Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Administrators Reading Coach Special Education Teachers ILT Instructional Assistants Volunteers	Running Records Lexile Levels DRA Continuum Guided reading Formal and Informal Assessments

Grade 5	FALL 2008				WINTER 2009				SPRING 2009			
	MEAN RIT	%LO	%AV	%HI	MEAN RIT	%LO	%AV	%HI	MEAN RIT	%LO	%AV	%HI
Grade 5 MAP Assessment												
<i>Lang:Vocab/Concept Dev.</i>	195.8	60%	27%	13%								
<i>Understand Text Imag/Lit</i>	198.5	48%	24%	27%								
<i>Understand Text Inform/Expos</i>	198.5	55%	23%	23%								
<i>Genre/Fict/Nonfiction</i>	199.5	57%	19%	24%								
<i>Style &amp; Language</i>	198	57%	23%	21%								

**Grade 5 MCAS Data Synopsis for this year's class (use last year's Grade 4 scores)**

**Reading/ELA Subject Area Sub-scores**

*Language:62% of possible points were attained compared to 78% at the state level*

*Reading and Literature:42% of possible points were attained compared to 67% at the state level*

**Item Analysis (Multiple Choice & Open Response):**

*54% of possible points were attained compared to 79% at the state level*

MCAS Score Analysis of last year's Grade 4 scores for this year's Grade 5 students			
How many scored?		How many scored?	
260-280	0	N/A	
240-258	2	256-258	0
220-238	25	236-238	4
200-218	20	216-218	15

**Grade 5 MCAS Data Synopsis for last year's grade 5 students**

**Reading/ELA Subject Area Sub-scores**

*Language:59% of possible points were attained compared to 79% at the state level*

*Reading and Literature: 55% of possible points were attained compared to 67% at the state level*

*Item Analysis (Multiple Choice & Open Response):MC – 62% of possible points were attained compared to 77% at the state level*

*OR – 44% of possible points were attained compared to 52% at the state level*

## Grade 5

### School Goal 1 **EXTERNAL**:

#### ELA/Reading:

One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in Reading as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 20% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 80% will show growth within their performance level. Our goal is to have 25% at Proficient in READING in 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Students will explain the process for solving open response problems both orally and in writing.  Best Practice: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (predicting, questioning, clarifying, & summarizing)	Houghton Mifflin strategies staff development Grade level meetings MCAS example review Exemplars review	Sept. 2008 through June 2010 Monthly staff meetings	State Frameworks Houghton Mifflin Core Program MCAS open response examples w/rubrics Exemplars Graphic Organizers Supplemental materials Learning Centers	Principal Classroom teachers Reading Coaches ESL teachers Special education teachers Reading tutors ILT	Review examples of student work including exemplars and open response rubric scored samples Review of Informal, formative, and MCAS data Teacher observation Student Portfolios
Teachers will implement explicit instruction of standards based vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit.	Grade Level meetings Frayer Model staff development	September 2008 through 2010 Monthly staff meetings	State standards and Houghton Mifflin vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts	Principal Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Reading tutors Special Education	Review of examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/Post assessments MCAS questions

<p>Best Practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frayer Model for vocabulary development</li> <li>• Interactive Word Walls</li> </ul>			<p>Graphic Organizers Posted vocabulary Learning Centers</p>	<p>Teachers ILT</p>	<p>Exit Slips Teacher Observation Student Portfolios</p>
<p>Teachers will monitor daily student understanding of vocabulary and comprehension of reading lesson.</p> <p>Best Practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit slips</li> <li>• Think, Pair, &amp; Share</li> </ul>	<p>Focused school wide Professional Development Plan Grade level meetings</p>	<p>September 2008 through June 2010</p>	<p>State Standards Differentiated Instruction flexible groupings and activities Think, Pair, &amp; Share Exit Slips</p>	<p>Classroom teachers Reading Coaches ESL Teachers Special Education Teachers Reading tutors Principal ILT</p>	<p>Review examples of student work Exit Slips Houghton Mifflin Reading program assessments Think, Pair, &amp; Share MCAS questions</p>
<p>Daily Independent Reading Practice to increase each student's reading level to meet grade level expectations. Monitor for understanding</p>	<p>Focused school wide professional development plan</p>	<p>September 2008 through June 2010</p>	<p>State Standards Think, Pair, &amp; Share Exit Slips</p>	<p>Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Special Education Teachers Reading Tutors Principal ILT</p>	<p>Examples of student work Exit Slips Think, Pair, &amp; Share MCAS questions</p>
<p>School day schedule will be modified to give more time for ELA/Reading</p>	<p>Focused school wide Professional Development Plan Grade level meetings Staff Meetings</p>	<p>February 2009 through June 2009</p>	<p>State Frameworks Houghton Mifflin Core Program MCAS open response examples w/rubrics Exemplars Graphic Organizers</p>	<p>Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Special Education Teachers Reading Tutors Principal ILT</p>	<p>Review examples of student work including exemplars and open response rubric scored samples</p>

			Supplemental materials Learning Centers Title One WPS Prof. Dev.		Review of Informal, formative, and MCAS data Teacher observation Student Portfolios
--	--	--	---	--	---

**Grade 5**

**School Goal 2 INTERNAL:**

**ELA/Reading:**

A. One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in READING as demonstrated by the administration of MAP Assessment. No less than 30% of students will meet or exceed their growth scores. The remaining 70% will show growth in their overall RIT score from fall to spring. Our goal is to have no less than 25% at their grade level benchmark by June 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Students will explain the process for solving open response problems both orally and in writing.  Best Practice: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (predicting, questioning, clarifying, & summarizing)	Houghton Mifflin strategies staff development Grade level meetings MCAS example review Exemplars review	Sept. 2008 through June 2010 Monthly staff meetings	State Frameworks Houghton Mifflin Core Program MCAS open response examples w/rubrics Exemplars Graphic Organizers Supplemental materials Learning Centers	Principal Classroom teachers Reading Coach ESL Lab Teachers Special education teachers Reading tutors ILT	Review examples of student work including exemplars and open response rubric scored samples Review of Informal, formative, and MCAS data Teacher observation Student Portfolios

<p>Teachers will implement explicit instruction of standards based vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit.</p> <p>Best Practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frayer Model for vocabulary development</li> <li>• Interactive Word Walls</li> </ul>	<p>Grade Level meetings Frayer Model staff development</p>	<p>September 2008 through 2010 Monthly staff meetings</p>	<p>State standards and Houghton Mifflin vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic Organizers Posted vocabulary Learning Centers</p>	<p>Principal Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Reading tutors Special Education Teachers ILT</p>	<p>Review of examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/Post assessments MCAS questions Exit Slips Teacher Observation Student Portfolios</p>
<p>Teachers will monitor daily student understanding of vocabulary and comprehension of reading lesson.</p> <p>Best Practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit slips</li> <li>• Think, Pair, &amp; Share</li> </ul>	<p>Focused school wide Professional Development Plan Grade level meetings</p>	<p>September 2008 through June 2010</p>	<p>State Standards Differentiated Instruction flexible groupings and activities Think, Pair, &amp; Share Exit Slips</p>	<p>Classroom teachers Reading Coaches ESL Teachers Special Education Teachers Reading tutors Principal ILT</p>	<p>Review examples of student work Exit Slips Houghton Mifflin Reading program assessments Think, Pair, &amp; Share MCAS questions</p>
<p>Daily Independent Reading Practice to increase each student's reading level to meet grade level expectations.</p>	<p>Focused school wide professional development plan</p>	<p>September 2008 through June 2010</p>	<p>State Standards Think, Pair, &amp; Share Exit Slips</p>	<p>Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Special Education Teachers</p>	<p>Examples of student work Exit Slips Think, Pair, &amp; Share</p>

Monitor for understanding				Reading Tutors Principal ILT	MCAS questions
---------------------------	--	--	--	------------------------------------	----------------

**Grade 5**

**School Goal Sub Groups:**

One hundred percent of our special education students will show improvement in Reading as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 20% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 80% will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in reading for Special Education subgroup is 0% proficient or above, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 10% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

One hundred percent of our ELL students will show improvement in reading as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 25 % of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 75% percent will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in reading for the ELL subgroup is 0% Proficient or Above on MCAS, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 10% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Teachers will implement Flexible group work to monitor and adjust intervention plans for phonics instruction and literacy development	ELL and Special Education Training Faculty Meetings Grade Level Meetings	February 2009-June 2009	Houghton Mifflin Program Components MELA-O/IPT NWEA Web site Classroom Libraries ESL Lab Materials	Classroom Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Administrators Reading Coach Special Education Teachers ILT Instructional Assistants	Formal and Informal Assessments Lexile Levels Descartes SSP Meetings 504 Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations

					MELA-O Assessments
Teachers will provide opportunities for Vocabulary building and comprehension strategies	ELL Training Special Education Training	November 2008 – June 2009	Houghton Mifflin Program Components MELA-O/IPT NWEA Web site Classroom Libraries ESL Lab Materials	Classroom Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Administrators Reading Coach Special Education Teachers ILT Instructional Assistants	Review of Work samples and responses Formal and Informal Assessments Lexile Levels Descartes
Teachers will increase oral reading opportunities to improve fluency, decoding, and sight word vocabulary	ELL Training Special Education Training	November 2008 – June 2009	Listening stations Leveled readers Big Books Choral Reading DRA Assessment Kit MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	Classroom Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Administrators Reading Coach Special Education Teachers ILT Instructional Assistants Volunteers	Running Records Lexile Levels DRA Continuum Guided reading Formal and Informal Assessments

