

New Washington Elementary School (0807)



PL 221 PLAN 2016-2019 SCHOOL YEAR

Submitted: Fall, 2016

Table of Contents

<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary (Description of school, purpose, achievements)	
Parental Participation	
Technology Plan	
Safe and Disciplined Learning Environment	
Attendance	
Description and Location of Curriculum	
Title and descriptions of Assessment	
Belief Statement, Mission, Vision	
Leadership team	
Three-Year Goals	
Data Summary – Data Wise	
Collection, Analysis and Reporting of Data (needs of improvement)	
ISTEP/Graduation rate/Benchmarks	
Action Plans and Professional Development –	
Goals/objectives/Implementation/Timeline	
Statues to be Waived	
Appendix	
Comprehensive Needs Assessment	
School Review	
Assurance – Building/District	

Executive Summary (Overview)

School and Community Description

New Washington Elementary School is a K-5 public education facility. New Washington Elementary is one of 12 elementary schools in the Greater Clark County School Corporation. In addition to the elementary schools, the corporation has three middle schools and three high schools, all strategically located to serve a geographically and ethnically diverse community.

The Greater Clark County School Corporation is situated in the southeastern tip of Indiana; its southern border is the Ohio River, and across the river is Louisville, Kentucky. New Washington Elementary School, built in 1972 and remodeled in 1984 and again in 2004, is located off State Road 62 and serves Charlestown, Owen, Washington, Bethlehem, and Oregon Townships in Southern Indiana. The single story brick building occupying fifteen landscaped acres has an enrollment of approximately 360 students. The various flower gardens around the building are a source of pride for the school and are maintained solely by staff and students. The campus borders the New Washington Middle/High School campus, creating a special partnership involving facilities that are accessible and enjoyed by the entire community. Dedicated staff members subscribe to a shared mission that is a “partnership of staff, parents, and community, preparing the whole child for success. We believe that we will accomplish this through educational experiences guided by data, high expectations, and the belief that every child can learn with a deep level of understanding.

Student Demographics

The current population of New Washington Elementary School is 311 students in grades Preschool through 5. The current student population is 3% Hispanic, 93% White/Non Hispanic, and 4% Multiracial. The percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch for the 2016-2017 school is 55%.

Parent Participation

New Washington Elementary provides several opportunities throughout the school year for parent participation. These include the following:

- Parent Open House
- Kindergarten Orientation
- Kindergarten Round-up
- Monthly PTO meetings
- Annual Family Literacy night
- Various PTO Activities – Color Walk, Movie Night, Back to School Bash,

Parent communication also occurs regularly throughout the year by the following:

- Quarterly Progress Reports
- Quarterly Report Cards
- Parent-Teacher Conferences
- Monthly Newsletters
- NWES Website
- Various Social Media - Twitter and Facebook
- Class Dojo

Attendance

The attendance rate for New Washington Elementary for the 2015-2016 school year was 96.2%.

Safe and Orderly Environment (PRIDE)

In an effort to maximize the safety of our school community, all exterior school entrances and classroom doors will remain locked. All visitors must enter the building by the main entrance using the intercom system next to the door to request access. They will be asked, through the intercom, to state the reason for their visit and to show identification. The office staff will monitor the visitors and grant entrance into the building. When visiting our school, visitors must present their driver's license to a designated staff member. The Raptor system will perform a quick background check on the visitor and print a badge. The office staff will then issue a visitor's ID badge and lanyard that must be worn while in the building. In order to visit/volunteer in the classroom, visitors must contact the teacher in advance, receive permission from the teacher, and be included on their daily visitor log. Visitors not included on the daily visitor log will not be permitted entrance to the classroom.

Students at New Washington Elementary school participate in a variety of activities to reinforce PRIDE skills throughout our school. PRIDE skills are taught monthly through role playing and classroom activities. Teachers model and monitor expected behaviors. Students are recognized weekly for PRIDE students of the week. Classes have quarterly PRIDE contest for students. Students earn incentives for their classroom when caught modeling PRIDE behaviors.

Technology

Greater Clark is using technology to create authentic learning experiences and to empower all learners to take ownership of their learning. Teachers and students leverage tools like interactive whiteboards, ActivInspire, HP Chromebooks, Google Classroom, Google Apps for Education, online textbooks, Symbaloo, IXL, EasyTech, Remind, Class Dojo and more in partnership with our goal clarity curriculum maps to support student learning. All technology integration and professional development is incorporated inside of our Numeracy, Literacy, and College and Career Readiness frameworks.

Curriculum and Instruction

GCCS curriculum is aligned with state standards. Curriculum information is located in the main office as well as on the Greater Clark County Website. All certified staff has been trained and using the Greater Clark Pacing Guide for their grade level. Elementary teachers in grades K-5 have pacing guides for: Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social Studies which are aligned to the 2014 Indiana College and Career Standards. Maps. Performance data linked to the maps is routinely reviewed to guide process for improving instruction and aligning the formative-assessment process. Curriculum development occurs in the following areas:

Language Arts
Mathematics
Science/Health
Social Studies
Library Media Skills
Music
Art
Physical Education
Technology Education

In order to understand the level of implementation of key programs and strategies, implementation data are collected and analyzed as evidenced by observations, walk-throughs, collaboration, and student work samples. Students failing ISTEP+ participate in remediation during the school day, after school programs and/or intersession. Supplemental programs are monitored and evaluated with assessments. Student grades and report cards are aligned with Indiana Academic Standards and ISTEP+ as evidenced by correlations of student grades with scores on ISTEP+. The interventions that will address critical areas will include: full-day kindergarten, tiered small group instruction (IMPACT Groups), extended school year (Intercessions), and after school programming run by Communities in Schools.

Staff

New Washington Elementary School has 13 full-time highly qualified classroom teachers. There is also one special education teachers, one and a half intervention teachers one pre-school teacher, one speech/hearing teacher, and one and a half

art/music/PE teacher. There is one administrative assistant, one half school administrative manager, one media clerk, one half health assistant, and four para-educators. Three custodians and four cafeteria workers complete the staff. The principal at New Washington Elementary is Darcie Goodin

Darcie Goodin – Principal
Debbie Mosley – Read 180/Music/Art/PE
Jackie Bowen – Music/Art/PE
Amy Webb – Speech
Sherry Cummings - K
Jody Sexton - K
Andi Pennington - 1
Stephanie Wilson -1
Kasey Comer- 2
Heather Barry -2
Kara Dieterlen - 3
Katelyn Jackson - 3
David Alcorn - 4
Judy Mullins - 4
Kendra Arthur - 5
Paula Willinger - 5
Amy Ellison - Intervention
Tracey Montgomery – Special Needs
Margaret Young - Intervention
Brenda Traill - PreSchool

Titles and Descriptions of Assessment Instruments

ELA Reading/Writing:

Writing Benchmark Assessments – These assessments focus on Indiana College and Career State Standards. They provide students with exposure to writing prompts in specific genres. Teachers score the writing assessments with the Indiana Writing Rubric (Gr. 2-5) and a 6 Traits Writing Rubric (Gr. K-1). Kdg. – Gr. 5 teachers administer, score and analyze Writing Assessments four times per year.

Aimsweb - Gr. K -1 teachers administer Aimsweb Literacy screening 3 times per year. Students who score red/yellow on Aimsweb Reading screening will be progress monitored.

STAR - Gr 2-5 teachers will administer STAR Reading screening 3 times per year. Students who score red/yellow on STAR Reading screening will be progress monitored.

Running Records - (K-2) Teachers will administer running records using McGraw Hill benchmark and progress monitoring materials or other similar materials to determine a guided reading level for those students.

Common Quarterly Assessments – Grades K-5 teachers utilize CQA assessments aligned to standards and a corporation prescribed pacing of skills/standards on a biweekly basis to assess ELA standards taught. Students not meeting mastery level on the CQA and Learning Check assessments will be remediated in small group and given the opportunity to retake assessments following remediation.

Math:

Aimsweb - Gr. K -1 teachers administer Aimsweb Math screening 3 times per year. Students who score red/yellow on Aimsweb Math screening will be progress monitored..

STAR - Gr 2-5 teachers will administer STAR Math screening 3 times per year. Students who score red/yellow on STAR Reading screening will be progress monitored.

Technology:

21st Century Skills - Grade 5 teachers administer and analyze technology skills results at the end of each school year.

Mission, Vision, and Beliefs

Mission

The mission of New Washington Elementary School, a partnership of staff, parents, and community, is to prepare the whole child for success. This will be accomplished through educational experiences guided by data, high expectations, and the belief that every child can learn with a deep level of understanding.

Vision

“Every Student Succeeds”

Beliefs

At New Washington Elementary School we believe that each student can demonstrate value added success based on their own individual educational goals.

At New Washington Elementary School we believe that with a common direction, we can set clear instructional goals for ourselves and clear educational goals for our students.

At New Washington Elementary School we believe that we can teach so that our kids have a deep understanding of the subject matter – not just a broad understanding.

At New Washington Elementary School we believe that a strong connection to home will help enrich a child’s educational experience.

We believe that New Washington Elementary School will prove to be a professional learning community that demonstrates value added achievement for all of our students.

Leadership Team

Darcie Goodin, Principal

Amy Ellison

Sherry Cummings

Heather Urbano

Katelyn Jackson

David Alcorn

Paula Willinger

Three-year Goals 2016-19

Goal 1: English/Language Arts

Goal: By Spring 2019 \geq 85% of students in grades 3-5 will meet State Standard in ELA as measured by ISTEP+/ISTAR.

Goal: By Spring 2019 \geq 90% of students in grades 3 will meet State Standard in Reading as measured by IREAD3.

Benchmark

By Spring 2017, \geq 42.5% of students in the bottom 25% subgroup will show High Growth in ELA as measured by ISTEP+

By Spring 2017, \geq 36.2% of students in the top 75% subgroup will show High Growth in ELA as measured by ISTEP+Create 2017

Goal 2: Mathematics

Goal: By Spring 2019 \geq 80% of students in grades 3-5 will meet State Standard in Mathematics as measured by ISTEP+/ISTAR.

Benchmark

By Spring 2017 \geq 44.9% of students in the bottom 25% subgroup will show High Growth in Mathematics as measured by ISTEP+.

By Spring 2017 \geq 39.2% of students in the top 75% subgroup will show High Growth in mathematics as measured by ISTEP+.Create 2017

Goal 3: College and Career (PRIDE)

By Spring 2017, \geq 97% of New Washington Elementary students will have received no behavioral referrals for the 2016-17 school year.

By Spring 2017, \geq 97.2% of New Washington Elementary students (K-5) will attend school daily.

Data Summary and Action Plan

Data Wise Action Plan

School: New Washington Elementary

Grade Level/Subject Area: English Language Arts

Area of Focus: Literacy

Data

2016 ISTEP+ Performance (% of Students who Passed ELA ISTEP+): 76.3 %

2017 ISTEP+ Performance Goal (% of Students who Passed ELA ISTEP+): 80%

2016 STAR (% of Students at Grade Level on Reading): 84%

2017 STAR Goal (% of Students at Grade Level Reading): 90%

2016 ELA CQA Mastery: 76%

2017 ELA CQA Mastery Goal: 80%

What is the Learner-Centered Problem?