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b>FALL 2008</b>				<b>WINTER 2009</b>				<b>SPRING 2009</b>			
<b>Grade 6 MAP Assessment</b>	<b>MEAN RIT</b>	<b>%LO</b>	<b>%AV</b>	<b>%HI</b>	<b>MEAN RIT</b>	<b>%LO</b>	<b>%AV</b>	<b>%HI</b>	<b>MEAN RIT</b>	<b>%LO</b>	<b>%AV</b>	<b>%HI</b>
<i>Lang:Vocab/Concept Dev.</i>	204.5	54	15	31								
<i>Understand Text Imag/Lit</i>	206.8	50	23	27								
<i>Understand Text Inform/Expos</i>	204.3	46	38	16								
<i>Genre/Fict/Nonfiction</i>	204.6	48	27	25								
<i>Style &amp; Language</i>	204.3	54	27	19								

**Grade 6 MCAS Data Synopsis for this year's class (use last year's Grade 5 scores)**

**Reading/ELA Subject Area Sub-scores**

*Language:59% of possible points attained compared to 79% at the state level*

*Reading and Literature:55% of possible points were attained compared to 78% at the state level*

*Item Analysis (Multiple Choice & Open Response):MC 62% of possible points were attained compared to 77% at the state level  
OR44% of possible points were attained compared to 52% at the state level*

<b>MCAS Score Analysis of last year's Grade 5 scores for this year's Grade 6 students</b>			
<b>How many scored?</b>		<b>How many scored?</b>	
260-280	0	N/A	
240-258	9	256-258	0
220-238	24	236-238	4
200-218	12	216-218	9

**Grade 6 MCAS Data Synopsis for last year's grade 6 students**  
**Reading/ELA Subject Area Sub-scores**

*Language: 49% of possible points were attained compared to 77% at the state level*

*Reading and Literature: 54% of possible points were attained compared to 68% at the state level*

*Item Analysis (Multiple Choice & Open Response): MC – 58% of possible points were attained compared to 76% at the state level*  
*46% of possible points were attained compared to 56% at the state level*

**Grade 6**

**School Goal 1 EXTERNAL:** One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in Reading as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 20% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 80% will show growth within their performance level. Our goal is to have 25% at Proficient in READING in 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Students will explain the process for solving open response problems both orally and in writing.  Best Practice: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (predicting, questioning, clarifying, & summarizing)	Houghton Mifflin strategies staff development Grade level meetings MCAS example review Exemplars review	Sept. 2008 through June 2010 Monthly staff meetings	State Frameworks Houghton Mifflin Core Program MCAS open response examples w/rubrics Exemplars Graphic Organizers Supplemental materials Learning Centers	Principal Classroom teachers Reading Coaches ESL teachers Special education teachers Reading tutors ILT	Review examples of student work including exemplars and open response rubric scored samples Review of Informal, formative, and MCAS data Teacher observation Student Portfolios

<p>Teachers will implement explicit instruction of standards based vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit.</p> <p>Best Practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frayer Model for vocabulary development</li> <li>• Interactive Word Walls</li> </ul>	<p>Grade Level meetings Frayer Model staff development</p>	<p>September 2008 through 2010 Monthly staff meetings</p>	<p>State standards and Houghton Mifflin vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic Organizers Posted vocabulary Learning Centers</p>	<p>Principal Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Reading tutors Special Education Teachers ILT</p>	<p>Review of examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/Post assessments MCAS questions Exit Slips Teacher Observation Student Portfolios</p>
<p>Teachers will monitor daily student understanding of vocabulary and comprehension of reading lesson.</p> <p>Best Practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit slips</li> <li>• Think, Pair, &amp; Share</li> </ul>	<p>Focused school wide Professional Development Plan Grade level meetings</p>	<p>September 2008 through June 2010</p>	<p>State Standards Differentiated Instruction flexible groupings and activities Think, Pair, &amp; Share Exit Slips</p>	<p>Classroom teachers Reading Coaches ESL Teachers Special Education Teachers Reading tutors Principal ILT</p>	<p>Review examples of student work Exit Slips Houghton Mifflin Reading program assessments Think, Pair, &amp; Share MCAS questions</p>
<p>Daily Independent Reading Practice to increase each student's reading level to meet grade level expectations. Monitor for understanding</p>	<p>Focused school wide professional development plan</p>	<p>September 2008 through June 2010</p>	<p>State Standards Think, Pair, &amp; Share Exit Slips</p>	<p>Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Special Education Teachers Reading Tutors Principal ILT</p>	<p>Examples of student work Exit Slips Think, Pair, &amp; Share MCAS questions</p>

School day schedule will be modified to give more time for ELA/Reading	Focused school wide Professional Development Plan Grade level meetings Staff Meetings	February 2009 through June 2009	State Frameworks Houghton Mifflin Core Program MCAS open response examples w/rubrics Exemplars Graphic Organizers Supplemental materials Learning Centers Title One WPS Prof. Dev.	Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Special Education Teachers Reading Tutors Principal ILT	Review examples of student work including exemplars and open response rubric scored samples Review of Informal, formative, and MCAS data Teacher observation Student Portfolios
--	---	---------------------------------	--	---	--

## Grade 6

### ELA/Reading School Goal 2:

**ELA/Reading School Goal 2: A.** One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in READING as demonstrated by the administration of MAP Assessment. No less than 30% of students will meet or exceed their growth scores. The remaining 70% will show growth in their overall RIT score from fall to spring. Our goal is to have no less than 25% at their grade level benchmark by June 2009.

<b><i>Action Steps</i></b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b><i>Professional Development</i></b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b><i>Timeline/Date Completed</i></b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b><i>Resources</i></b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b><i>Person Responsible</i></b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b><i>Monitoring Effectiveness</i></b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?

<p>Students will explain the process for solving open response problems both orally and in writing.</p> <p>Best Practice: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (predicting, questioning, clarifying, &amp; summarizing)</p>	<p>Houghton Mifflin strategies staff development Grade level meetings MCAS example review Exemplars review</p>	<p>Sept. 2008 through June 2010 Monthly staff meetings</p>	<p>State Frameworks Houghton Mifflin Core Program MCAS open response examples w/rubrics Exemplars Graphic Organizers Supplemental materials Learning Centers</p>	<p>Principal Classroom teachers Reading Coach ESL Lab Teachers Special education teachers Reading tutors ILT</p>	<p>Review examples of student work including exemplars and open response rubric scored samples Review of Informal, formative, and MCAS data Teacher observation Student Portfolios</p>
<p>Teachers will implement explicit instruction of standards based vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit.</p> <p>Best Practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frayer Model for vocabulary development</li> <li>• Interactive Word Walls</li> </ul>	<p>Grade Level meetings Frayer Model staff development</p>	<p>September 2008 through 2010 Monthly staff meetings</p>	<p>State standards and Houghton Mifflin vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic Organizers Posted vocabulary Learning Centers</p>	<p>Principal Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Reading tutors Special Education Teachers ILT</p>	<p>Review of examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/Post assessments MCAS questions Exit Slips Teacher Observation Student Portfolios</p>
<p>Teachers will monitor daily student understanding of vocabulary and comprehension of reading lesson.</p>	<p>Focused school wide Professional Development Plan Grade level meetings</p>	<p>September 2008 through June 2010</p>	<p>State Standards Differentiated Instruction flexible groupings and activities Think, Pair, &amp;</p>	<p>Classroom teachers Reading Coaches ESL Teachers Special Education Teachers Reading tutors</p>	<p>Review examples of student work Exit Slips Houghton Mifflin Reading program assessments</p>

Best Practice: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit slips</li> <li>• Think, Pair, &amp; Share</li> </ul>			Share Exit Slips	Principal ILT	Think, Pair, & Share MCAS questions
Daily Independent Reading Practice to increase each student's reading level to meet grade level expectations. Monitor for understanding	Focused school wide professional development plan	September 2008 through June 2010	State Standards Think, Pair, & Share Exit Slips	Classroom teachers Reading coaches ESL teachers Special Education Teachers Reading Tutors Principal ILT	Examples of student work Exit Slips Think, Pair, & Share MCAS questions

## Grade 6

### School Goal 3 SUB GROUPS

A. One hundred percent of our special education students will show improvement in Reading as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 20% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 80% will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in reading for Special Education subgroup is 0% proficient or above, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 10% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

B. One hundred percent of our ELL students will show improvement in reading as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 25 % of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 75% percent will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in reading for the ELL subgroup is 0% Proficient or Above on MCAS, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 10% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Teachers will implement Flexible group work to monitor and adjust intervention plans for phonics instruction and literacy development	ELL and Special Education Training Faculty Meetings Grade Level Meetings	February 2009-June 2009	Houghton Mifflin Program Components MELA-O/IPT NWEA Web site Classroom Libraries ESL Lab Materials	Classroom Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Administrators Reading Coach Special Education Teachers ILT Instructional Assistants	Formal and Informal Assessments Lexile Levels Descartes SSP Meetings 504 Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations MELA-O Assessments
Teachers will provide opportunities for Vocabulary building and comprehension strategies	ELL Training Special Education Training	November 2008 – June 2009	Houghton Mifflin Program Components MELA-O/IPT NWEA Web site Classroom Libraries ESL Lab Materials	Classroom Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Administrators Reading Coach Special Education Teachers ILT Instructional Assistants	Review of Work samples and responses Formal and Informal Assessments Lexile Levels Descartes
Teachers will increase oral reading opportunities to improve fluency, decoding, and sight word vocabulary	ELL Training Special Education Training	November 2008 – June 2009	Listening stations Leveled readers Big Books Choral Reading DRA Assessment Kit MELA-O/IPT	Classroom Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Administrators Reading Coach Special Education Teachers ILT	Running Records Lexile Levels DRA Continuum Guided reading Formal and Informal Assessments

			ESL Materials	Instructional Assistants Volunteers	
--	--	--	---------------	---	--

# Mathematics Analysis

The majority of students at Elm Park Community School scored in the Needs Improvement and Warning categories on the MCAS in Mathematics in 2008.

- **78%** in grades three, four, five, and six of the aggregate scored in these categories.

% of Students Proficient or Advanced in MCAS Mathematics				
	3 <sup>rd</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>	5 <sup>th</sup>	6 <sup>th</sup>
<b>2008</b>	26	10	26	26
<b>2007</b>	11	13	9	21
<b>2006</b>	26	14	10	16

On the spring 2008 MCAS Mathematics open response questions, the aggregate group attained the mean scores as follows:

- In Number Sense and Operations open response items, the average number of points attained was **1.27**.
- In Geometry open response items, the average number of points attained was **1.01**.
- In Patterns, Relations and Algebra open response items, the average number of points attained was **1.67**.
- In Measurement open response items, the average number of points attained was **1.26**.
- In Data Analysis, Statistics, and Probability open response items, the average number of points attained was **1.56**.

According to the MAP data, from Fall 2007 to Fall 2008, **54%** of Elm Park Community School students in grades two, three, four, five, and six met or exceeded their target growth for math.

- 4.2% fell *below* in MAP target growth; however, fell *above* in projected state proficiency.
- 41.8% fell *below* in MAP target growth and also fell *below* in projected state proficiency.
- 15.3% fell *above* in MAP target growth and also fell *above* in projected state proficiency.
- 38.6% fell *above* in MAP target growth; however, fell *below* in projected state proficiency.

In fall of 2008, MAP student projected performance levels were as follows:

- **47%** of Elm Park Community School students are projected to fall within the “warning” category on the spring 2009 MCAS in mathematics.
- **32%** of Elm Park Community School students are projected to fall within the “needs improvement” category of the spring 2009 MCAS in mathematics.
- **21%** of Elm Park Community School students are projected to fall within the “proficient” and “advanced” categories of the spring 2009 MCAS in mathematics.

In Math as in ELA, school wide action steps are an immediate endeavor to be implemented daily on all grade levels.

**2008-2009 – School Improvement Action Plan**  
**Improve mathematics instruction and accelerate students that are below grade level to reach grade level**  
**Overview of School’s Mathematics Program**

<b>Mathematics Program</b>	<b>Actions Steps</b>	<b>Leader</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
Everyday Mathematics core program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 60-90 minute math block</li> </ul>	Classroom Teacher Math Coach Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Title One Funding</li> <li>• WPS Professional Development</li> </ul>	2008 – 2009 School Year
Use MCAS and MAP data to drive instruction	Identify students needing further math instruction and support Monitor individual student progress	Classroom Teacher Math Coach ILT Principal		
Staff Development	Create flexible groupings Monitoring pacing of program	Math Coach ILT Principal		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify teacher needs</li> <li>• Provide professional development opportunities that support school’s instructional focus of vocabulary and comprehension as it relates to mathematics</li> <li>• Introduce the EDM/state standards curriculum mapping</li> <li>• Introduce the</li> </ul>			

	“unpacked” math state standards			
<b>EDM Program Objectives</b>	<b>Actions Steps</b>	<b>Leader</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Frequency/Timeline</b>
Use data to improve mathematics instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of last year’s data</li> <li>• Develop grade level goals</li> <li>• Review of this year’s data</li> <li>• Use data to develop action plan</li> </ul>	Title I Math Coach Classroom Teacher SPED teachers ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators	MAP MCAS DRA DIBELS EDM Unit Tests Informal Assessments	Biweekly/Monthly November 2008 – June 2009
Continue to develop and utilize staff to coordinate math resources and activities	<p>Biweekly data meetings Analyze data Discuss curriculum issues Discuss scheduling issues</p> <p>Oversee and implement intervention plans for students</p>	Title I Math Coach Classroom Teacher SPED teachers ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators	MAP MCAS DRA DIBELS EDM Unit Tests Informal Assessments	Biweekly/Monthly November 2008 – June 2009
Provide resources that directly relate to grade level math goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purchase supplemental instruction materials that support grade level goals</li> </ul>	Administrators Title 1 Math Coach ILT	MAP MCAS DRA DIBELS EDM Unit Tests Informal Assessments	Biweekly/Monthly November 2008 – June 2009
Provide research based sustained staff development in math instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff training in Everyday Math</li> </ul>	Administrators Title 1 Math Coach ILT		Monthly Staff Meetings November 2008 – June 2009

Provide staff development in the area of action steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Train staff in differentiating instruction for mathematics</li> </ul>	Administrators Title 1 Math Coach ILT	Supplemental DI materials	Monthly Staff Meetings November 2008 – June 2009
---	--	---	---------------------------	---

**School Goal 1 EXTERNAL**

One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in Math as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 25% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 75% will show growth within their performance level. Our goal is to have 30% at Proficient in MATHEMATICS in 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Students will explain their process for solving open response problems both orally and in writing  BEST PRACTICE: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (Questioning, clarifying, and summarizing) and checking	Houghton Mifflin Comprehension strategies staff development Grade level meetings MCAS examples Exemplars review	November 2008 – June 2009	MA State Frameworks EDM Program components MCAS Open response examples w/ rubrics Graphic organizers Supplemental materials Manipulatives	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators	Examples of student work (to include exemplars and open response samples) Teacher Observation Informal assessments Rubric Scored samples Exit slips MCAS data
Explicit instruction of standards based math vocabulary with ongoing	Grade level meetings Frayer Model Staff	November 2008 – June 2009 Monthly staff	MA State standards and EDM vocabulary	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers	Examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/post

<p>instruction throughout the unit</p> <p><b>BEST PRACTICE:</b> Frayer Model for vocabulary development</p>	<p>development</p>	<p>meetings</p>	<p>alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic Organizers Posted vocabulary Manipulatives</p>	<p>Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators</p>	<p>assessments MCAS questions Teacher Observation Think, pair, share Exit slips EDM Unit assessments Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators</p>
<p>Monitor daily student work</p> <p><b>BEST PRACTICE:</b> Exit slips Think, pair, share</p>	<p>Focused school wide PD plan</p> <p>Grade level meetings</p>	<p>November 2008 – June 2009</p>	<p>MA State standards DI flexible groupings and activities Think, pair, share strategy Exit slips</p>	<p>Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators</p>	<p>Examples of student work Exit slips EDM Unit assessments Think, pair, share MCAS questions</p>

**School Goal 2 INTERNAL**

One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in MATH as demonstrated by the administration of MAP Assessment. No less than 40% of students will meet or exceed their growth scores. The remaining 60% will show growth in their over all RIT score from fall to spring. Our goal is to have no less than 25 % at their grade level benchmark by June 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Students will complete MAP goal setting worksheets and discuss strategies to best meet MAP target goal  BEST PRACTICE: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing)	Houghton Mifflin strategies staff development Monthly staff meetings	November 2008 – June 2009	NWEA web site Goal setting worksheets Graphic organizers	Classroom teachers Math coach ESL Lab teachers Special education teachers Administrators ILT	Teacher observations Informal assessments Rubric scored samples Exit slips
Explicit instruction of standards based math vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit	Grade level meetings Frayer Model staff development	November 2008 – June 2009	MA State standards and EDM vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic organizers Manipulatives	Classroom teachers Math coach ESL Lab teachers Special education teachers Administrators	Examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/Post assessments MCAS questions Teacher observation Think, pair, share

BEST PRACTICE: Frayer Model for vocabulary development				ILT	Exit slips EDM unit assessments
Monitor daily student understanding of math objectives	Focused school wide professional development	November 2008 – June 2009	MA State Standards Think, pair, share Exit slips	Classroom teachers Math coach ESL Lab teachers Special education teachers Administrators ILT	Examples of student work Exit Slips Think, pair, share

### School Goals 3 Sub Groups

One hundred percent of our special education students will show improvement in Math as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 30% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 70% will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in math for special education subgroup is 2% proficient or above, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 10% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

One hundred percent of our ELL students will show improvement in math as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS . No less than 20 percent of students will show growth to the next performance level. The 80 percent will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in math for the ELL subgroup is 15 percent Proficient or Above on MCAS, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 10% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Teachers will differentiate instruction to implement,	ELL Training Special Education	November 2008 June 2009	EDM Program Components	Classroom Teachers Special Education	Formal/Informal assessments

monitor, and adjust intervention plans to target specific math skills and concepts	Training WPS professional development		Math Manipulatives Math Centers MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Math Coach ILT Administrators	504 Meetings SSP Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations
Teachers will implement small group/individual instruction to reinforce non-secure goals and increase skills and concept practice	ELL Training Special Education Training WPS professional development	November 2008 – June 2009	EDM Program Components Math Manipulatives Math Centers MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Math Coach ILT Administrators	Formal/Informal assessments 504 Meetings SSP Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations
Teachers will use learning Center activities and EDM games to reinforce number sense and operating skills	ELL Training Special Education Training WPS professional development	November 2008 – June 2009	EDM Program Components Math Manipulatives Math Centers MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Math Coach ILT Administrators	Formal/Informal assessments 504 Meetings SSP Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations

**Kindergarten  
Mathematics**

	<i>Baseline - FALL 2008</i>	<i>Mid Year Assessment - WINTER 2009</i>	<i>End of Year Assessment - SPRING 2009</i>
<b>Kindergarten Everyday Math Assessment</b>	-		

**Kindergarten**

**Mathematics School Goal 1 EXTERNAL**

One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in Math as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 25% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 75% will show growth within their performance level. Our goal is to have 30% at Proficient in MATHEMATICS in 2009.