Students need to increase stamina in comprehension and word-solving strategies as they interact with and manipulate complex text.

What is the Problem of Practice?

As teachers, we have not taught reading and word solving strategies with fidelity and consistency across all k-5 grade levels and have not adequately taught students to interact with complex text independently.

What Instructional Strategy will be implemented to reach goal?

We will refine our literacy block instruction, including but not limited to, guided reading groups and project based learning units, as we target deficit skills such as word solving strategies and exposing students to complex texts.

<u>Task</u> (What specific tasks will you implement to reach goal?)	<u>When</u> (will you complete task?)	<u>Who</u> (will be responsible?)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We want children to acquire skills and strategies for figuring out words and understanding text 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> August – May 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We want children to write and talk about what they read 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> August – May 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will develop project based learning units to connect reading across the different disciplines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each teacher will implement at least one PBL unit per semester. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers/Coach
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will refine and strengthen our guided reading group instruction by developing grade specific lesson templates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> December 2016 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers/Literacy Coach/Principal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will fully implement the GCCS Literacy Framework. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> December 2016 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher/ Literacy Coach/ Principal

Data Summary and Action Plan

Data Wise Action Plan

School: New Washington Elementary

Grade Level/Subject Area: Mathematics

Area of Focus: Numeracy

Data

2016 ISTEP+ Performance (% of Students who Passed Math ISTEP+): 66%

2017 ISTEP+ Performance Goal (% of Students who Passed Math ISTEP+): 80%

2016 STAR (% of Students at Grade Level in Math): 88%

2017 STAR Goal (% of Students at Grade Level in Math): 90%

2016 Math CQA Mastery: 78%

2017 Math CQA Mastery Goal: 80%

What is the Learner-Centered Problem?

K-2 Numeracy needs to be taught conceptually versus procedurally.

3-5 Students struggle with stamina with multi-step problems – answer question, show your work, check their work, does my answer makes sense.

What is the Problem of Practice?

K-2 We teach standards too quickly without being sure students understand the concept.

3-5 Teachers need to teach and model problem solving skills and strategies.

What Instructional Strategy will be implemented to reach goal?

- Daily Problem Solving (Math Journal)
 - Implement Poster Method weekly
 - Teachers need to teach concept vs procedure.
-

Task (What specific tasks will you implement to reach goal?)

When (will you complete task?)

Who (will be responsible?)

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create higher level DOK questions. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August – Jun | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers/Coach/ Principal |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement Poster Method Weekly | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By October teachers will have implemented a weekly poster method | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers/ Coach/ Principal |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daily Problem Solving - Math Journal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By October teachers will have implemented a daily math journal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers/Coach/Principal |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources PD on problem solving | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement Balanced Math Program | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • July | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers/Coach/Principal |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PD concept vs procedure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September – December • September – | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers/Coach/Principal |

- Math Framework/
Stations/ Gradual
Release
 - PD student
relevance
- December
- September – June
 - September
- Teachers/Coach/Principal
 - Teachers/Coach/Principal
 - Teachers/Coach/Principal

Data Summary and Action Plan

Data Wise Action Plan

School: New Washington Elementary

Grade Level/Subject Area: PRIDE

Area of Focus: PRIDE Expectations

Data

2016 PRIDE Results (Behavior Referrals): 68

2017 PRIDE Goal (Behavior Referrals): 60

What is the Learner-Centered Problem?

Students need to develop self monitoring strategies to improve behavior in a non-classroom environment.

What is the Problem of Practice?

Staff feels we are inconsistent maintaining and monitoring PRIDE expectations in non-classroom environments.

What Instructional Strategy will be implemented to reach goal?

- Implement three cup strategy in cafeteria.

- Schoolwide incentive program – based on behavior matrices.

<u>Task</u> (What specific tasks will you implement to reach goal?)	<u>When</u> (will you complete task?)	<u>Who</u> (will be responsible?)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement 3 cup system in cafeteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cafeteria Staff
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revisit and continue to monitor behavior expectations in restroom, hallway, cafeteria, playground, and during morning arrival. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August – June 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers/AIC/Principal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role play “WWMD” What would a Mustang do. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September – June 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers/AIC/Principal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish a schoolwide incentive program to reward students for positive behaviors (Students and Staff) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • October - June 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers/PBIS Team

No statutes and/or rules
will be waived by

New Washington
Elementary School.

Fall
2016

Appendix

New Washington Elementary School

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Overview

In September 2010, committees were aligned to seven systems in order to engage in data collection. These systems committees included Assessment, Culture, Curriculum, Intervention, Pedagogy, Planning, and Professional Development. The committees were comprised of faculty, staff, and parents. Weekly meetings were held to answer the questions on our CNA matrix. ISTEP+, Acuity, and DIBELS scores were examined to determine how students were performing. ISTEP+ scores were disaggregated to determine if there were significant differences in performance based on subgroups. Key errors were analyzed for all areas of testing. Comparisons were made of students' report card grades in language arts and math with corresponding ISTEP+ scores. Student, parent, and staff surveys were used to solicit information concerning school climate, professional development, parent involvement, discipline, safety, and instructional practices.

The data collected revealed both strengths and weaknesses. On the 2010 ISTEP+ 76% of third grade students, 84% of fourth grade students, and 85% of fifth grade students created an overall passing total of 82%. There was an overall gain of 9.8%, the highest amount of growth recorded over the past seven years. Our weaknesses appear to be in application of ELA and Math skills, including answering open-ended response type questions and problem solving in math. We will continue to work on those areas to strengthen our students' skills.

Data revealed our attendance is 95.8%; the state average is 95.8%.

Data collected revealed that the majority of staff surveyed indicated that student disruptions did not regularly disrupt learning time for students. Overall, most students indicated that they felt safe at school. Most teachers felt that most of the school rules and procedures were being followed. In fact, discipline data shows that 99.09% of our students do follow our rules and procedures on a daily basis. 54 (15%) of our students were sent to the principal's office for basic behavioral issues, and 20 of those students were seen more than once. There were only 5 major infractions that resulted in student suspension.

Parent/family involvement in the school is measured by parent/family participation in school conferences, meetings and activities. A parent survey given in the fall of 2010 reflected that parents/guardians of N.W.E. are satisfied with their opportunities for involvement and their expectations are being met. In addition 91% of the parents feel welcomed at our school. All families of students in grades K – 5 are informed of state standards, student performance, grade level expectations,

class policies and procedures through various forms of communication including a Parent/Student Handbook, regular classroom and monthly school newsletters and our school website. Parents are included in reviewing and updating the PL #221 School Wide Plan; providing feedback to inform the development of the new programs, and to evaluate the schools' current program.

New Washington has established a 45 minute common planning time for K-5 teacher collaboration once a week and two 40-minute staff professional development meetings a week. Special faculty meetings are often scheduled to address management issues.

The staff used a clustering of data statements and a dotting process to select the most significant areas as a focus for inquiry. Inquiry groups were formed to study the significant areas of concern. The staff firmly believes that working to strengthen these areas of concern will positively impact student achievement.

New Washington Elementary is on Exemplary status. The Corporation is in District Improvement.

An updated comprehensive needs assessment of all students in the school, including subgroups, was used to review and revise the school-wide comprehensive plan to improve teaching and learning. The needs assessment includes data collection and analysis as well as integration with key teaching strategies. The plan was developed in consultation with Director for Curriculum and Instruction, Supervisor for Assessment, Supervisor for School Instruction, Informational Services Coordinator, Director of Special Education and Bi-lingual Education. Parents, community members, teachers, and administrators will participate in reviewing and updating the plan through PL221 school-wide planning committee meetings.

During the re-planning year for PL221 (2010-2011), workshops, collaboration at team, grade level and cross grade level meetings, all staff provided input to the development of the plan. Parents are contacted to participate in the planning and annual updating process. The New Washington PL221 School Improvement Plan is shared on the school's website for access by parents and community members. Parents, community members, teachers, and administrators will participate in reviewing and updating the plan through PL221 school-wide planning meetings. The plan will be evaluated annually to determine whether the key strategies of the school-wide program have increased the achievement of students, particularly the students who are the lowest achievers of academic standards on ISTEP+. Evaluation results are used to make necessary revisions to the plan.

The District provides support to the school in revising the plan and responding to the feedback from the outside review process. Both the District and outside review process/ revisions ensures the NCLB statutory components are included and all components are identified. Documentation of meetings, such as sign-in sheets, agendas, notes on the plan, scoring/ feedback rubrics, etc., are kept as evidence in preparation for an IDOE monitoring visit.

Assessment

Assessment Q1. How many/what % of students meet state standards? Have mastered which skills?

Answers:

In 2009, most of the third grade students mastered ELA Standards 1, 2, & 3, but had difficulties with standards 4, 5, & 6.

In 2010, most of the third grade students mastered all ELA Standards.

In 2009, most of the third grade students performed at mastery in Standards 1, 4, 5, & 6.

In 2010, most of the third grade students mastered all Math Standards.

In 2009, most of the fourth grade students mastered all ELA Standards except Language Conventions.

In 2010, most of the fourth grade students showed mastery in all ELA Standards.

In 2009, fourth grade students performed slightly above mastery in all Math Standards.

In 2010, fourth grade students performed well above mastery in all Math Standards.

Applied Skills data shows that in 2010, students performed only slightly above mastery in ELA and Math applications.

Data Statements:

From the Spring 2009 Academic Standards Summary Report for 62 third grade students the following data is reported:

- 44/62 (71%) of the third grade students mastered ELA Academic Standard 1-Vocabulary.
- 46/62 (74%) of the third grade students mastered ELA Academic Standard 2- Nonfiction/Informational Text.
- 45/62 (73%) of the third grade students mastered ELA Academic Standard 3-Literary Text.
- 43/62 (69%) of the third grade students mastered ELA Academic Standard 4- Writing Process.
- 40/62 (65%) of the third grade students mastered ELA Academic Standard 5-Writing Applications.
- 41/62 (66%) of the third grade students mastered ELA Academic Standard 6 Language Conventions.