<p><b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?</p>	<p><b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?</p>	<p><b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.</p>	<p><b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?</p>	<p><b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?</p>	<p><b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?</p>
<p>Students will explain their process for solving open response problems both orally and in writing</p> <p><b>BEST PRACTICE:</b> Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (Questioning, clarifying, and summarizing) and checking</p>	<p>Houghton Mifflin Comprehension strategies staff development Grade level meetings MCAS examples Exemplars review</p>	<p>November 2008 – June 2009</p>	<p>MA State Frameworks EDM Program components MCAS Open response examples w/ rubrics Graphic organizers Supplemental materials Manipulatives</p>	<p>Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators</p>	<p>Examples of student work (to include exemplars and open response samples) Teacher Observation Informal assessments Rubric Scored samples Exit slips MCAS data</p>
<p>Explicit instruction of standards based math vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit</p> <p><b>BEST PRACTICE:</b> Frayer Model for vocabulary development</p>	<p>Grade level meetings Frayer Model Staff development</p>	<p>November 2008 – June 2009 Monthly staff meetings</p>	<p>MA State standards and EDM vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic Organizers Posted vocabulary Manipulatives</p>	<p>Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators</p>	<p>Examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/post assessments MCAS questions Teacher Observation Think, pair, share Exit slips EDM Unit assessments Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach</p>

					ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators
Monitor daily student work  BEST PRACTICE: Exit slips Think, pair, share	Focused school wide PD plan  Grade level meetings	November 2008 – June 2009	MA State standards DI flexible groupings and activities Think, pair, share strategy Exit slips	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators	Examples of student work Exit slips EDM Unit assessments Think, pair, share MCAS questions

### Kindergarten

#### School Goal 2 INTERNAL

##### Math

One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in MATH as demonstrated by the administration of MAP Assessment. No less than 40% of students will meet or exceed their growth scores. The remaining 60% will show growth in their over all RIT score from fall to spring. Our goal is to have no less than 25 % at their grade level benchmark by June 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Students will complete MAP goal setting worksheets and discuss	Houghton Mifflin strategies staff development	November 2008 – June 2009	NWEA web site Goal setting worksheets	Classroom teachers Math coach ESL Lab teachers	Teacher observations Informal

strategies to best meet MAP target goal  BEST PRACTICE: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing)	Monthly staff meetings		Graphic organizers	Special education teachers Administrators ILT	assessments Rubric scored samples Exit slips
Explicit instruction of standards based math vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit  BEST PRACTICE: Frayer Model for vocabulary development	Grade level meetings Frayer Model staff development	November 2008 – June 2009	MA State standards and EDM vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic organizers Manipulatives	Classroom teachers Math coach ESL Lab teachers Special education teachers Administrators ILT	Examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/Post assessments MCAS questions Teacher observation Think, pair, share Exit slips EDM unit assessments
Monitor daily student understanding of math objectives	Focused school wide professional development	November 2008 – June 2009	MA State Standards Think, pair, share Exit slips	Classroom teachers Math coach ESL Lab teachers Special education teachers Administrators ILT	Examples of student work Exit Slips Think, pair, share

## Kindergarten

### School Goals 3 Sub Groups

#### Math

One hundred percent of our special education students will show improvement in Math as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 30% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 70% will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in math for special education subgroup is 2% proficient or above, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 10% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

One hundred percent of our ELL students will show improvement in math as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS . No less than 20 percent of students will show growth to the next performance level. The 80 percent will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in math for the ELL subgroup is 15 % Proficient or Above on MCAS, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 10% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Teachers will differentiate instruction to implement, monitor, and adjust intervention plans to target specific math skills and concepts	ELL Training Special Education Training WPS professional development	November 2008 June 2009	EDM Program Components Math Manipulatives Math Centers MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Math Coach ILT Administrators	Formal/Informal assessments 504 Meetings SSP Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations
Teachers will implement small group/individual instruction to reinforce non-secure goals and increase skills and concept practice	ELL Training Special Education Training WPS professional development	November 2008 – June 2009	EDM Program Components Math Manipulatives Math Centers MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Math Coach ILT Administrators	Formal/Informal assessments 504 Meetings SSP Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations
Teachers will use learning Center activities and EDM games to reinforce number sense and operating skills	ELL Training Special Education Training WPS professional development	November 2008 – June 2009	EDM Program Components Math Manipulatives Math Centers MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Math Coach ILT Administrators	Formal/Informal assessments 504 Meetings SSP Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations

**Grade 1  
Mathematics**

	<i>End of Year - FALL 2008</i>	<i>End of Year - WINTER 2009</i>	<i>End of Year - SPRING 2009</i>
<b>Grade 1 Everyday Math Assessment</b>	-		

**Grade 1**

**Mathematics School Goal 1 EXTERNAL**

One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in Math as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 25% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 75% will show growth within their performance level. Our goal is to have 30% at Proficient in MATHEMATICS in 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Students will explain their process for solving open response problems both orally and in writing  BEST PRACTICE: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (Questioning, clarifying, and summarizing) and checking	Houghton Mifflin Comprehension strategies staff development Grade level meetings MCAS examples Exemplars review	November 2008 – June 2009	MA State Frameworks EDM Program components MCAS Open response examples w/ rubrics Graphic organizers Supplemental materials Manipulatives	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators	Examples of student work (to include exemplars and open response samples) Teacher Observation Informal assessments Rubric Scored samples Exit slips MCAS data

<p>Explicit instruction of standards based math vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit</p> <p><b>BEST PRACTICE:</b> Frayer Model for vocabulary development</p>	<p>Grade level meetings Frayer Model Staff development</p>	<p>November 2008 – June 2009 Monthly staff meetings</p>	<p>MA State standards and EDM vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic Organizers Posted vocabulary Manipulatives</p>	<p>Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators</p>	<p>Examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/post assessments MCAS questions Reacher Observation Think, pair, share Exit slips EDM Unit assessments Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators</p>
<p>Monitor daily student work</p> <p><b>BEST PRACTICE:</b> Exit slips Think, pair, share</p>	<p>Focused school wide PD plan</p> <p>Grade level meetings</p>	<p>November 2008 – June 2009</p>	<p>MA State standards DI flexible groupings and activities Think, pair, share strategy Exit slips</p>	<p>Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators</p>	<p>Examples of student work Exit slips EDM Unit assessments Think, pair, share MCAS questions</p>

**Grade 1**

**School Goal 2 INTERNAL**

One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in MATH as demonstrated by the administration of MAP Assessment. No less than 40% of students will meet or exceed their growth scores. The remaining 60% will show growth in their over all RIT score from fall to spring. Our goal is to have no less than 25 % at their grade level benchmark by June 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Students will complete MAP goal setting worksheets and discuss strategies to best meet MAP target goal  BEST PRACTICE: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing)	Houghton Mifflin strategies staff development Monthly staff meetings	November 2008 – June 2009	NWEA web site Goal setting worksheets Graphic organizers	Classroom teachers Math coach ESL Lab teachers Special education teachers Administrators ILT	Teacher observations Informal assessments Rubric scored samples Exit slips
Explicit instruction of standards based math vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit	Grade level meetings Frayer Model staff development	November 2008 – June 2009	MA State standards and EDM vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic organizers Manipulatives	Classroom teachers Math coach ESL Lab teachers Special education teachers Administrators	Examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/Post assessments MCAS questions Teacher observation Think, pair, share

BEST PRACTICE: Frayer Model for vocabulary development				ILT	Exit slips EDM unit assessments
Monitor daily student understanding of math objectives	Focused school wide professional development	November 2008 – June 2009	MA State Standards Think, pair, share Exit slips	Classroom teachers Math coach ESL Lab teachers Special education teachers Administrators ILT	Examples of student work Exit Slips Think, pair, share

## Grade 1

### School Goals 3 Sub Groups

One hundred percent of our special education students will show improvement in Math as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 30% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 70% will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in math for special education subgroup is 2% proficient or above, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 10% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

One hundred percent of our ELL students will show improvement in math as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS . No less than 20 percent of students will show growth to the next performance level. The 80 percent will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in math for the ELL subgroup is 15 percent Proficient or Above on MCAS, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 20% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Teachers will differentiate instruction to implement,	ELL Training Special Education	November 2008 June 2009	EDM Program Components	Classroom Teachers Special Education	Formal/Informal assessments

monitor, and adjust intervention plans to target specific math skills and concepts	Training WPS professional development		Math Manipulatives Math Centers MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Math Coach ILT Administrators	504 Meetings SSP Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations
Teachers will implement small group/individual instruction to reinforce non-secure goals and increase skills and concept practice	ELL Training Special Education Training WPS professional development	November 2008 – June 2009	EDM Program Components Math Manipulatives Math Centers MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Math Coach ILT Administrators	Formal/Informal assessments 504 Meetings SSP Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations
Teachers will use learning Center activities and EDM games to reinforce number sense and operating skills	ELL Training Special Education Training WPS professional development	November 2008 – June 2009	EDM Program Components Math Manipulatives Math Centers MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Math Coach ILT Administrators	Formal/Informal assessments 504 Meetings SSP Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations

**Grade 2  
Mathematics**

	<i>FALL 2008</i>				<i>WINTER 2009</i>				<i>SPRING 2009</i>			
	<i>MEA N RIT</i>	<i>%LO</i>	<i>%AV</i>	<i>%HI</i>	<i>MEA N RIT</i>	<i>%LO</i>	<i>%AV</i>	<i>%HI</i>	<i>MEA N RIT</i>	<i>%LO</i>	<i>%AV</i>	<i>%HI</i>
<b>Grade 2 MAP Assessment</b>												
<i>Number Sense and Operations</i>	170.4	59%	15%	26%								
<i>Patterns and Algebra</i>	173.5	51%	12%	37%								
<i>Geometry</i>	176.3	44%	19%	37%								
<i>Measurement</i>	169.9	69%	12%	19%								
<i>Data Analysis and Probability</i>	174.3	51%	25%	24%								

**Grade2**

**Goal 1 Mathematics -Data**

	<i>Unit Test- FALL 2008</i>	<i>Unit Test-WINTER 2009</i>	<i>Unit Test-SPRING 2009</i>
<b>Grade 2 Everyday Math Assessment</b>	-		

**Grade 2**

**Mathematics School Goal 1: School Goal 1 EXTERNAL**

One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in Math as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 25% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 75% will show growth within their performance level. Our goal is to have 30% at Proficient in MATHEMATICS in 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Students will explain their process for solving open response problems both orally and in writing  BEST PRACTICE: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies(Questioning, clarifying, and	Houghton Mifflin Comprehension strategies staff development Grade level meetings MCAS examples Exemplars review	November 2008 – June 2009	MA State Frameworks EDM Program components MCAS Open response examples w/ rubrics Graphic organizers Supplemental materials	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators	Examples of student work(to include exemplars and open response samples) Teacher Observation Informal assessments Rubric Scored samples

summarizing) and checking			Manipulatives		Exit slips MCAS data
Explicit instruction of standards based math vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit  BEST PRACTICE: Frayer Model for vocabulary development	Grade level meetings Frayer Model Staff development	November 2008 – June 2009 Monthly staff meetings	MA State standards and EDM vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic Organizers Posted vocabulary Manipulatives	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators	Examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/post assessments MCAS questions Reacher Observation Think, pair, share Exit slips EDM Unit assessments Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators
Monitor daily student work  BEST PRACTICE: Exit slips Think, pair, share	Focused school wide PD plan  Grade level meetings	November 2008 – June 2009	MA State standards DI flexible groupings and activities Think, pair, share strategy Exit slips	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators	Examples of student work Exit slips EDM Unit assessments Think, pair, share MCAS questions

**School Goal 2 INTERNAL**

One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in MATH as demonstrated by the administration of MAP Assessment. No less than 40% of students will meet or exceed their growth scores. The remaining 60% will show growth in their over all RIT score from fall to spring. Our goal is to have no less than 25 % at their grade level benchmark by June 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Students will complete MAP goal setting worksheets and discuss strategies to best meet MAP target goal  BEST PRACTICE: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing)	Houghton Mifflin strategies staff development Monthly staff meetings	November 2008 – June 2009	NWEA web site Goal setting worksheets Graphic organizers	Classroom teachers Math coach ESL Lab teachers Special education teachers Administrators ILT	Teacher observations Informal assessments Rubric scored samples Exit slips
Explicit instruction of standards based math vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit  BEST PRACTICE: Frayer Model for vocabulary development	Grade level meetings Frayer Model staff development	November 2008 – June 2009	MA State standards and EDM vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic organizers Manipulatives	Classroom teachers Math coach ESL Lab teachers Special education teachers Administrators ILT	Examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/Post assessments MCAS questions Teacher observation Think, pair, share Exit slips EDM unit assessments
Monitor daily student understanding of math objectives	Focused school wide professional development	November 2008 – June 2009	MA State Standards Think, pair, share Exit slips	Classroom teachers Math coach ESL Lab teachers Special education teachers Administrators ILT	Examples of student work Exit Slips Think, pair, share

**Grade 2**

**School Goals 3 Sub Groups**

One hundred percent of our special education students will show improvement in Math as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 30% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 70% will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in math for special education subgroup is 2% proficient or above, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 10% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

One hundred percent of our ELL students will show improvement in math as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS . No less than 20 percent of students will show growth to the next performance level. The 80 percent will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in math for the ELL subgroup is 15 % Proficient or Above on MCAS, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 20% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Teachers will differentiate instruction to implement, monitor, and adjust intervention plans to target specific math skills and concepts	ELL Training Special Education Training WPS professional development	November 2008 June 2009	EDM Program Components Math Manipulatives Math Centers MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Math Coach ILT Administrators	Formal/Informal assessments 504 Meetings SSP Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations

<p>Teachers will implement small group/individual instruction to reinforce non-secure goals and increase skills and concept practice</p>	<p>ELL Training Special Education Training WPS professional development</p>	<p>November 2008 – June 2009</p>	<p>EDM Program Components Math Manipulatives Math Centers MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials</p>	<p>Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Math Coach ILT Administrators</p>	<p>Formal/Informal assessments 504 Meetings SSP Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations</p>
<p>Teachers will use learning Center activities and EDM games to reinforce number sense and operating skills</p>	<p>ELL Training Special Education Training WPS professional development</p>	<p>November 2008 – June 2009</p>	<p>EDM Program Components Math Manipulatives Math Centers MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials</p>	<p>Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Math Coach ILT Administrators</p>	<p>Formal/Informal assessments 504 Meetings SSP Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations</p>

Grade 3 MAP Assessment	FALL 2008				WINTER 2009				SPRING 2009			
	MEAN RIT	%LO	%AV	%HI	MEAN RIT	%LO	%AV	%HI	MEAN RIT	%LO	%AV	%HI
<i>Number Sense and Operations</i>	182.3	54%	38%	8%								
<i>Patterns and Algebra</i>	186.9	48%	25%	27%								
<i>Geometry</i>	186.4	48%	29%	235								
<i>Measurement</i>	184.0	67%	21%	12%								
<i>Data Analysis and Probability</i>	183.3	60%	21%	19%								

**Grade 3 MCAS Data Synopsis for last year's class**  
**Mathematics Subject Area Sub-scores**

<p><i>Number Sense and Operations:</i>  <b>59% of possible points attained compared to 73% at the state level</b></p>
<p><i>Patterns, Relations, and Algebra:</i>  <b>61% of possible points attained compared to 79% at the state</b></p>
<p><i>Geometry:</i>  48% of possible points attained compared to 71% at the state level</p>
<p><i>Measurement:</i>  <b>65% of possible points attained compared to 77% at the state level</b></p>
<p><i>Data Analysis, Statistics, and Probability:</i>  <b>56% of possible points compared to 78% at the state level</b></p>
<p><i>Item Analysis (Multiple Choice &amp; Open Response):</i>  <b>MC - 67% of possible points attained compared to 80% at the state level</b>  <b>SA - 47 % of possible points attained compared to 72% at the state level</b>  <b>OR - 42% of possible points compared 68% at the state level</b></p>

### Grade 3

#### Mathematics School Goal 1: **School Goal 1 EXTERNAL**

One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in Math as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 25% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 75% will show growth within their performance level. Our goal is to have 30% at Proficient in MATHEMATICS in 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Students will explain their process for solving open response problems both orally and in writing  BEST PRACTICE: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (Questioning, clarifying, and summarizing) and checking	Houghton Mifflin Comprehension strategies staff development Grade level meetings MCAS examples Exemplars review	November 2008 – June 2009	MA State Frameworks EDM Program components MCAS Open response examples w/ rubrics Graphic organizers Supplemental materials Manipulatives	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators	Examples of student work (to include exemplars and open response samples) Teacher Observation Informal assessments Rubric Scored samples Exit slips MCAS data
Explicit instruction of standards based math vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit	Grade level meetings Frayer Model Staff development	November 2008 – June 2009 Monthly staff meetings	MA State standards and EDM vocabulary alignments Frayer Model	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers	Examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/post assessments MCAS questions

<p>BEST PRACTICE: Frayer Model for vocabulary development</p>			<p>handouts Graphic Organizers Posted vocabulary Manipulatives</p>	<p>ILT Administrators</p>	<p>Teacher Observation Think, pair, share Exit slips EDM Unit assessments Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators</p>
<p>Monitor daily student work</p> <p>BEST PRACTICE: Exit slips Think, pair, share</p>	<p>Focused school wide PD plan</p> <p>Grade level meetings</p>	<p>November 2008 – June 2009</p>	<p>MA State standards DI flexible groupings and activities Think, pair, share strategy Exit slips</p>	<p>Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators</p>	<p>Examples of student work Exit slips EDM Unit assessments Think, pair, share MCAS questions</p>

**Grade 3**

**School Goal 2 INTERNAL**

One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in MATH as demonstrated by the administration of MAP Assessment. No less than 40% of students will meet or exceed their growth scores. The remaining 60% will show growth in their over all RIT score from fall to spring. Our goal is to have no less than 25 % at their grade level benchmark by June 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Students will complete MAP goal setting worksheets and discuss strategies to best meet MAP target goal  BEST PRACTICE: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing)	Houghton Mifflin strategies staff development Monthly staff meetings	November 2008 – June 2009	NWEA web site Goal setting worksheets Graphic organizers	Classroom teachers Math coach ESL Lab teachers Special education teachers Administrators ILT	Teacher observations Informal assessments Rubric scored samples Exit slips
Explicit instruction of standards based math vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit	Grade level meetings Frayer Model staff development	November 2008 – June 2009	MA State standards and EDM vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic organizers Manipulatives	Classroom teachers Math coach ESL Lab teachers Special education teachers Administrators ILT	Examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/Post assessments MCAS questions Teacher observation Think, pair, share Exit slips

BEST PRACTICE: Frayer Model for vocabulary development					EDM unit assessments
Monitor daily student understanding of math objectives	Focused school wide professional development	November 2008 – June 2009	MA State Standards Think, pair, share Exit slips	Classroom teachers Math coach ESL Lab teachers Special education teachers Administrators ILT	Examples of student work Exit Slips Think, pair, share

### Grade 3

#### School Goals 3 Sub Groups

One hundred percent of our special education students will show improvement in Math as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 30% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 70% will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in math for special education subgroup is 2% proficient or above, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 10% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

One hundred percent of our ELL students will show improvement in math as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS . No less than 20 percent of students will show growth to the next performance level. The 80 percent will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in math for the ELL subgroup is 15 % Proficient or Above on MCAS, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 20% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Teachers will differentiate instruction to implement,	ELL Training Special Education	November 2008 June 2009	EDM Program Components	Classroom Teachers Special Education	Formal/Informal assessments

monitor, and adjust intervention plans to target specific math skills and concepts	Training WPS professional development		Math Manipulatives Math Centers MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Math Coach ILT Administrators	504 Meetings SSP Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations
Teachers will implement small group/individual instruction to reinforce non-secure goals and increase skills and concept practice	ELL Training Special Education Training WPS professional development	November 2008 – June 2009	EDM Program Components Math Manipulatives Math Centers MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Math Coach ILT Administrators	Formal/Informal assessments 504 Meetings SSP Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations
Teachers will use learning Center activities and EDM games to reinforce number sense and operating skills	ELL Training Special Education Training WPS professional development	November 2008 – June 2009	EDM Program Components Math Manipulatives Math Centers MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Math Coach ILT Administrators	Formal/Informal assessments 504 Meetings SSP Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations

<b>Grade 4 MAP Assessment</b>	<b>FALL 2008</b>				<b>WINTER 2009</b>				<b>SPRING 2009</b>			
	<b>MEAN RIT</b>	<b>%LO</b>	<b>%AV</b>	<b>%HI</b>	<b>MEAN RIT</b>	<b>%LO</b>	<b>%AV</b>	<b>%HI</b>	<b>MEAN RIT</b>	<b>%LO</b>	<b>%AV</b>	<b>%HI</b>
<i>Number Sense and Operations</i>	182.3	54%	38%	8%								
<i>Patterns and Algebra</i>	186.9	48%	25%	27%								
<i>Geometry</i>	186.4	48%	29%	23%								
<i>Measurement</i>	184.0	67%	21%	19%								
<i>Data Analysis and Probability</i>	183.3	60%	21%	19%								

**Grade 4**

**Goal 1 Mathematics -Data**

**Grade 4 MCAS Data Synopsis for this year's class use last year's grade 3 scores**

**Mathematics Subject Area Sub-scores**

<b>Number Sense and Operations:</b> <i>59% of possible points attained compared to 73% at the state level</i>
<b>Patterns, Relations, and Algebra</b> <i>61% of possible points compared to 79% at the state level</i>
<b>Geometry:</b> <i>48% of possible points compared to 71% at the state level</i>
<b>Measurement:</b> <i>65% of possible points compared to 77% at the state level</i>
<b>Data Analysis, Statistics, and Probability:</b> <i>56% of possible points attained compared to 78% at the state level</i>
<b>Item Analysis (Multiple Choice &amp; Open Response):</b> <i>MC – 67% possible points attained compared to 80% at the state level</i> <i>SA – 47% of possible points attained compared to 72% at the state level</i> <i>OR – 42% of possible points attained compared to 68% at the state level</i>

<b>MCAS Score Analysis (last year's Grade 3 scores for this year's Grade 4 students)</b>			
<b>How many scored?</b>		<b>How many scored?</b>	
36-40	4	N/A	
30-35	11	34-35	5
26-29	5	28-29	4
22-25	10	24-25	7
22-25	24	19-21	6
0-7	3	5-7	3

Grade 4 MCAS Data Synopsis for last year's Grade 4  
 Mathematics Subject Area Sub-scores

<p><b>Number Sense and Operations:</b>  <i>44% of possible points compared to 65% at the state level</i></p>
<p><b>Patterns, Relations, and Algebra:</b>  <i>50% of possible points compared to 73% at the state level</i></p>
<p><b>Geometry:</b>  <i>42% of possible points attained compared to 68%</i></p>
<p><b>Measurement:</b>  <i>41% of the possible points compared to 63% at the state level</i></p>
<p><b>Data Analysis, Statistics, and Probability:</b>  <i>52% of the possible points compared to 70% at the state level</i></p>
<p><b>Item Analysis (Multiple Choice &amp; Open Response):</b>  <i>MC – 52% of the possible points compared to 74% at the state level</i>  <i>SA – 34% of the possible points compared to 62% at the state level</i>  <i>OR – 35% of the possible points compared to 60% at the state level</i></p>

**Grade 4**

Mathematics School Goal 1: **School Goal 1 EXTERNAL**

One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in Math as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 25% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 75% will show growth within their performance level. Our goal is to have 30% at Proficient in MATHEMATICS in 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b>	<b>Professional Development</b>	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b>
What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one	What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?

		year) or short term action.			
<p>Students will explain their process for solving open response problems both orally and in writing</p> <p><b>BEST PRACTICE:</b> Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (Questioning, clarifying, and summarizing) and checking</p>	<p>Houghton Mifflin Comprehension strategies staff development</p> <p>Grade level meetings</p> <p>MCAS examples</p> <p>Exemplars review</p>	<p>November 2008 – June 2009</p>	<p>MA State Frameworks</p> <p>EDM Program components</p> <p>MCAS Open response examples w/ rubrics</p> <p>Graphic organizers</p> <p>Supplemental materials</p> <p>Manipulatives</p>	<p>Classroom Teachers</p> <p>Special Education Teachers</p> <p>Math Coach</p> <p>ESL Lab Teachers</p> <p>ILT</p> <p>Administrators</p>	<p>Examples of student work (to include exemplars and open response samples)</p> <p>Teacher Observation</p> <p>Informal assessments</p> <p>Rubric Scored samples</p> <p>Exit slips</p> <p>MCAS data</p>
<p>Explicit instruction of standards based math vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit</p> <p><b>BEST PRACTICE:</b> Frayer Model for vocabulary development</p>	<p>Grade level meetings</p> <p>Frayer Model Staff development</p>	<p>November 2008 – June 2009</p> <p>Monthly staff meetings</p>	<p>MA State standards and EDM vocabulary alignments</p> <p>Frayer Model handouts</p> <p>Graphic Organizers</p> <p>Posted vocabulary</p> <p>Manipulatives</p>	<p>Classroom Teachers</p> <p>Special Education Teachers</p> <p>Math Coach</p> <p>ESL Lab Teachers</p> <p>ILT</p> <p>Administrators</p>	<p>Examples of student Frayer Model work</p> <p>Pre/post assessments</p> <p>MCAS questions</p> <p>Teacher Observation</p> <p>Think, pair, share</p> <p>Exit slips</p> <p>EDM Unit assessments</p> <p>Classroom Teachers</p> <p>Special Education Teachers</p> <p>Math Coach</p> <p>ESL Lab Teachers</p> <p>ILT</p> <p>Administrators</p>
<p>Monitor daily student work</p> <p><b>BEST PRACTICE:</b> Exit slips</p>	<p>Focused school wide PD plan</p> <p>Grade level meetings</p>	<p>November 2008 – June 2009</p>	<p>MA State standards</p> <p>DI flexible groupings and activities</p> <p>Think, pair, share</p>	<p>Classroom Teachers</p> <p>Special Education Teachers</p> <p>Math Coach</p> <p>ESL Lab Teachers</p>	<p>Examples of student work</p> <p>Exit slips</p> <p>EDM Unit assessments</p>

Think, pair, share			strategy Exit slips	ILT Administrators	Think, pair, share MCAS questions
--------------------	--	--	------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------

**Grade 4**

**School Goal 2 INTERNAL**

One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in MATH as demonstrated by the administration of MAP Assessment. No less than 40% of students will meet or exceed their growth scores. The remaining 60% will show growth in their over all RIT score from fall to spring. Our goal is to have no less than 25 % at their grade level benchmark by June 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Students will complete MAP goal setting worksheets and discuss strategies to best meet MAP target goal  BEST PRACTICE: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (predicting, questioning,	Houghton Mifflin strategies staff development Monthly staff meetings	November 2008 – June 2009	NWEA web site Goal setting worksheets Graphic organizers	Classroom teachers Math coach ESL Lab teachers Special education teachers Administrators ILT	Teacher observations Informal assessments Rubric scored samples Exit slips

clarifying, and summarizing)					
Explicit instruction of standards based math vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit  BEST PRACTICE: Frayer Model for vocabulary development	Grade level meetings Frayer Model staff development	November 2008 – June 2009	MA State standards and EDM vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic organizers Manipulatives	Classroom teachers Math coach ESL Lab teachers Special education teachers Administrators ILT	Examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/Post assessments MCAS questions Teacher observation Think, pair, share Exit slips EDM unit assessments
Monitor daily student understanding of math objectives	Focused school wide professional development	November 2008 – June 2009	MA State Standards Think, pair, share Exit slips	Classroom teachers Math coach ESL Lab teachers Special education teachers Administrators ILT	Examples of student work Exit Slips Think, pair, share

## Grade 4

### School Goals 3 Sub Groups

One hundred percent of our special education students will show improvement in Math as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 30% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 70% will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in math for special education subgroup is 2% proficient or above, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 10% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

One hundred percent of our ELL students will show improvement in math as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS . No less than 20 percent of students will show growth to the next performance level. The 80 percent will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in math for the ELL subgroup is 15 % Proficient or Above on MCAS, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 20% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Teachers will differentiate instruction to implement, monitor, and adjust intervention plans to target specific math skills and concepts	ELL Training Special Education Training WPS professional development	November 2008 June 2009	EDM Program Components Math Manipulatives Math Centers MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Math Coach ILT Administrators	Formal/Informal assessments 504 Meetings SSP Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations
Teachers will implement small group/individual instruction to reinforce non-secure goals and increase skills and concept practice	ELL Training Special Education Training WPS professional development	November 2008 – June 2009	EDM Program Components Math Manipulatives Math Centers MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Math Coach ILT Administrators	Formal/Informal assessments 504 Meetings SSP Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations

Teachers will use learning Center activities and EDM games to reinforce number sense and operating skills	ELL Training Special Education Training WPS professional development	November 2008 – June 2009	EDM Program Components Math Manipulatives Math Centers MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Math Coach ILT Administrators	Formal/Informal assessments 504 Meetings SSP Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations
---	--	---------------------------	---	---	---