From the Spring 2009 Academic Standards Summary Report for 62 third grade students the following data is reported:

- 46/62 (74%) of the third grade students mastered Math Academic Standard 1- Number Sense.
- 42/62 (68%) of the third grade students mastered Math Academic Standard 2- Computation.
- 41/62 (66%) of the third grade students mastered Math Academic Standard 3- Algebra and Functions.
- 45/62 (73%) of the third grade students mastered Math Academic Standard 4- Geometry.
- 45/62 (73%) of the third grade students mastered Math Academic Standard 5-Measurement.
- 44/62 (71%) of the third grade students mastered Math Academic *Standard 6- Problem Solving.*

From the Spring 2009 Academic Standards Summary Report for 65 fourth grade students the following data is reported:

- 48/65 (71%) of the fourth grade students mastered ELA Academic Standard 1-Vocabulary.
- 48/65 (73%) of the fourth grade students mastered ELA Academic Standard 2- Nonfiction/Informational Text.
- 51/65 (75%) of the fourth grade students mastered ELA Academic Standard 3-Literary Text.
- 48/65 (71%) of the fourth grade students mastered ELA Academic Standard 4- Writing Process.
- 46/65 (71%) of the fourth grade students mastered ELA Academic Standard 5-Writing Applications.
- 44/65 (68%) of the fourth grade students mastered ELA Academic Standard 6-Language Conventions

From the Spring 2009 Academic Standards Summary Report for 66 fourth grade students the following data is reported:

- 41/66 (60%) of the fourth grade students mastered Math Academic Standard 1- Number Sense.
- 45/66 (66%) of the fourth grade students mastered Math Academic Standard 2- Computation.
- 42/66 (62%) of the fourth grade students mastered Math Academic Standard 3- Algebra and Functions.
- 41/66 (62%) of the fourth grade students mastered Math Academic Standard 4- Geometry.
- 40/66 (61%) of the fourth grade students mastered Math Academic Standard 5-Measurement.
- 43/66 (63%) of the fourth grade students mastered Math Academic Standard 6- *Data Analysis and Probability*.
- 42/66 (64%) of the fourth grade students mastered Math Academic Standard 7- Problem Solving.

From the Spring 2010 Academic Standards Summary Report for 68 third grade students the following data is reported:

- 52/69 (75%) of the third grade students mastered ELA Academic Standard 1-Vocabulary.
- 54/68 (78%) of the third grade students mastered ELA Academic Standard 2- Nonfiction/Informational Text.
- 54/68 (78%) of the third grade students mastered ELA Academic Standard 3-Literary Text.
- 54/68 (78%) of the third grade students mastered ELA Academic Standard 4- Writing Process.
- 51/68 (75%) of the third grade students mastered ELA Academic Standard 5-Writing Applications.
- 52/68 (76%) of the third grade students mastered ELA Academic Standard 6 Language Conventions.

From the Spring 2010 Academic Standards Summary Report for 69 third grade students the following

data is reported:

- 53/69 (77%) of the third grade students mastered Math Academic Standard 1- Number Sense.
- 54/69 (78%) of the third grade students mastered Math Academic Standard 2- Computation.
- 53/69 (77%) of the third grade students mastered Math Academic Standard 3- Algebra and Functions.
- 51/69 (74%) of the third grade students mastered Math Academic Standard 4- Geometry.
- 53/69 (77%) of the third grade students mastered Math Academic Standard 5-Measurement.
- 54/69 (78%) of the third grade students mastered Math Academic *Standard 6- Problem Solving*.

From the Spring 2010 Academic Standards Summary Report for 59 fourth grade students the following data is reported:

- 53/59 (90%) of the fourth grade students mastered ELA Academic Standard 1-Vocabulary.
- 51/59 (86%) of the fourth grade students mastered ELA Academic Standard 2- Nonfiction/Informational Text.
- 50/59 (85%) of the fourth grade students mastered ELA Academic Standard 3-Literary Text.
- 53/59 (90%) of the fourth grade students mastered ELA Academic Standard 4- Writing Process.
- 52/59 (88%) of the fourth grade students mastered ELA Academic Standard 5-Writing Applications.
- 54/59 (92%) of the fourth grade students mastered ELA Academic Standard 6-Language Conventions

From the Spring 2010 Academic Standards Summary Report for 59 fourth grade students the following data is reported:

- 48/59 (81%) of the fourth grade students mastered Math Academic Standard 1- Number Sense.
- 49/59 (83%) of the fourth grade students mastered Math Academic Standard 2- Computation.
- 46/59 (78%) of the fourth grade students mastered Math Academic Standard 3- Algebra and Functions.
- 48/59 (81%) of the fourth grade students mastered Math Academic Standard 4- Geometry.
- 48/59 (81%) of the fourth grade students mastered Math Academic Standard 5-Measurement.
- 48/59 (81%) of the fourth grade students mastered Math Academic Standard 6- *Data Analysis and Probability*.
- 49/59 (83%) of the fourth grade students mastered Math Academic Standard 7- Problem Solving.

From the Spring 2010 Applied Skills Frequency Distribution Report for students in grades three, four, and five, the following data is reported:

- Less than 50% of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students scored at least two points on Applied Skills Problem Solving.
- Less than 50% of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students scored at least four points on Applied Skills Writing Applications.

- Less than 60% of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students scored at least four points on Applied Skills Language Conventions.
- Less than 40% of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students scored at least two points on ELA Applied Skills Constructed Response items.

Assessment Q2. Are some groups not performing as well as others?

Answers:

Most third grade students that received lunch assistance passed the Spring 2009 ELA ISTEP.

Half of the third grade students that received lunch assistance passed the Spring 2009 Math ISTEP+.

Half of the fourth grade students that received lunch assistance passed the Spring 2009 ELA ISTEP+.

Half of the fourth grade students receiving lunch assistance passed the Spring 2009 Math ISTEP+.

More than half of the third grade special needs students passed the Spring 2009 ELA ISTEP+.

Most of the third grade special needs students passed the Spring 2009 Math ISTEP+.

Half of the fourth grade special needs students passed the Spring 2009 ELA ISTEP+.

Less than half of the fourth grade special needs students passed the Spring 2009 Math ISTEP+.

Most of the third grade students receiving lunch assistance passed the Spring 2010 ELA ISTEP+.

Most of the third grade students receiving lunch assistance passed the Spring 2010 Math ISTEP+.

Most of the fourth grade students receiving lunch assistance passed the Spring 2010 ELA ISTEP+.

Most of the fourth grade students receiving lunch assistance passed the Spring 2010 Math ISTEP+.

Half of the third grade special need students passed the Spring 2010 ELA ISTEP+.

More than half of the third grade special needs students passed the Spring 2010 Math ISTEP+.

Data Statements:

Spring 2009

From the Spring 2009 ISTEP+ Disaggregation Summary Report for third grade, the following data was reported:

- 14/26 (54%) of third grade students receiving lunch assistance passed the ELA ISTEP+
- 13/26 (50%) of third grade students receiving lunch assistance passed the Math ISTEP+.

From the Spring 2009 ISTEP+ Disaggregation Summary Report for third grade, the following data was reported:

- 15/30 (50%) of fourth grade students receiving lunch assistance passed the ELA ISTEP+.
- 15/30 (50%) of fourth grade students receiving lunch assistance passed the Math ISTEP+.

From the Spring 2009 ISTEP+ Disaggregation Summary Report for third grade, the following data was reported:

- 8/15 (53%) of third grade special needs students passed the Spring 2009 ELA ISTEP+.
- 10/15 (67%) of third grade special needs students passed the Spring 2009 Math ISTEP+.

From the Spring 2009 ISTEP+ Disaggregation Summary Report for fourth grade, the following data was reported:

- 7/14 (50%) of the fourth grade special needs students passed the Spring 2009 ELA ISTEP+.
- 6/14 (43%) of the fourth grade special needs students passed the Spring 2009 Math ISTEP+.

Spring 2010

From the Spring 2010 ISTEP+ Disaggregation Summary Report for third grade, the following data was reported:

- 26/32 (81%) of third grade students receiving lunch assistance passed the Spring 2010 ELA ISTEP+.
- 26/32 (81%) of the third grade students receiving lunch assistance passed the Spring 2010 Math ISTEP+.

From the Spring 2010 ISTEP+ Disaggregation Summary Report for fourth grade, the following data was reported

- 15/20 (75%) of the fourth grade students receiving lunch assistance passed the Spring 2010 ELA ISTEP+.
- 14/20 (70%) of the fourth grade students receiving lunch assistance passed the Spring 2010 Math ISTEP+.

- 8/16 (50%) of the third grade special needs students passed the Spring 2010 ELA ISTEP+.
- 9/16 (56%) of third grade special needs students passed the Spring 2010 Math ISTEP+.

Assessment Q3. What are the critical errors made by students below mastery?

Answers:

Key errors for students on applied ISTEP were 1. Not understanding question asked, 2. Could not locate answer, 3. Did not support answer with details, 4. Did not show work, 5. Did not understand vocabulary, 6. Could not interpret information from a graph, 7. Did not restate the question.

Data Statements:

Most third grade students who were below mastery on the Fall 2010 Acuity ELA Constructed Response Assessment made the following critical errors:

- Did not understand the question being asked
- Could not locate the answer in the text
- Did not answer the question

Most third grade students who were below mastery on the Fall 2010 Acuity Math Constructed Response Assessment made the following critical errors:

- Did not understand the skill needed to solve the problem
- Could not interpret information from a graph

Most fourth grade students who were below mastery on the Fall 2010 Acuity ELA Constructed Response Assessment made the following critical errors:

- Did not restate the question
- Did not support their statements with details

Most fourth grade students who were below mastery on the Fall 2010 Acuity Math Constructed Response Assessment made the following critical errors:

- Did not understand the math vocabulary
- Did not show their work

Assessment Q4. Are students showing adequate yearly progress; are #s of students not-passing decreasing/fewer?

Answer:

Most students are showing adequately yearly progress and the number of students not-passing is decreasing.

Data Statement:

From the Spring 2009 ELA and Math ISTEP+ Disaggregation Summary Report for third grade, the following data was reported:

- 44/62 (71%) of the third grade students passed the Spring 2009 ELA ISTEP+.
- 44/62 (71%) of the third grade students passed the Spring 2009 Math ISTEP+.

From the Spring 2010 ELA and Math ISTEP+ Disaggregation Summary Report for third grade, the following data was reported:

- 52/69 (75%) of the third grade students passed the Spring 2010 ELA ISTEP+.
- 53/69 (77%) of the third grade students passed the Spring 2010 Math ISTEP+.

From the Spring 2009 ELA and Math ISTEP+ Disaggregation Summary Report for fourth grade, the following data was reported:

- 46/68 (68%) of the fourth grade students passed the Spring 2009 ELA ISTEP+.
- 43/68 (63%) of the fourth grade students passed the Spring 2009 Math ISTEP+.

From the Spring 2010 ELA and Math ISTEP+ Disaggregation Summary Report for fourth grade, the following data was reported:

- 51/59 (86%) of the fourth grade students passed the Spring 2010 ELA ISTEP+.
- 48/59 (81%) of the fourth grade students passed the Spring 2010 Math ISTEP+.

Assessment Q5. How well are students meeting standards in non-ISTEP+ grades? Errors?

Answer:

Most kindergarten students met their targeted TRC goals in the spring of 2010.

Less than half of the first grade students met their targeted TRC goals in the spring of 2010.

Most second grade students met their targeted TRC goals in the spring of 2010.

More than half of the kindergarten students met their targeted mClass math goals in the spring of 2010.

Less than half of the first grade students met their targeted mClass math goals in the spring of 2010.

Most of the second grade students met their targeted mClass math goals in the spring of 2010.

Data Statements:

Spring 2010

From the Spring 2010 mClass Reading Class Summary Report for 58 kindergarten students, the following data was reported:

- 51/58 (88%) of kindergarten students met their targeted TRC goals.

From the Spring 2010 mClass Reading Class Summary Report for 60 first grade students, the following data was reported:

- 22/60 (37%) of first grade students met their targeted TRC goals.

From the Spring 2010 mClass Reading Class Summary Report for 56 second grade students, the following data was reported:

- 40/56 (71%) of second grade students met their targeted TRC goals.

From the Spring 2010 mClass Math Class Report for 58 kindergarten students, the following data was reported:

- 34/58 (59%) of kindergarten students met their targeted mClass math goals.

From the Spring 2010 mClass Math Class Report for 44 first grade students, the following data was reported:

- 20/44 (46%) of first grade students met their targeted mClass math goals.

From the Spring 2010 mClass Math Class Report for 54 second grade students, the following data was reported:

35/54 (65%) of second grade students met their targeted mClass math goals.

Assessment Q6. How many students read at/above gr. level? W/ comprehension?

Answer:

Most kindergarten students met their targeted TRC goals in the spring of 2010.

Less than half of the first grade students met their targeted TRC goals in the spring of 2010.

Most second grade students met their targeted TRC goals in the spring of 2010.

According to the Spring Scholastic Reading Inventory Report, most of the second grade students met their targeted lexile range.

According to the Spring Scholastic Reading Inventory Report, less than half of the third grade students met their targeted lexile range.

According to the Spring 2010 Scholastic Reading Inventory Report, more than half of the fourth grade students met their targeted lexile range.

Data Statement:

From the Spring 2010 mClass Reading Class Summary Report for 58 kindergarten students, the following data was reported:

- 51/58 (88%) of kindergarten students met their targeted TRC goals.

From the Spring 2010 mClass Reading Class Summary Report for 60 first grade students, the following data was reported:

- 22/60 (37%) of first grade students met their targeted TRC goals.

From the Spring 2010 mClass Reading Class Summary Report for 56 second grade students, the following

data was reported:

- 40/56 (71%) of second grade students met their targeted TRC goals.

From the Spring 2010 Scholastic Reading Inventory Report for 54 second grade students, the following data was reported:

- 33/54 (61%) of second grade students met their targeted Lexile range.

From the spring 2011 Scholastic Reading Inventory Report for 48 second grade students, the following data was reported:

- 25/48 (52%) of second grade students met their targeted Lexile range.

From the Spring 2010 Scholastic Reading Inventory Report for 71 third grade students, the following data was reported:

- 31/71 (44%) of third grade students met their targeted Lexile range.

From the Spring 2011 Scholastic Reading Inventory Report for 50 third grade students, the following data was reported:

- 35/50 (70%) of third grade students met their targeted Lexile range.

From the Spring 2010 Scholastic Reading Inventory Report for 62 fourth grade students, the following data was reported:

- 43/62 (69%) of fourth grade students met their targeted Lexile range.

From the Spring 2010 Scholastic Reading Inventory Report for 78 fourth grade students, the following data was reported:

- 51/78 (65%) of fourth grade students met their targeted Lexile range.

Assessment Q7. Do students w/ As, Bs, & Cs on report cards pass ISTEP+ (elem)?

Answer:

Most third grade students with As, Bs, and Cs on their report cards passed Spring 2010 ELA ISTEP+ and Spring 2010 Math ISTEP+.

Most fourth grade students with As, Bs, and Cs on their report cards passed Spring 2010 ELA ISTEP+ and Spring 2010 Math ISTEP+.

Data Statements:

From the Spring 2010 Third Grade ISTEP+ Proficiency Roster and the 2010 STI Third Grade Final Grade Summary Report, the following data was reported:

- 50/52 (96%) of third grade students who passed the Spring 2010 ELA ISTEP+ made As, Bs, and Cs on their report cards.
- 52/53 (98%) of third grade students who passed the Spring 2010 Math ISTEP+ made As, Bs, and Cs on their report cards.

From the Spring 2010 Fourth Grade ISTEP+ Proficiency Roster and the 2010 STI Fourth Grade Final Grade Summary Report, the following data was reported:

- 48/51 (94%) of fourth grade students who passed the Spring 2010 ELA ISTEP+ made As, Bs, and Cs on their report cards.
- 46/48 (96%) of fourth grade students who passed the Spring 2010 Math ISTEP+ made As, Bs, and Cs on their report cards.

Assessment Q9. How well prepared do kindergarten students come to school?

Answer:

According to the Brigance Test, just over half of our kindergarten students came academically prepared for the 2010-2011 school year.

Data Statements:

- 33/48 (68%) of kindergarten students scored $\geq 75\%$ on the Brigance test in the spring of 2010.
- 27/50 (54%) of kindergarten students scored at the overall proficient level on the BOY DIBELS formative assessment.

Culture

Culture Q1. Are culturally appropriate strategies utilized in classrooms (racial, ethnic, language-minority, cultural, exceptional learning, and socioeconomic groups)?

Answer:

Teachers at NWES reported that a variety of culturally appropriate strategies are used in their classrooms to differentiate instruction based on the needs of diverse groups within those classrooms. Among the strategies were the use of culturally diverse texts, culture studies, adaptations based on the recommendations found on IEPs, cooperative groups and peer tutoring, varying techniques to address diverse learning styles, and inviting guest speakers who represent cultures other than those represented in our community.

Data Statements:

- 14/14 teachers reported using culturally diverse text.
- 14/14 teachers reported making adaptations based on recommendations in student IEPs.
- 4/14 teachers reported inviting guest speakers into their classrooms.

Culture Q2. Is the number of student disruptions kept to a minimum so that learning time for students is maximized?

Answer:

The results of our teacher survey show a wide range of student disruptions from 38 to 0. The average number of non-behavioral disruptions (phone calls, end of day deliveries, resource teachers, peer facilitators, tornado drill) was 8.8 weekly. The average number of behavioral disruptions was 9.1 weekly.

Data Statements:

- 1/14 teachers reported 38 student disruptions per week.
- 1/14 teachers reported 0 student disruptions per week.
- 12/14 teachers reported an average of 6 disruptions per week.

Culture Q3. Do we have a safe learning environment?

Answer:

We have a safe learning environment. On a corporation survey of safety in our school, parents, certified staff, and classified staff rated our schools safety at an average level of 4.37 out of 5.

Data Statements:

- On an average scale, 4.74/5.0 of certified staff members reported feeling safe at school.
- On an average scale, 4.08/5.0 of parents reported that their student(s) feel safe while at school.
- On an average scale, 4.31/5.0 of classified staff members reported feeling safe at school.

Culture Q4. How well are our rules or procedures for behavior followed?

Answer:

99.09% of our students follow our rules or procedures. There were 5 major infractions that resulted in suspension; 2 of which were for battery, 1 for intimidation, 1 for verbal aggression or profanity, and 1 categorized as other. There were no infractions resulting in expulsion. 15% (54) of our students were sent to the principal last year for behavioral issues. 20 of those students were seen more than once.

Data Statements:

- 99.09% of students follow rules or procedures.
- In 2009-2010, 2 infractions were reported as battery.
- In 2009-2010, 1 infraction was reported as intimidation.
- In 2009-2010, 1 infraction was reported as verbal aggression.

Culture Q5. How do we inform families about state standards, student performance, grade level expectations, class policies & procedures?

Answer:

We use a wide variety of methods to communicate with families about state standards, student performance, grade level expectations, class policies & procedures. Our school sends home a monthly newsletter, mid-term progress reports, and report cards are sent home quarterly.

Data Statements:

- 7/14 classroom teachers reported using a website.
- 7/14 classroom teachers reported using weekly newsletters

- 8/14 classroom teachers reported using student planners on a daily basis.

Culture Q6. What level of attendance do we have at parent conf. Open house, other?

Answer:

We have a moderately high level of attendance at parent conferences and other family events.

Data Statements:

- 461 grandparents attended Grandparent's Day for 368 students.
- 28/50 kindergarteners and 42 of their parents attended Camp Kindergarten registration.
- 238 conferences were held for 368 students.

Culture Q7. What business partnerships do we have? With what outcomes? Role in decision-making?

Answer:

We have business partnerships with several businesses. Most of our partnerships are for funding through our school and our PTO, but we also have business partnerships for learning opportunities with our school as well as health support.

Data Statements:

- We have over 120 business partners that support our school financially through both monetary donations and prize/gift donations.
- Clark Memorial Hospital has partnered with us to encourage healthy activity with our students.
- New Washington State Bank has partnered with our school in developing a student mentor program for educational support and provided financial assistance to purchase technology for the classrooms.

Curriculum

Curriculum Q1. Is curriculum aligned with state standards? Instruction? Are curriculum maps

completed, reviewed and updated regularly?

Answer:

All teachers at NWES in 2010 align their curriculum and instruction to state standards.

Data Statement:

- According to teacher survey based on GCW usage, teachers scored 4.7 out of 5 possible points on being standards aligned
- Goal Clarity Windows are developed on Rubicon Atlas (minimum of every 2 weeks)
- Rubicon Atlas (mapping) is used to develop Goal Clarity Windows
- Goal Clarity Windows are given to the principal for monitoring

Curriculum Q2. Is staff fully implementing key programs trained in?

Answer:

Most teachers at NWES in 2010 have implemented key programs.

Data Statements:

- Of the teachers (K-4) responding to a curriculum survey, 100% have implemented Balanced Math in their classrooms
- Of the teachers (K-4) responding to a curriculum survey, 100% have implemented the scheduled Literacy Block for an average of 91 minutes an average of 4.8 days per week (Fifth grade rotations)
- Of the fifth grade teachers who teach math 100% have implemented Balanced Math in their classroom
- Of the fifth grade teachers who teach Language Arts/Reading, 100% have implemented the scheduled Literacy Block 80 minutes per day, 5 days per week

Curriculum Q3. How are Goal Clarity Windows being used?

Answer:

Goal Clarity Windows are being used by teachers (collaboratively) at NWES in 2010 to plan standards based lessons. Goal Clarity Windows are developed on Rubicon Atlas and monitored by the principal.

Data Statement:

- 100 % of teachers are using GCW to plan curriculum and instruction
- 100% of teachers post GCW using Rubicon Atlas

Curriculum Q4. Are rubrics and exemplars being developed and used by teachers AND Students: Are state rubrics posted and used by students?

Answer:

Teachers are beginning to develop and utilize rubrics and exemplars in all grade levels throughout the school year.

Data Statements:

Math

Teacher Rubrics

- The one of one (100%) fifth grade math teacher reported that she uses a rubric to score math word problems monthly.
- With five of five (100%) responding, five of five (100%) 3rd – 4th grade teachers who teach math use rubrics to grade math word problems.
- One (33%) use a rubric once a month
- Two (33%) use a rubric once a quarter
- One (17%) uses a rubric biweekly
- One (17%) did not indicate frequency.
- With four of seven (57%) responding, one of four (25%) primary teachers reported that they use rubrics to grade math word problems.
- One reported using rubrics to assess math word problems “occasionally”

Student Self Assessment Rubrics

- The one of one (100%) fifth grade math teacher reported that her students self assess with a rubric to score math word problems. That teacher uses a rubric to self-assess math once per month.
- With five of five responding, one of five (20%) 3rd and 4th grade teachers use rubrics with

students to self assess math word problems. One (20 %) uses a rubric to self-assess math “every other lesson”.