**Grade 5**  
*Mathematics*

<b>Grade 5 MAP Assessment</b>	<b>FALL 2006</b>				<b>WINTER 2007</b>				<b>SPRING 2007</b>			
	<b>MEAN RIT</b>	<b>%LO</b>	<b>%AV</b>	<b>%HI</b>	<b>MEAN RIT</b>	<b>%LO</b>	<b>%AV</b>	<b>%HI</b>	<b>MEAN RIT</b>	<b>%LO</b>	<b>%AV</b>	<b>%HI</b>
<b><i>Number Sense and Operations</i></b>	205.3	50%	26%	24%								
<b><i>Patterns and Algebra</i></b>	205.6	48%	27%	24%								
<b><i>Geometry</i></b>	206.5	53%	16%	31%								
<b><i>Measurement</i></b>	202.9	55%	27%	18%								
<b><i>Data Analysis and Probability</i></b>	204.0	57%	23%	21%								

**Grade 5 MCAS Data Synopsis for this year's class use last year's grade 5 scores**  
**Mathematics Subject Area Sub-scores**

<i>Number Sense and Operations: 44% of the possible points compared to 65% at the state level</i>
<i>Patterns, Relations, and Algebra:50% of the possible points compared to 73% at the state level</i>
<i>Geometry:42% of the possible points compared to 68% at the state level</i>
<i>Measurement: 41% of the possible points compared to 63% at the state level</i>
<i>Data Analysis, Statistics, and Probability: 41% of the possible points compared to 70% at the state level</i>
<i>Item Analysis (Multiple Choice &amp; Open Response): MC- 52% of the possible points compared to 74% at the state level SA – 56% of the possible points compared to 62% at the state level OR – 48% of the possible points compared to 60% at the state level</i>

**MCAS Score Analysis (Use last year's scores for this year's students.)**

<b>How many scored?</b>		<b>How many scored?</b>	
260-280	0	N/A	
240-258	5	256-258	0
220-238	21	236-238	1
200-218	22	216-218	12

Grade 5 MCAS Data Synopsis for last year's class (use last year's grade 5 scores)

*Mathematics Subject Area Sub-scores*

<p><i>Number Sense and Operations:</i>  <i>43% of the possible points compared to 64% at the state level</i></p>
<p><i>Patterns, Relations, and Algebra:</i>  <i>56% of the possible points compared to 70% at the state level</i></p>
<p><i>Geometry: 59% of the possible points compared to 73% at the state level</i></p>
<p><i>Measurement: 34% of the possible points compared to 56% at the state level</i></p>
<p><i>Data Analysis, Statistics, and Probability: 43% of the possible points compared to 63% at the state level</i></p>
<p><i>Item Analysis (Multiple Choice &amp; Open Response):</i>  <i>MC – 57% of the possible points compared to 73% at the state level</i>  <i>SA – 43% of the possible points compared to 69% at the state level</i>  <i>OR – 34% of the possible points compared to 55% at the state level</i></p>

Grade 5

Mathematics School Goal 1: **School Goal 1 EXTERNAL**

One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in Math as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 25% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 75% will show growth within their performance level. Our goal is to have 30% at Proficient in MATHEMATICS in 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b>	<b>Professional Development</b>	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b>
<p>What Actions will occur?                      What steps will staff take?</p>	<p>How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?</p>	<p>When will this strategy or action begin and end?                      Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one</p>	<p>What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?</p>	<p>Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?</p>	<p>What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?</p>

		year) or short term action.			
<p>Students will explain their process for solving open response problems both orally and in writing</p> <p><b>BEST PRACTICE:</b> Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (Questioning, clarifying, and summarizing) and checking</p>	<p>Houghton Mifflin Comprehension strategies staff development Grade level meetings MCAS examples Exemplars review</p>	<p>November 2008 – June 2009</p>	<p>MA State Frameworks EDM Program components MCAS Open response examples w/ rubrics Graphic organizers Supplemental materials Manipulatives</p>	<p>Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators</p>	<p>Examples of student work (to include exemplars and open response samples) Teacher Observation Informal assessments Rubric Scored samples Exit slips MCAS data</p>
<p>Explicit instruction of standards based math vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit</p> <p><b>BEST PRACTICE:</b> Frayer Model for vocabulary development</p>	<p>Grade level meetings Frayer Model Staff development</p>	<p>November 2008 – June 2009 Monthly staff meetings</p>	<p>MA State standards and EDM vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic Organizers Posted vocabulary Manipulatives</p>	<p>Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators</p>	<p>Examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/post assessments MCAS questions Teacher Observation Think, pair, share Exit slips EDM Unit assessments Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators</p>
<p>Monitor daily student work</p> <p><b>BEST PRACTICE:</b> Exit slips</p>	<p>Focused school wide PD plan  Grade level meetings</p>	<p>November 2008 – June 2009</p>	<p>MA State standards DI flexible groupings and activities Think, pair, share</p>	<p>Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers</p>	<p>Examples of student work Exit slips EDM Unit assessments</p>

Think, pair, share			strategy Exit slips	ILT Administrators	Think, pair, share MCAS questions
--------------------	--	--	------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------

## Grade 5

### School Goal 2 INTERNAL

One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in MATH as demonstrated by the administration of MAP Assessment. No less than 40% of students will meet or exceed their growth scores. The remaining 60% will show growth in their over all RIT score from fall to spring. Our goal is to have no less than 25 % at their grade level benchmark by June 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Students will complete MAP goal setting worksheets and discuss strategies to best meet MAP target goal  BEST PRACTICE: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing)	Houghton Mifflin strategies staff development Monthly staff meetings	November 2008 – June 2009	NWEA web site Goal setting worksheets Graphic organizers	Classroom teachers Math coach ESL Lab teachers Special education teachers Administrators ILT	Teacher observations Informal assessments Rubric scored samples Exit slips

Explicit instruction of standards based math vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit  BEST PRACTICE: Frayer Model for vocabulary development	Grade level meetings Frayer Model staff development	November 2008 – June 2009	MA State standards and EDM vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic organizers Manipulatives	Classroom teachers Math coach ESL Lab teachers Special education teachers Administrators ILT	Examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/Post assessments MCAS questions Teacher observation Think, pair, share Exit slips EDM unit assessments
Monitor daily student understanding of math objectives	Focused school wide professional development	November 2008 – June 2009	MA State Standards Think, pair, share Exit slips	Classroom teachers Math coach ESL Lab teachers Special education teachers Administrators ILT	Examples of student work Exit Slips Think, pair, share

## Grade 5

### School Goals 3 Sub Groups

One hundred percent of our special education students will show improvement in Math as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 30% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 70% will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in math for special education subgroup is 2% proficient or above, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 10% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

One hundred percent of our ELL students will show improvement in math as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS . No less than 20 percent of students will show growth to the next performance level. The 80 percent will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in math for the ELL subgroup is 15 % Proficient or Above on MCAS, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 20% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

<b>Action Steps</b>	<b>Professional Development</b>	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b>
What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to	When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if	What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the	Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is

	implement the activity?	this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	activity?		making a difference in student outcome?
Teachers will differentiate instruction to implement, monitor, and adjust intervention plans to target specific math skills and concepts	ELL Training Special Education Training WPS professional development	November 2008 June 2009	EDM Program Components Math Manipulatives Math Centers MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Math Coach ILT Administrators	Formal/Informal assessments 504 Meetings SSP Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations
Teachers will implement small group/individual instruction to reinforce non-secure goals and increase skills and concept practice	ELL Training Special Education Training WPS professional development	November 2008 – June 2009	EDM Program Components Math Manipulatives Math Centers MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Math Coach ILT Administrators	Formal/Informal assessments 504 Meetings SSP Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations
Teachers will use learning Center activities and EDM games to reinforce number sense and operating skills	ELL Training Special Education Training WPS professional development	November 2008 – June 2009	EDM Program Components Math Manipulatives Math Centers MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Math Coach ILT Administrators	Formal/Informal assessments 504 Meetings SSP Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations

--	--	--	--	--	--

**Grade 6**  
*Mathematics*

Grade 6 MAP Assessment	FALL 2008				WINTER 2009				SPRING 2009			
	MEAN RIT	%LO	%AV	%HI	MEAN RIT	%LO	%AV	%HI	MEAN RIT	%LO	%AV	%HI
<i>Number Sense and Operations</i>	210.3	59%	19%	22%								
<i>Patterns and Algebra</i>	212.4	51%	22%	27%								
<i>Geometry</i>	210.5	55%	25%	20%								
<i>Measurement</i>	208	67%	18%	15%								
<i>Data Analysis and Probability</i>	213.8	45%	33%	22%								

**Grade 6 MCAS Data Synopsis for this year's class use last year's grade 6 scores**  
*Mathematics Subject Area Sub-scores*

<i>Number Sense and Operations:</i> 43% of the possible points compared to 64% at the state level
<i>Patterns, Relations, and Algebra:</i> 56% of the possible points compared to 70% at the state level
<i>Geometry:</i> 59% of the possible points compared to 73% at the state level
<i>Measurement:</i> 34% of the possible points compared to 56% at the state level
<i>Data Analysis, Statistics, and Probability:</i> 43% of the possible points compared to 63% at the state level

**Item Analysis (Multiple Choice & Open Response):**  
**MC – 57% of the possible points compared to 73% at the state level**  
**SA – 43% of the possible points compared to 69% at the state level**  
**OR – 34% of the possible points compared to 55% at the state level**

<b>MCAS Score Analysis (last year's Grade 5 scores for this year's Grade 6 students)</b>			
<b>How many scored?</b>		<b>How many scored?</b>	
260-280	3	N/A	
240-258	8	256-258	1
220-238	16	236-238	1
200-218	16	216-218	9

**Grade 6 MCAS Data Synopsis for last year's class (use last year's grade 6 scores)**  
**Mathematics Subject Area Sub-scores**