- With four of seven (57%) responding, one of four (25%) primary teachers reported having students use rubrics to self assess math word problems. One (25%) uses a rubric to self-assess math “occasionally”

Writing

Teacher Rubrics

- With two of two (100%) responding, two of two (100%) fifth grade teachers who teach reported using rubrics to score papers.
- One (50%) reported using a rubric to score writing “with each genre”.
- One (50%) reported using a rubric to score writing 1 – 2 times per week.
- With five of five (100%) responding, five of five (100%) 3rd and 4th grade teachers use rubrics to grade writing prompts.
- One (20%) reported using rubrics “at least once a week”
- One (20%) reported using rubrics “biweekly”
- Two (40%) reported using rubrics one per quarter
- With four of seven (57%) responding, four of four (100%) primary teachers reported that they use rubrics to grade math writing prompts.
- Two (50%) reported that they just used one for the first time the week of this survey.
- One (25%) reported that they use rubrics “occasionally”
- One (25%) reported they s/he uses rubrics once per week.

Student Self Assessment Rubrics

- With two of two responding, two of two (100%) fifth grade teachers report using rubrics with their students to self-assess writing.
- One (50%) reported using student rubric self-assessment with each genre.
- One (50%) reported using student rubric self-assessment once or twice a week.

- With five of five (100%) responding, two of five (40%) 3rd and 4th grade teachers who teach writing use rubrics with their students to self-assess writing.
- Two (100%) who use rubrics for student self-assessment reported using it once per week.

- With four of seven (57%) reporting, three of four (75%) primary teachers reported using rubrics with students to self-assess writing.
- One (25%) who use rubrics for student self-assessment reported using it once per week.
- One (25%) who use reported that the rubric was always on her wall to which students can refer.

- One (25%) reported using a self-assessment rubric for writing occasionally.

Curriculum Q5. Are students provided technology classes? How often? How assessed?

Answer:

All students at NWES in 2010 in grades 2-5 are provided technology classes. All students K-1 use technology within the classroom.

Data Statement:

- 100% of students have access to technology
- Grades 2-5 receive standards based technology instruction during special area rotations
- Grades 2-5 are assigned to writing lab one 45 minute block per week
- Grades K-2 utilize RAZ reading
- Grades K-5 utilize Reading Counts
- Compass Learning Odyssey is available for use by all grades
- Kindergarten utilizes starfall.com
- Promethean boards are used in all 5th grade classrooms with plans to install boards in all other classrooms.
- Grades 4 & 5 will receive grades from assessments on Rubicon Atlas

Curriculum Q6. How many/what percent of students are enrolled in Advanced Placement and or Honor courses? Served by the corporation's highly Able program?

Answer:

A small percentage of students at NWES in 2010 are enrolled in the Highly Able program.

Data Statement:

- 4 students (1%) of 342 (total enrollment) are enrolled in the Highly Able program
- Based on testing and GCCS guidelines

Intervention

Intervention Q1. Are extended time interventions (i.e., tutoring, summer school, supplemental

classes) increasing student learning?

Answer:

Most students in 2009 – 2010 who received extended time interventions increased student learning.

Data statements:

- 19% of students received extended time intervention
- 100% of kindergarteners who participated in intervention the first semester increased learning as measured by DIBELS LNF.
- 100% of kindergarteners who participated in intervention the second semester increased learning as measured by DIBELS LNF.
- 89% of first graders who received intervention during the first semester increased student learning as measured by DIBELS.
- 89% of first graders who received intervention during the first semester increased student learning as measured by DIBELS.
- 91% of first graders who received intervention during the first semester increased student learning as measured by DIBELS.
- 92% of 2nd graders who received intervention during the 2009-2010 school year increased student learning as measured by DIBELS.
- 58% of kids who received intervention passed ELA on ISTEP
- 54% of kids who received intervention passed Math on ISTEP
- 100% of kids who participated in after school reading academy improved their TRC and ORF DIBELS scores.
- 40% of kids who participated in the reading mentor passed the ELA portion of the ISTEP.

Intervention Q2. What data is used to identify students, programs and personnel for our intervention program?

Answer:

During the 2009-210 school year, students were identified to participate in intervention programs.

Data Statements:

For Title one intervention, Children were identified using the following measures:

- K – Dibels LNF
- 1st – DIBELS NWF and TRC
- 2nd – DIBELS ORF and TRC
- 3rd – End of year TRC, SRI, and ACUITY
- 4th – ISTEP intervention

For Classroom intervention, children were identified using the following measures based on 10 classroom teacher surveys:

- 10 used observation
- 4 used DIBELS
- 1 used Acuity
- 1 used SRI
- 6 used Pre/post test
- 1 used Benchmarks
- 1 used running records
- 10 used Goal clarity window assessment
- 1 used skills checklist.

For special education intervention, children were identified using the following measures:

- Formal assessment with school psychologist

Intervention Q3. How often is student data reviewed for intervention groups?

Answer:

Student data is reviewed for intervention groups on a regular basis throughout the school year. Grade-level teachers meet at least bi-weekly with intervention teachers to discuss real-time data.

Data Statements:

- During the 2009-2010 school year, progress monitoring was done at the end of each semester (May and January). During this time, title 1 teachers used Rigby, running records, and DIBELS.
- During the 2010 – 2011 school year, progress monitoring is done every two weeks using Goal Clarity Window assessments and DIBELS.
- For children in the special education program, progress monitoring is done bi-weekly through charting, DIBELS (K-2)and direct observation.

Intervention Q4. How is intervention data communicated with the regular classroom teacher?

Answer:

Intervention data is communicated with general education teachers at least bi-weekly.

Data Statements:

- Grade level collaboration during planning or period zero meetings
- Bi-weekly intervention meetings with interventionist
- DIBELS online when progress monitoring is completed
- Progress reports every 9 weeks

Intervention Q5. What methods are used to evaluate and track the effectiveness of intervention initiatives?

Answer:

During the 2009 – 2010 school year, 348 of 353 were promoted with their cohort groups.

Various methods are used to evaluate and track effectiveness of intervention initiatives. Ongoing assessments help allow teachers to monitor student growth and needs Intervention data is share with classroom teachers and parents.

Data Statement:

During the 2009 – 2010 school year, 348 of 353 were promoted with their cohort groups.

- 5 children were retained as recommended by the classroom teacher:
- 2 2nd graders
- 2 1st graders
- 1 kindergarten

Various methods are used to evaluate and track effectiveness of intervention initiatives.

With reading interventions, the 3rd to 4th grade cohort group increased the passing rate on the English/Language Arts ISTEP by 15% from grade three to grade four.

- 29% (18/62) of all students in grade 3 did not pass the English/Language Arts portion of the spring 2009 ISTEP.
- 14% (8/59) of all students in grade 4 did not pass the English/Language Arts portion of the spring 2010 ISTEP.

With Balanced Math interventions, this cohort group increased the passing rate on the Math ISTEP by 10% from grade three to grade four.

- 29% (18/62) of all students in grade 3 did not pass the Math portion of the spring 2009 ISTEP.
- 19% (11/59) of all students in grade 4 did not pass the Math portion of the spring 2010 ISTEP.

With reading interventions, the 4th to 5th grade cohort group increased the passing rate on the English/Language Arts ISTEP by 11% from grade three to grade four.

- 28% (19/68) of all students in grade 4 did not pass the English/Language Arts portion of the spring 2009 ISTEP.
- 17% (11/66) of all students in grade 5 did not pass the English/Language Arts portion of the spring 2010 ISTEP.

With Balanced Math interventions, this cohort group increased the passing rate on the Math ISTEP by 20% from grade three to grade four.

- 34% (23/68) of all students in grade 4 did not pass the Math portion of the spring 2009 ISTEP.
- 14% (9/66) of all students in grade 5 did not pass the Math portion of the spring 2010 ISTEP.

Intervention data is communicated with parents and guardians.

- Progress reports are given by special education teachers and speech-language pathologist every nine weeks. Goals are changed annually.
- Teachers reported that email is utilized as well as informal face to face communication

Of 10 staff surveys returned, multiple means of communication are used to communicate intervention data with parents:

- 5 teachers use midterm reporting
- 6 report at least every 9 weeks
- 5 will make parent phone calls when needed
- 4 send notes home
- 7 communicate information at parent conferences

When intervention is not successful teachers will modify their instructional strategies.

- Modify classroom materials—10 out of 10 teachers surveyed modify classroom materials
- Pulls out intervention—3 out of 10 teachers surveyed use pull out intervention
- Intervention in the classroom with a smaller group—6 out of 10 teachers surveyed provide intervention in the classroom with a small group.
- Special education referral—4 students have been referred with 2/4 qualifying.
- Students will receive literacy and math instruction with students at similar levels (ie going back a grade for core instruction)

Intervention data is used in a variety of ways within the grade level.

- 5th grade uses classroom data to flexible group students.
- 1 out of 3 4th grade classrooms has 2 certified teachers to instruct students at risk for not passing ISTEP as determined by Spring 2010 ISTEP scores.
- 1st grade uses progress monitoring of goal clarity windows to form intervention groups.

One small group of students that did not pass are with one teacher while the other two teachers take larger groups for enrichment activities.

- 2nd grade classroom teachers are using intervention data to make appropriate stations for literacy block and to pull children for in classroom intervention.
- 3rd grade is using intervention data to form reading groups within the classroom.
- 13/14 teachers are using intervention data to form leveled groups within the classroom

Pedagogy

Pedagogy Q1. Is consistent language & strategies used across grades & classes within grades?

Answer:

Yes, use of proper content terms is consistent with some kid-friendly terms for primary students. Proper terms are derived from state standards and curriculum maps.

Data Statements:

- 100% use proper content terminology
- 50% use proper and kid-friendly terminology (primary teachers vs. intermediate teachers.)

Pedagogy Q2. How much time is spent in teach, guided practice, independent practice?

Answer:

The surveyed average time spent in Teach: 30%, Guided Practice: 42%, and Independent Practice: 20%.

Data Statements:

- Teach: Average: 1 hour 10 minutes per day.
 - 60% at least 60 minutes per day.
 - 40% less than 60 minutes per day.
- Guided Practice: Average: 1 hour 40 minutes per day.
- Independent Practice: Average: 45 minutes per day.

Pedagogy Q3. What methodologies are used consistently in our building?

Answer:

Poster Method for problem solving, rubrics for student self-assessment, graphic organizers, differentiation, hands-on modeling. DOL, RAZ, Compass. It was noted that all teachers have the common belief that all students can learn!

Data Statements:

- 70% have implemented Literacy Framework.
- 100% have implemented Balanced Math Framework.

Pedagogy Q4. Do we have guidelines for homework that are consistent in each classroom? How do we ensure guidelines are adhered to?

Answer:

Each teacher has a schedule for homework and has a plan for checking and/or grading it.

Data Statements:

- 100% have guidelines for homework.
- 95% either check or grade that it was adhered to.

Pedagogy Q5. What strategies are used to ensure student engagement?

Answer:

Accountability, proximity, seating arrangements, active participation, behavior systems, group/partner work, principal walk-throughs.

Data Statement:

- 100% of participating teachers reported using various strategies to engage students.

Planning

Planning Q1. Do students have enough time to learn?

Answer:

All teachers feel they have enough time to teach reading. Around 85-90% have enough time to teach math and writing. Most teachers feel students do not get enough time in science and social studies.

Data Statement:

13 out of 17 classroom teachers completed the survey.

- Math 85%
- Grammar 75%
- Writing 89%
- Social Studies 37%
- Science 39%
- Reading 100%
- Spelling 75%

Planning Q2. Does the school schedule enhance or hinder learning? Time on task?

Answer:

Staff did not agree on scheduling. The lower grades felt more hindered by the schedules.

Data Statements:

13 out of 17 classroom teachers completed the survey.

Enhance or Hinder Learning:

Scale of 1-5, with 1 being hinder, and 5 being enhanced

- 1 8%
- 2 15%
- 3 23%
- 4 15%
- 5 38%

13 out of 17 classroom teachers completed the survey.

Planning Q 3. How are paraprofessionals & special program staff used to support student learning?

Answer:

All paraprofessionals and special program staff begin duties at 7:45 and work directly with students both in push-in and pull-out programs until the end of the school day. Other duties include morning gym duty, lunch monitoring, and bus duty.

Data Statements:

- 4 special needs assistants (small group, adaptations, support teacher in student activities)
- 2 kindergarten assistants (small group, support teacher in student activities)

Planning Q4. Are school improvement strategies monitored on a regular basis?

Answer:

Yes, School improvement strategies are monitored regularly at New Washington E.

Data Statements:

- Classroom Intervention Reports are turned in and reviewed bi-weekly.
- Goal Clarity Windows are posted on Rubicon bi-weekly.
- Acuity is taken three times per year.
- Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) is taken 4 times per year.
- Writing and Math Problem Solving Benchmarks are given at the end of each 9 weeks. DIBELS for Math and Reading are given 3 times per year to grades K-2.

Planning Q5. How is shared leadership demonstrated in the building? What opportunities are available for teacher leaders?

Answer:

Teachers have a variety of opportunities to participate in leadership at New Washington. Staff shares leadership on various committees and with decisions.

Data Statements:

- Leadership Committee consists of 8 faculty members and the principal. They meet twice per month to analyze testing data, create positive changes within the building, and brainstorm possible solutions to problems on site.
- Social Committee consists of 2 staff members, 5 faculty members, and the principal. They meet once per month to plan and host social outings, pitch-in lunches, and staff showers/parties.
- Positive Behavior Support (PBS) consists of 1 staff member and 6 faculty members. They created and maintain a school wide behavior plan that focuses on positive behavior in the classroom, restroom, special area, hallway, and cafeteria.
- Building Discussion Committee receives and discusses any building specific complaints. Minutes must be sent to the administration for further action if needed.

Professional Development

Professional Development Q1. What is the relationship of student achievement, state standards, & professional dev?

Answer:

Professional development topics are decided based on the areas that need growth in student achievement.

Data Statement :

- Professional development topics are decided based on the areas that need growth in student achievement.
- State standards tested from Acuity, ISTEP, and DIBELS are analyzed and curriculum is designed around the needs of the students.
- Goal Clarity Windows directly address state standards and a mastery of 85% or higher is considered successful.
- Intervention is provided to those who did not meet mastery on that particular skill. Records are kept to refer to when analyzing individual student achievement.

Professional Development Q2. What impact has PD had on classroom practice? How do we know? How do we evaluate impact?

Answer:

Morning PD allows teachers time to plan together for lessons, standards and strategies used in the classroom

Data Statements:

Our school wide literacy and math frameworks are developed during this time. We study best practices and research in order to increase the competency of teachers in the key areas of reading and math. Scores from Goal Clarity Windows, benchmarks, Balanced Math quizzes, DIBELS, weekly progress monitoring, and Acuity evaluate the effectiveness of our teaching practices. Our teaching practices are then adjusted accordingly.

- 13 out of 17 classroom teachers completed the survey.
- Professional Development Collaboration Meetings/Period Zero:
- Scale of 1-5, with 1 being low impact and 5 being high impact
 - 1 0%
 - 2 7%
 - 3 7%
 - 4 23%
 - 5 61%

Professional Development Q3. What kinds of collaboration exist? How effective is each?

Answer:

Period Zero meetings are required two days per week and grade levels meet at least once per week to work on goal clarity windows, share ideas and strategies, analyze testing data, and create assessments.

Data Statements:

It is mandatory for grade levels to meet at least once per week to work on goal clarity windows, share ideas and strategies, analyze testing data, and create assessments. Teachers must meet as a grade level every other week with the Interventionists and principal to discuss individual progress of the students and to adjust strategies as needed. Period Zero meetings are required two days per week. The focus of these collaboration times is professional development in reading and math.

13 out of 17 classroom teachers completed the survey.

- Goal Clarity Window Collaboration:
- Scale of 1-5, with 1 being ineffective and 5 being effective

One 0%

Two 28%

Three 23%

Four 23%

Five 46%

- Intervention Meetings:
- Scale of 1-5, with 1 being ineffective and 5 being effective

One 23%

Two 15%

Three 38%

Four 8%

Five 15%

- Period Zero Meetings:
- Scale of 1-5, with 1 being ineffective and 5 being effective

One 0%

Two 8%

Three 23%

Four 38%

Five 31%

Professional Development Q4. Does PD increase cultural competency?

Answer:

The Positive Behavior Support Team (PBS) developed a school wide program that focuses on positive behavior in the classroom, restroom, special area, hallway, and cafeteria.

Data Statements:

- Based on our school demographics, the PBS has begun to meet our need for cultural competency. Additional training will be given as the need arises.

GCCS Literacy Framework

90 Minute Literacy Block (Kindergarten - 2)		
Time Guidelines	Intent	Notes
10-20 minutes	Focused Mini Lesson	Gradual Release of Responsibility- I do, we do, you do Intentional, explicit instruction on the Daily Learning Target Includes visual representation (Anchor Chart)
20 minutes	Word Work Kindergarten Focus on Foundation standards Grade 1	Gradual Release of Responsibility- I do, we do, you do

	Build on foundations with emphasis on phonics & fluency Grade 2 Advanced Phonics, Fluency, Comprehension	
20 minutes Variables that may influence gaps: student needs, class size, amount of time in literacy block.	Guided Reading Group Kindergarten Focus is Basic story elements independently (5 standards) Grade 1 Focus Shifts to a balance of foundations, RL, and RN with an emphasis on phonics and fluency Grade 2 Comprehension shifts to more complex thinking through the text independently	5-6 students using gradient text (levelled texts) that are at the student's' instructional level (100 points higher than their independent level)
This happens while not in groups	Independent/Shared Reading Writing - Interactive/ Constructive Response	Appropriate levelled text Writing journals Gradual Release of Responsibility- I do, we do, you do
30 - 45 Minute Writing Block		
Time	Intent	Notes
	Writer's Workshop	6+1 Writing Traits Writing Process

SPECIAL ED

Co-teaching during core

Guided Reading – Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) and/or

Push in/ Pull out – SDI (supports IEP)

ELL

Co-teaching during core, push in/pull out Language Acquisition Support (supports ILP)

90 Minute Literacy Block (3rd and 4th Grade)		
Time Guidelines	Intent	Notes
10-20 minutes	Focused Mini Lesson	Gradual Release of Responsibility- I do, we do, you do Intentional, explicit instruction on the Daily Learning Target Includes visual representation (Anchor Chart)
20 minutes	Word Work	Gradual Release of Responsibility- I do, we do, you do
20 minutes Variables that may influence grps: student needs, class size, amount	Guided Reading Group	5-6 students using gradient text (levelled texts) that are at the student's' instructional level (100 points higher than their independent level)

of time in literacy block.		
This happens while students are not in groups	<p align="center">Independent/Shared Reading</p> <p align="center">Writing - Constructive Response to Text</p>	<p>Appropriate Levelled Texts</p> <p>Writing Journals</p> <p>Cornell Notes</p> <p>Complex Thinking/ Work products</p> <p>Gradual Release of Responsibility-</p> <p>I do, we do, you do</p>
30 - 45 Minute Writing Block (3rd and 4th Grade)		
Time	Intent	Notes
	Writer's Workshop	<p>6+1 Writing Traits</p> <p>Writing Process</p>

SPECIAL ED

Co-teaching during core

Guided Reading – Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) and/or

Push in/ Pull out – SDI (supports IEP)

ELL

Co-teaching during core, push in/pull out Language Acquisition Support (supports ILP)

90 Minute Literacy Block (5th and 6th Grade)

Time	Intent	Notes
10-20 minutes	Focused Mini Lesson	<p>Gradual Release of Responsibility- I do, we do, you do</p> <p>Intentional, explicit instruction on the Daily Learning Target</p> <p>Includes visual representation (Anchor Chart)</p>
20 minutes	Word Work	<p>Gradual Release of Responsibility- I do, we do, you do</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">20 minutes (*elem - 3 groups per day) (ms - 2 groups per)</p> <p style="color: red;">*Variables that may influence grps: student needs, class size, amount of time in literacy block.</p> <p style="color: red;">Guided reading needs to be 40-45 minutes (two groups per day).</p>	Guided Reading Group	<p>5-6 students using gradient text (levelled texts) that are at the student's instructional level (100 points higher than their independent level)</p>
This happens while students are not in groups	<p style="text-align: center;">Independent/shared Reading</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Writing - Constructive Response</p>	<p>Appropriate Levelled Texts</p> <p>Writing Journals</p> <p>Cornell Notes</p>

		<p>Complex Thinking/ Work products</p> <p>Gradual Release of Responsibility-</p> <p>I do, we do, you do</p>
30 - 45 Minute Writing Block (5th and 6th Grade)		
Time	Intent	Notes
	<p>Writer's Workshop</p>	<p>6+1 Writing Traits</p> <p>Writing Process</p>

SPECIAL ED

Co-teaching during core

Guided Reading – Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) and/or

Push in/ Pull out – SDI (supports IEP)

ELL

Co-teaching during core, push in/pull out Language Acquisition Support (supports ILP)

30 Minute IMPACT Block (K - 5th Grade)		
Tier	Intent	Resources
<p>1</p>	<p>Literacy enrichment/acceleration during IMPACT time with Gen Ed teacher</p> <p>Self-Directed</p> <p>Product oriented/project based</p>	<p>Each gen ed teacher should have a Tier 1 and Tier 2 group in classroom during IMPACT in order to maintain appropriate sizes of Tier 2 groups to be effective (see below)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● GT programming

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Gradient texts appropriate to lexile levels
2	Read 180	4th & 5th Grade Only (400+ lexile) (90 minutes)
2	Sub-skill reading deficits with gen ed teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LLI Guided Reading ● McGraw-Hill Reading Intervention (all components)
3	Expert will pull out students to deliver an intensive reading intervention specific to the sub-skill deficit (phonemic awareness, vocabulary, phonics, fluency, comprehension) as supported by data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● McGraw-Hill Reading Intervention ● Barton Program-Need trainings (PA/phonics) ● Read Naturally (FL) ● Words Their Way (phonics/fluency) ● LIPS – Need training (PA)
3	Systems 44	Below 400 Lexile

As a rule, in order for IMPACT groups to be most effective:

- Tier 2 groups no more than 6 – 8 per group
- Tier 3 groups should be no more than 3 – 5 students per group

2016-2017 Math Block Framework

Greater Clark Schools has adopted a balanced approach to mathematic instruction that requires 60 minutes per day of direct instruction and includes: Computational Skills – Math review and mental math, Problem Solving, Conceptual Understanding, Math Fact Mastery, and Common Formative Assessment.