<p><b>Number Sense and Operations:</b>  <b>52% of the possible points compared to 72% at the state level</b></p>
<p><b>Patterns, Relations, and Algebra:</b>  <b>46% of the possible points compared to 75% at the state level</b></p>
<p><b>Geometry:</b>  <b>39% of the possible points compared to 69% at the state level</b></p>
<p><b>Measurement:</b>  <b>26% of the possible points compared to 64% at the state level</b></p>
<p><b>Data Analysis, Statistics, and Probability:</b>  <b>58% of the possible points compared to 73% at the state level</b></p>
<p><b>Item Analysis (Multiple Choice &amp; Open Response):</b>  <b>MC – 53% of the possible points compared to 73% at the state level</b>  <b>SA – 54% of the possible points compared to 72% at the state level</b>  <b>OR – 34% of the possible points compared to 64% at the state level</b></p>

## Grade 6

### Mathematics School Goal 1: **School Goal 1 EXTERNAL**

One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in \_\_Math\_\_ as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than \_\_25%\_\_ of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining \_\_75%\_\_ will show growth within their performance level. Our goal is to have \_\_30%\_\_ at Proficient in MATHEMATICS in 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Students will explain their process for solving open response problems both orally and in writing  BEST PRACTICE: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (Questioning, clarifying, and summarizing) and checking	Houghton Mifflin Comprehension strategies staff development Grade level meetings MCAS examples Exemplars review	November 2008 – June 2009	MA State Frameworks EDM Program components MCAS Open response examples w/ rubrics Graphic organizers Supplemental materials Manipulatives	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators	Examples of student work (to include exemplars and open response samples) Teacher Observation Informal assessments Rubric Scored samples Exit slips MCAS data
Explicit instruction of standards based math vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit  BEST PRACTICE:	Grade level meetings Frayer Model Staff development	November 2008 – June 2009 Monthly staff meetings	MA State standards and EDM vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic Organizers	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators	Examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/post assessments MCAS questions Teacher Observation

Frayer Model for vocabulary development			Posted vocabulary Manipulatives		Think, pair, share Exit slips EDM Unit assessments Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators
Monitor daily student work  BEST PRACTICE: Exit slips Think, pair, share	Focused school wide PD plan  Grade level meetings	November 2008 – June 2009	MA State standards DI flexible groupings and activities Think, pair, share strategy Exit slips	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers Math Coach ESL Lab Teachers ILT Administrators	Examples of student work Exit slips EDM Unit assessments Think, pair, share MCAS questions

## Grade 6

### School Goal 2 INTERNAL

One hundred percent of our students will show improvement in MATH as demonstrated by the administration of MAP Assessment. No less than 40% of students will meet or exceed their growth scores. The remaining 60% will show growth in their over all RIT score from fall to spring. Our goal is to have no less than 25% at their grade level benchmark by June 2009.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Students will complete MAP goal setting worksheets and discuss strategies to best meet MAP target goal  BEST PRACTICE: Employ Houghton Mifflin comprehension strategies (predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing)	Houghton Mifflin strategies staff development Monthly staff meetings	November 2008 – June 2009	NWEA web site Goal setting worksheets Graphic organizers	Classroom teachers Math coach ESL Lab teachers Special education teachers Administrators ILT	Teacher observations Informal assessments Rubric scored samples Exit slips
Explicit instruction of standards based math vocabulary with ongoing instruction throughout the unit  BEST PRACTICE: Frayer Model for vocabulary development	Grade level meetings Frayer Model staff development	November 2008 – June 2009	MA State standards and EDM vocabulary alignments Frayer Model handouts Graphic organizers Manipulatives	Classroom teachers Math coach ESL Lab teachers Special education teachers Administrators ILT	Examples of student Frayer Model work Pre/Post assessments MCAS questions Teacher observation Think, pair, share Exit slips EDM unit assessments
Monitor daily student understanding of math objectives	Focused school wide professional development	November 2008 – June 2009	MA State Standards Think, pair, share Exit slips	Classroom teachers Math coach ESL Lab teachers Special education teachers Administrators ILT	Examples of student work Exit Slips Think, pair, share

## Grade 6

### School Goals 3 Sub Groups

One hundred percent of our special education students will show improvement in Math as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS. No less than 30% of students will show growth to the next performance level. The remaining 70% will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in math for special education subgroup is 2% proficient or above, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 10% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

One hundred percent of our ELL students will show improvement in math as demonstrated by the administration of the MCAS . No less than 20 percent of students will show growth to the next performance level. The 80 percent will show growth within their performance level. While our current achievement in math for the ELL subgroup is 15% Proficient or Above on MCAS, this subgroup will make AYP of at least 20% in 2009 or Safe Harbor.

<b>Action Steps</b> What Actions will occur? What steps will staff take?	<b>Professional Development</b> How will staff acquire the necessary skills and attitudes to implement the activity?	<b>Timeline/Date Completed</b> When will this strategy or action begin and end? Please indicate if this is a long term (more than one year) or short term action.	<b>Resources</b> What are the existing and new resources that will be used to accomplish the activity?	<b>Person Responsible</b> Who will provide the leadership? Who will do the work?	<b>Monitoring Effectiveness</b> What ongoing formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcome?
Teachers will differentiate instruction to implement, monitor, and adjust intervention plans to target specific math skills and concepts	ELL Training Special Education Training WPS professional development	November 2008 June 2009	EDM Program Components Math Manipulatives Math Centers MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials	Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Math Coach ILT Administrators	Formal/Informal assessments 504 Meetings SSP Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations

<p>Teachers will implement small group/individual instruction to reinforce non-secure goals and increase skills and concept practice</p>	<p>ELL Training Special Education Training WPS professional development</p>	<p>November 2008 – June 2009</p>	<p>EDM Program Components Math Manipulatives Math Centers MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials</p>	<p>Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Math Coach ILT Administrators</p>	<p>Formal/Informal assessments 504 Meetings SSP Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations</p>
<p>Teachers will use learning Center activities and EDM games to reinforce number sense and operating skills</p>	<p>ELL Training Special Education Training WPS professional development</p>	<p>November 2008 – June 2009</p>	<p>EDM Program Components Math Manipulatives Math Centers MELA-O/IPT ESL Materials</p>	<p>Classroom Teachers Special Education Teachers ESL Lab Teachers Math Coach ILT Administrators</p>	<p>Formal/Informal assessments 504 Meetings SSP Meetings Initial/Annual Evaluations</p>

## **FAMILY INVOLVEMENT**

Epstein has identified six (6) types of parent involvement: parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision making, and collaborating with community. All schools will address two (2) of these areas. All schools will write action steps for communicating with parents; in addition, each school will select an area of their choice.

Elm Park Community School recognizes that student achievement is based upon frequent communication and interaction between each student's home environment and the school. The Learning Compact outlines the partners (teacher, student, parent, and administration) in each student's education. This year our school continues to be challenged by the increasing numbers of cultural and language, lack of available affordable housing, medical, and mental health needs of our students and their families. In order to meet the wide variety of parental needs, the school provides several supports to assist parents. The PBIS Team, Student Support Team, Special Education Team, three days per week School Adjustment Counselor, PBIS, Second Step & Steps to Respect which focus on violence prevention, bullying prevention, developing and maintaining positive behaviors in school, ESSIP, and Mock Trial Programs with the District Attorney's office all provide supports that help to increase student achievement. During the current school year, over 80% of our parents participated in parent/teacher, counselor conferences regarding attendance, SSP and special education team meetings. Some parents who are unable to attend a school day meeting, will usually communicate on a regular basis with the teacher through home notes, telephone calls, and also schedule evening meetings with the principal and assistant principals. Many conferences also include social service agency personnel who support the family and family members, as well as several court appearances.

Information regarding current events is disseminated to families in monthly classroom and grade level written communications, bi-monthly school-wide office memos, Connect-Ed, as well as community dinners and workshop notices. Our community business partners such as Becker College, Big Brothers & Big Sisters through Unum Provident Insurance Company and the WPI "Men's & Women's Basketball Teams. First Unitarian Church, John Street Baptist Church, Verizon, WPI, and individuals from the Worcester Community have all involved our parents in some capacity as they continue to work with Elm Park Community School's students. These partners continue to meet students at school and facilitate assistance with homework during the day and also after school.

During this current school year, parental involvement increased significantly especially in collaborating with the school to meet their child needs. The school staff and administrators who facilitate an increase in involving parents in school activities continue to facilitate this role. There are also more intermediate students' parents who participate in a variety of activities throughout the school. The economy and our families' finances have greatly impacted on the time of day parents may be available to participate in school hour activities. Parents continue to arrive at school in the late afternoon and evening to retrieve their child's homework that was left in their desk or locker.

Parents continue to participate in late afternoon and evening Book Fair activities, parent conferences and other student achievement focused meetings, field trips, LASOS in collaboration with the Latino Educational Institute located at Worcester State College, student performances, award recognitions, and School Council meetings, and activities sponsored by a particular grade or classroom.

Parents of English Language Learners have actively participated in Elm Park Community School events such as Know Your School Night and continue to partner with another of the same language speaking parent who facilitates in translating for them. Our English Language Learning parent population participates in our ESL classes which are offered twice per week for two hours. In order for parents to be more supportive of their child's learning, parents indicated that they had to learn how to read, write, and speak English. This year, we have received monies through the Weed and Seed Grant to support the teacher who provides ESL services to over twenty-eight to thirty parents per session. As a school, we want to continue providing more of a support network that will assist parents and teachers in improving student achievement.

The school's instructional leadership team will be responsible for the collection of evidence as stated in the action steps of the plan. The team will be responsible for the next phase in the process by assisting in the monitoring of the implementation and outcome benchmarking. Implementation benchmarking measures whether you have successfully implemented your strategies and serve as a critical periodic review of those strategies and whether they are contributing to changes in your desired student outcomes.

Name	Role/Title	Signature
Debra Mantyla	Math Coach	
Ruthann Melancon	Principal	
Maria Palmieri	Reading Coach	
Kristina Pelczarski	Special Education teacher	
Carol Puskas	5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Teacher	
Toni Reidy	Reading Coach	
Kathleen Sebok	1 <sup>st</sup> Grade Teacher	