Components	Total Time: 60 minutes	Ideas/Daily Specifics
Math Review & Mental Math	15-20 Minutes	Assessment every two weeks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First $\frac{1}{2}$ of the time students are working and teacher is monitoring • Second $\frac{1}{2}$ of the time the class is processing together through various methods (see <i>Bal. Math</i>) • About 3-5 minutes on mental math (can be done at other times of the day, such as transitions)

Instructional Unit (GCW) w/Conceptual Skills	30-40 Minutes	Assessments (Learning Checks and District-Wide CQA) every 2 weeks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First 10-15 minutes is a hook/teaching moment • Differentiate instruction to meet individual needs by using guided practice, small groups, peer tutors, workstations, etc. • Math Journal Quick Writes • Discussion and using various TPT's • Reread standard, ask kids if they met the standard. (WALT)
Formal Problem Solving	35 – 40 Minutes	Bi-weekly
Math Fact Mastery	5 - 10 Minutes	Goal setting

Three - Year Data	State	Dist Total	School 3-Year Elem 3-5			Goal
ISTEP	2014-15	2014-15	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
% of Students Passing ELA section of ISTEP+ 3-5	69.0%	69.0%	91.2%	91.9%	81.20%	92.9%
% of Students Pass+ on ELA section of ISTEP+ 3-	19.0%	18.0%	25.0%	16.7%	18.70%	18.7%

5						
% of Students Passing Math section of ISTEP+ 3-5	65.0%	59.0%	89.9%	92.6%	60.60%	94.6%
% of Students Pass+ on Math section of ISTEP+ 3-5	24.0%	18.0%	27.7%	29.3%	15.50%	31.3%
% of Students Passing Social Studies section of ISTEP+ 5	NA	NA	90.0%	73.5%	NA	75.5%
% of Students Passing Science section of ISTEP+ 4	69.0%	63.0%	83.0%	63.5%	76.00%	73.0%
Three - Year Data	State	Dist Total	School 3-Year Elem 3-5			Goal
ISTEP	2014-15	2014-15	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Growth Model Language Arts Performance		63.8%	93.2%	92.5%	82.70%	94.5%
% of Students in Bottom 25% at High Growth-ELA	42.5%	40.0%	45.5%	50.0%	30.40%	52.0%
% of Students in Top 75% at High Growth-ELA	36.2%	33.2%	50.8%	34.3%	33.80%	36.3%
Overall Group with Low Growth-ELA	<39.8%	34.5%	10.3%	20.2%	29.70%	<18.2%
Growth Model Math Performance		56.0%	91.2%	93.8%	61.60%	95.8%
% of Students in Bottom 25% at High Growth-Math	44.9%	36.6%	47.8%	54.2%	20.80%	56.2%
% of Students in Top 75% at High Growth-Math	39.2%	33.9%	39.1%	35.2%	28.40%	39.2%
Overall Group with Low Growth-Math	<42.4%	35.9%	27.6%	28.4%	44%	<26.4%
GRADE		Dist. 2015	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	Goal 2016
School Grade - Accountability		D	A	A	A	A

Three - Year Data	State	Dist Total	School 3-Year Elem 3-5			Goal
IREAD 3	2014-15	2014-15	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
% of students passing IREAD3	90.7%	92.6%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100%%
Three - Year Data	State	Dist Total	District 3-Year			Current
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA	2014-15	2014-15	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Free and Reduced Lunch	49.2%	56.9%	52.2%	53.0%	50.8%	50.9%
Percent Special Education	14.9%	16.3%	18.4%	22.1%	19.1%	21.8%
Percent English as a Second Language	5.5%	6.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.3%
Ethnicity	29.8%	34.8%	3.0%	3.9%	5.2%	7.3%
Enrollment	1,046,026	10,591	331	330	329	293

Ongoing 2015-16 Data	Source	Dist. Avg	Sch Avg.	Sch. Avg
ACADEMIC		2014-15	2014-15	2015-16
% of Students Reading at Grade Level	AimsWeb K-1	78.0%	69.0%	60%
% of Students Math on grade level	AimsWeb K-1	78.3%	84.0%	89%
% of Students Reading at Grade Level	STAR Gr. 2-5	72.5%	80.0%	84%
% of Students Math on grade level	STAR Gr. 2-5	76.5%	76%	88%

**P.L. 221 Calendar
2016-2017
New Washington Elementary**

Week	Professional Development	Group	Monitoring
			Who – How monitored How results are used
July 25-29	July 25 th ELearning Conference July 26 th Welcome and Kick-off at CHS July 27 th Building Level Meetings	District Principal	
August 1-5	<u>Quarterly Focus: Literacy Framework</u> Week One: PBIS- Review of Procedures Q1 Pacing Guide Review & Instructional Planning LAR Creation	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Grade Level	Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
August 8-12	<u>Quarterly Focus: Literacy Framework</u> Week Two: DataWise Goal Setting Create DMR and Reading/LA skill review GCW Assessment Creation	Principal/AIC/BLT Data Teams Grade Level	Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
August 15-19	<u>Quarterly Focus: Literacy Framework</u> Week Three: Data Wise - ELA LAR/GCW Creation IMPACT planning	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	MRF/Walk Through Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
August 22 - 26	<u>Quarterly Focus: Literacy Framework</u> Week Four: Data Wise - Math LAR Creation GCW Test data review & skill planning	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans/Walk Through Lesson Plans/Walk Through Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
August 29- September 2	<u>Quarterly Focus: Literacy Framework</u> Week Five: Data Wise - PBIS GCW Assessment Creation	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
September 6 - 9 <i>NO SCHOOL, Sept. 5</i>	<u>Quarterly Focus: Literacy Framework</u> Week Six: Literacy Framework LAR/GCW Creation GCW Test data review & skill planning	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
September 12 - 16	<u>Quarterly Focus: Literacy Framework</u> Week Seven: Word Study LAR/GCW Creation IMPACT data review & skill planning	Principal/AIC/BLT PBIS Team Grade Level Data Teams	MRF/Walk Through Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
September 19 -	<u>Quarterly Focus: Literacy Framework</u>		

23 <i>TEACHERS ONLY, Sept. 21</i>	Week Eight: RISE Rubric Review LAR/GCW Creation GCW Test data review & skill planning (Create DMR and Reading/LA skill review)	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans/Walk Through Lesson Plans/Walk Through Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
September 26-30	<u>Quarterly Focus: Literacy Framework</u> Week Nine: Q2 Pacing Guide Review & Instructional Planning GLM to set IMPACT groups	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
October 17 - 21	<u>Quarterly Focus: Examining Instruction</u> Week One: Guided Reading Lesson Plans GCW/LAR Creation Hallway Walks	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
October 24 - 28	<u>Quarterly Focus: Examining Instruction</u> Week Two: Guided Reading Lesson Plans GCW Assessment Creation GCW Test data review & skill planning (Create DMR and Reading/LA skill review)	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	MRF/Walk Through Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
October 31 - November 4	<u>Quarterly Focus: Examining Instruction</u> Week Three: Word Study Notebook GCW/LAR Creation IMPACT data review & skill planning	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans/Walk Through Lesson Plans/Walk Through
November 7 - 11 <i>Teacher only</i> <i>Nov.8</i>	<u>Quarterly Focus: Examining Instruction</u> Week Four: Word Study Notebooks GCW/LAR Creation GCW Test data review & skill planning (Create DMR and Reading/LA skill review)	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
November 14 - 18	<u>Quarterly Focus: Examining Instruction</u> Week 5: Problem Solving GCW Assessment Creation Hallway Walks	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
November 21 - 22 <i>NO SCHOOL,</i> <i>Nov. 23 - 25</i>	<u>Quarterly Focus: Examining Instruction</u> Week Six: Multi-Step Problem Solving GCW/LAR Creation GCW Test data review & skill planning (Create DMR and Reading/LA skill review)	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	MRF/Walk Through Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through

			MRF/Data Binders
November 28- December 2	<u>Quarterly Focus: Examining Instruction</u> Week Seven: Multi-Step Problem Solving GCW/LAR Creation IMPACT data review & skill planning	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans/Walk Through Lesson Plans/Walk Through Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
December 5 - 9	<u>Quarterly Focus: Examining Instruction</u> Week Eight: Becoming Bucket Fillers GLM Writing Prompt grading GCW Test data review & skill planning (Create DMR and Reading/LA skill review)	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
December 12 - 16	<u>Quarterly Focus: Examining Instruction</u> Week Nine: Becoming Bucket Fillers Q3 Pacing Guide Review & Instructional Planning GLM to set IMPACT groups	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
January 3 - 6	<u>Quarterly Focus: Extending Instruction</u> Week One: Project Based Learning PRIDE LAR Creation	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	MRF/Walk Through Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
January 9 -13	<u>Quarterly Focus: Extending Instruction</u> Week Two: Project Based Learning GCW Assessment Creation GCW Test data review & skill planning (Create DMR and Reading/LA skill review)	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans/Walk Through Lesson Plans/Walk Through Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
January 17 - 20 NO SCHOOL, Jan. 16	<u>Quarterly Focus: Extending Instruction</u> Week Three: Project Based Learning GCW/LAR Creation IMPACT data review & skill planning Hallway Walks	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
January 23 -27	<u>Quarterly Focus: Extending Instruction</u> Week Four: Concept vs Procedural GCW/LAR Creation GCW Test data review & skill planning (Create DMR and Reading/LA skill review)	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
January 30 - February 3	<u>Quarterly Focus: Extending Instruction</u> Week Five: Concept vs Procedural	Principal/AIC/BLT	MRF/Walk Through

	GCW Assessment Creation Hallway Walks	Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
February 6 - 10	<u>Quarterly Focus: Extending Instruction</u> Week Six: “Guided Math” Framework GCW/LAR Creation GCW Test data review & skill planning (Create DMR and Reading/LA skill review)	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans/Walk Through Lesson Plans/Walk Through Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
February 13 - 17	<u>Quarterly Focus: Extending Instruction</u> Week Seven: “Guided Math” Framework GCW/LAR Creation IMPACT data review & skill planning	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
February 21 - 24 <i>NO SCHOOL or snow make up– Feb. 20</i>	<u>Quarterly Focus: Extending Instruction</u> Week Eight: “Guided Math” Framework GCW/LAR Creation GCW Test data review & skill planning (Create DMR and Reading/LA skill review)	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
February 27- March 3	<u>Quarterly Focus: Extending Instruction</u> Week Nine: “Guided Math” Framework GCW/LAR Creation IMPACT data review & skill planning	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	MRF/Walk Through Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
March 6 -10	<u>Quarterly Focus: Extending Instruction</u> Week Ten: Data Review GLM Writing Prompt grading GCW Test data review & skill planning (Create DMR and Reading/LA skill review)	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans/Walk Through Lesson Plans/Walk Through Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
March 13 -17	<u>Quarterly Focus: Extending Instruction</u> Week Eleven: Data Review Q4 Pacing Guide Review & Instructional Planning GLM to set IMPACT groups	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
April 3 - 7	<u>Quarterly Focus: Sustainability</u> Week One: Building Data Review for PRIDE GCW/LAR Creation Hallway Walks	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through

			MRF/Data Binders
April 10 -14	<u>Quarterly Focus: Sustainability</u> Week Two: PRIDE Review GCW Assessment Creation GCW Test data review & skill planning (Create DMR and Reading/LA skill review)	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	MRF/Walk Through Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
April 17 -21	<u>Quarterly Focus: Sustainability</u> Week Three: Literacy Block – Partner Read GCW/LAR Creation IMPACT data review & skill planning	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans/Walk Through Lesson Plans/Walk Through Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
April 24 - 28	<u>Quarterly Focus: Sustainability</u> Week Four: Literacy Block – Response to Text GCW/LAR Creation GCW Test data review & skill planning (Create DMR and Reading/LA skill review)	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
May 1 -4 <i>NO SCHOOL or snow make up– May 5</i>	<u>Quarterly Focus: Sustainability</u> Week Five: Literacy Block – Guided Reading GCW Assessment Creation Hallway Walks	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
May 8 - 12	<u>Quarterly Focus: Sustainability</u> Week Six: Literacy Block – Word Study GCW/LAR Creation GCW Test data review & skill planning (Create DMR and Reading/LA skill review)	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	MRF/Walk Through Lesson Plans Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
May 15 - 19	<u>Quarterly Focus: Sustainability</u> Week Seven: Balanced Math Review EOY IMPACT data review & skill planning	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans/Walk Through Lesson Plans/Walk Through Lesson Plans/Walk Through MRF/Data Binders
May 22 - 26	<u>Quarterly Focus: Sustainability</u> EOY GLM Writing Prompt grading GLM to set & review growth IMPACT	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans/Walk Through Lesson Plans/Walk Through
May 30-June 1	<u>Quarterly Focus: Sustainability</u>		

<i>NO SCHOOL-</i> May 29 Last student day- June 1	EOY	Principal/AIC/BLT Grade Level Data Teams	Lesson Plans/Walk Through Lesson Plans/Walk Through
---	-----	--	--

Ensuring Highly Qualified Staff **(SWP Component #3)**

The Greater Clark County Schools (GCCS) ensures that teachers hired for positions are “highly qualified” in academic subjects in which they are the primary instructor and requirements under the *No Child Left Behind Act*. Application for positions with the Greater Clark County Schools and initial screening process for holding the appropriate licensure in the teaching area is conducted through the Central Office. Hiring of staff for the Greater Clark County Schools elementary, middle and high school is conducted by the Greater Clark County Schools through the Central Office, building level principal and staff consisting of grade level representation. Background checks are conducted prior to hiring.

All GCCS teachers take the Highly Qualified Teacher Assessment/ HOUSSE and new teachers must take the *PRAXIS II*. Original records of these are kept at the school where the teacher is assigned the position and a copy is on file at Central Office. The Greater Clark County Schools annually submits “highly qualified” data/information regarding every certified employee teaching core academic subjects via the STN Application Center at www.doe.state.in.us. New teachers participate in the “mentor” program as required by the State of Indiana and overseen by the Division of Professional Standards. During their second year, teachers develop a portfolio and receive support from their building mentor on a regular basis.

Paraprofessionals must pass the *Parapro Test*. Instructional assistants are hired as substitutes for one month. If the non-certified/substitute person passes the *Parapro Test* during the first month, then he/she is hired with a “highly qualified” paraprofessional contract. The Greater Clark County Schools provide a competitive salary base for paraprofessionals. Paraprofessional salaries competitively increase incrementally with each year of experience.

Qualifications of teachers and paraprofessionals are reviewed and updated bi-annually to meet NCLB & HOUSSE requirements. When principals update the “highly qualified” information twice during the year, principals sign off that they have verified current information as accurate for teachers and paras as meeting highly qualified under federal law 107-110, Section 119, as mandated by the *No Children Left Behind Act of 2001*. This HOUSSE Summary Report is filed with Highly Qualified records and documentation is kept on file at the schools and Central Office.

Recruiting/ Retaining Highly Qualified Staff

(SWP Component #5)

Human Resource information and LRSC positions are posted and regularly updated on the District website. The Greater Clark County Schools provides a competitive salary base for beginning teachers with no years of teaching experience. Teacher salaries competitively increase incrementally with each year of experience. Teacher salaries are increased when a Masters is acquired. Certified staff receives benefits and may carry family options with additional contributions.

The Greater Clark County Schools is committed to having Teacher Mentors certified through the Indiana State Teacher Mentoring program in all LRSC schools. New teachers in the schools will have support from a teacher mentor who will provide continuous support related to the school's specific school improvement plan and school improvement goals and strategies.

In Title I buildings, weekly collaboration is scheduled to provide ongoing grade level support for new teachers as well as all grade level teachers. Grade level teachers and special resource teachers participate in grade level collaboration weekly. This collaboration focuses on examining formative assessments (student work samples) that monitor errors in reading, writing and math and the student's level of use of key strategies that teachers focus on. Teachers review how students are using the strategies and discuss how to revise and refine their modeling of those key strategies in order to impact student performance on the next formative assessment. During collaboration time, teachers use the data to reflect on current practices, expand, refine, and build new skills that focus on meeting school improvement goals and help address barriers to implementing key reform strategies in the school improvement plan. This infrastructure for job-embedded professional development provides new teachers support for progress monitoring of students and allows them access to their teaching peers on a regular basis that is facilitated, focused, and outcome based.

Eligible teachers have opportunities to have educational loans repaid using Perkins grant. Staff may receive credit renewal points for workshops. IU-Southeast offer graduate credits for professional development opportunities provided in collaboration with Greater Clark County Schools. All New Washington Elementary staff will have opportunities to participate in professional development that is focused on the school improvement goal and benchmarks (framework/model for reading, writing and math and key strategies based on the identified errors). Staff receives appropriate professional development resources such as books and publications to support study group discussions that are guided by the weekly teacher collaboration and looking at student work. Staff receives stipends (e.g. data analysis, use of reading assessments, curriculum alignment, checkpoint monitoring) that allow them to extend their professional growth time beyond the regular school day to meet as grade levels and/or school-wide.

New Washington Elementary recruits certified teachers who are working in the school as substitute teachers, on a regular basis, who are receiving hands-on experience with strategies and practices. Substitute teachers must have demonstrated exemplary standards and expectations in classroom management, student expectations, and exhibit participation in the professional learning community.

Assisting with Transitions

(SWP #7)

Strategies for transitions for preschoolers and 5th graders are as follows:

- Kindergarten Roundup: Spring Registration for incoming kindergarten students
- Camp Kindergarten: Student activities and informational meeting for parents of incoming kindergartners
- Student planners for grades 1-5
- 5th graders attend orientation at New Washington Middle School
- 5th grade teachers complete a “Middle School Scheduling Form” for each 5th grader and send it to New Washington Middle School

School Planning Review Team

NAME	POSITION	SIGNATURE
Darcie Goodin	Principal	<i>Darcie Goodin</i>
Amy Ellison	AIC	<i>Amy Ellison</i>
Sherry Cummings	Teacher	<i>Sherry Cummings</i>
Heather Urbano	Teacher	<i>Heather Urbano</i>
Katie Jackson	Teacher	<i>Katie Jackson</i>
David Alcorn	Teacher	<i>David Alcorn</i>
Paula Willinger	Teacher	<i>Paula Willinger</i>



**IDOE School Improvement and Professional Development
Building Level Assurance Form
Principal / Exclusive Representative Signatures**

Used Only When Exclusive Representative Signs Each School Individually.

DOE Building Number	0807
Building Name	New Washington Elementary

As principal, I verify that the individual professional development plans for all schools within the corporation align with the overall corporation's objectives, goals and expectations. (IC 20-20-31-6)

Principal Name (Print)	Darce Goodin
Principal's Signature	<i>Darce Goodin</i>
Date Signed	9/16/16

The exclusive representative is required to demonstrate support "only for the professional development program component of the plan."

By signing this form, I demonstrate my support for the professional development program for this school listed above as they have been reviewed, revised, and submitted as part of the Strategic and Continuous School Improvement and Achievement Plan. (511 IAC 6.2-3-3(10))

Exclusive Representative Name (Print)	Darce Goodin
Exclusive Representative Signature	<i>Darce Goodin</i>
Date Signed	9/16/16

This signed form should be kept on file at the school's office.

Principals will electronically assure that this form is signed and on file at the school during the Legal Standard 1 School Improvement Plan Submission process.

It is NOT necessary to return this form to the Indiana Department of Education.

Title I Schoolwide Plan Checklist

Directions: Review the Title I Schoolwide Plans prior to mailing to the IDOE to ensure that all requirements listed below have been met. Insert the page number where each component can be found in the column to the right. If a plan does not include all ten components, it is out of compliance with NCLB requirements and will need to be adjusted. **Components of a Schoolwide Plan*:**

Schoolwide Component	Page(s) Found in SIP
1. A comprehensive needs assessment of the whole school	p. 19-51
2. Implementation of schoolwide reform strategies that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provide opportunities for all children to meet proficient and advanced levels of students' academic achievement ● Use effective methods and instructional strategies that are based on scientifically based research that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Strengthens the core academic program ● Increases the amount of learning time ● Includes strategies for serving underserved populations ● Includes strategies to address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly low achieving children and those at risk of not meeting state standards ● Address how the school will determine if those needs of the children have been met ● Are consistent with and are designed to implement state and local improvement plans, if any 	p.12-17
3. Highly qualified teachers in all core content area classes	p.6-7
4. High qualified and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals	p.69
5. Strategies to attract high-quality, highly qualified teachers to this school	p.70

<p>6. Strategies to increase parent involvement, such as literary services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 6a. Description how the school will provide individual academic assessment results to parents ● 6b. Strategies to involve parents in the planning, review and improvement of the schoolwide plan 	p.4
Schoolwide Component	Page(s) Found in SIP
<p>7. Plans for assisting preschool children in the transition from early childhood programs such as Head Start, Even Start, Early Reading First, or a state-run preschool program</p>	p.71
<p>8. Opportunities and expectations for teachers to be included in the decision making related to the use of academic assessment results leading to the improvement of student achievement</p>	p.12-17
<p>9. Activities and programs at the school level to ensure that students having difficulty mastering proficient and advanced levels of the academic achievement are provided with effective, timely additional assistance</p>	p.6
<p>10. Coordination and integration of federal, state and local funds; and resources such as in-kind services and program components</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 10a. A list of programs that will be consolidated under the schoolwide plan (if applicable) 	p.6-8

