

Middletown Public Schools

Bielefield School
Improvement Plan
2008-2011

December 2008

Bielefield School Improvement Plan 2008-2011

Executive Summary

Bielefield School's 2008-11 school improvement plan aligns with and extends the work outlined in the district's 2008-11 improvement plan. Our school improvement plan reflects the influence of data-driven decisions, the Cambridge Report findings, benchmark and Connecticut Mastery Test outcomes, professional development, as well as what we have learned through our successes and challenges in the school improvement process.

In drafting its SMART goals, the building based school data team reviewed and analyzed student performance data. While Bielefield School's scores over the past five years had been generally improving, the rate of improvement on the 2008 Connecticut Mastery Tests was insufficient to meet the AYP targets for the whole school or subgroups in reading and subgroups in math. Matched scores from 2007 and 2008 CMT math and reading data, however, did show an increase in the number of students at goal for those students with continuous enrollment at Bielefield School.

At the primary level, gains in recent years have been steadily improving on the DRA and DRP. In addition, our suspension rate has generally declined since 2004, when the Effective Behavioral Support approach was implemented.

The focus of our SMART Goals, therefore, is to address the dual challenge of improving academic achievement for the whole group, while narrowing the significant difference on achievement measures between the school's whole group population and its subgroups.

To achieve these SMART goals, Bielefield School's school wide data team developed an action plan. The adult actions articulated within this plan are grounded in research and include setting clear learning goals, refining wide reading practices to build prior knowledge and vocabulary, expanding differentiated practice, establishing a tiered intervention model in mathematics and reading, and implementing a program that will build the capacity of the home environment to support student achievement. Embedded within all these actions is Connecticut's framework for using the Scientific Research-Based Interventions (SRBI) model adopted by CALI.

The specific action plans and indicators that are detailed in the school improvement plan are among Bielefield School's many recent and long-standing research-based efforts and practices to support student learning and improve teaching.

A glossary of terms and abbreviations is provided at the end of this document.

School Improvement and Data Team Planning Committee Members

Jill Garrity	Teacher, Kindergarten
Diane Castagno	Teacher, Grade 1
Jo Robinson	Teacher, Grade 2
Jennifer Fuqua	Teacher, Grade 3
Anne Fleming	Teacher, Grade 4
Martin Skelly	Teacher, Grade 4
Colleen Monnes	Teacher, Grade 5
Carole Waz	Resource Teacher
Mark Proffitt	Resource Teacher
Linett Talamona	School Social Worker
Eric Leaf	School Psychologist
Pamela Kahn	Interim Elementary Instructional Support Teacher
Dipti Shah	Elementary Instructional Support Teacher
Steven Lecky	Parent
Marian Early	Parent

Introduction and Overview

Bielefield School’s 2008-11 school improvement plan aligns with and extends the work outlined in the district’s 2008-11 improvement plan. Our school improvement plan reflects the influence of data-driven decisions, the Cambridge Report findings, benchmark and Connecticut Mastery Test outcomes, professional development, as well as what we have learned through our successes and challenges in the school improvement process.

SMART Goals: In drafting its SMART goals, the building based school data team reviewed and analyzed student performance data. Bielefield School’s scores over the past five years had been generally improving. Bielefield School achieved Safe Harbor in 2006 and 2007. In 2008, however, the rate of improvement was insufficient to meet the AYP targets for the whole school or subgroups in reading and subgroups in math; despite our concerted and carefully monitored effort to support students’ reading at all levels. Matched scores from 2007 and 2008 CMT math and reading data that compare scores of the same cohort of students over two years at Bielefield School, show an increase in the number of students at goal and above from third (2007) to fourth (2008) grade and fourth (2007) to fifth (2008) grade. The 2007 Strategic School Profile shows that our return rate of 74% is below the district average and indicates that mobility interrupts the continuity of learning for some of our students. We have every hope that the district’s implementation of pacing guides will help us mitigate the effects of mobility. At the primary level, the story is different. Gains in recent years have been steady and strong on such common measures as the DRA and DRP. The following charts illustrate Bielefield School’s progress:

2006-2008 CMT OVERALL At-A-Glance

Grade	Year	MATHEMATICS		Change 2007-2008	
		% At/Above Goal	% At/Above Proficient	At/Above Goal	At/Above Proficient
3	2008	37	71	-7	-2
	2007	44	73		
	2006	46	73		

4	2008	44	75	-12	-4
	2007	56	79		
	2006	40	74		

5	2008	68	81	17	5
	2007	51	76		
	2006	47	68		

Grade	Year	READING		Change 2007-2008	
		% At/Above Goal	% At/Above Proficient	At/Above Goal	At/Above Proficient
3	2008	39	56	-5	-17
	2007	44	73		
	2006	45	67		

4	2008	54	71	6	6
	2007	48	65		
	2006	45	66		

5	2008	62	66	11	10
	2007	51	56		
	2006	38	57		

In addition to the less than adequate whole group CMT achievement, significant gaps exist between whole and subgroups' performance, most notably in the Black and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups.

On a brighter note, Bielefield School has demonstrated a strong and steady decline in our suspension rate since 2004, when the Effective Behavioral Support approach was implemented. The improvement was acknowledged in the Cambridge Report (dated October 3, 2007), which rated our school favorably in the area of School Climate, i.e. "exceeds minimum requirements." While we are proud of our achievements in School Climate, this is an area in which we will remain vigilant; since a positive School Climate sets the stage for learning and achievement [refer to *CALI* professional development model].

The focus of our school improvement plan, therefore, is to address the dual challenge of improving academic achievement for the whole group, while narrowing the significant difference on achievement measures between the school's whole group population and its subgroups.

Based on the triangulation of data, the school wide data team developed the following Tier I SMART Goals for Bielefield School:

1. On the CMT in Math and Reading, the average grade-level gain in the number of students at or above proficiency over the three-year period of the District Improvement Plan will be at least 15 percentage points.
2. On the CMT in Math and Reading, achievement gaps within all student subgroups will be reduced by at least 30 percent over the three-year period of the District Improvement Plan. In addition, all student subgroups will show growth in academic achievement in Math and Reading.

On Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT), a 30 Percent Reduction Over a Three Year Period in Achievement Gaps for All Student Subgroups for MATHEMATICS			
	SUBGROUPS	GAP 2008	2011 Target
GRADE 3	BLACK	43	30
	HISPANIC	25	18
	F/R MEALS	41	29
	SPED	81	57
GRADE 4	BLACK	13	9
	HISPANIC	26	18
	F/R MEALS	26	18
	SPED	67	47
GRADE 5	BLACK	31	22
	HISPANIC	21	15
	F/R MEALS	41	29
	SPED	61	43
READING			
	SUBGROUPS	GAP 2008	2011 Target
GRADE 3	BLACK	43	30
	HISPANIC	37	26
	F/R MEALS	36	25
	SPED	64	45
GRADE 4	BLACK	25	18
	HISPANIC	26	18
	F/R MEALS	44	31
	SPED	43	30
GRADE 5	BLACK	41	29
	HISPANIC	11	8
	F/R MEALS	26	18
	SPED	78	55

Finally, the following table projects the percentage point rates of improvement for students as they proceed through grades 3, 4, and 5 over the next three years:

2008 CONNECTICUT MASTERY TEST

Data Chart for SMART Goal Baselines (2008) & Targets (2011) BY Grade by Subject

Goal 2: On CMT, a 15 percentage point gain in student proficiency

MATHEMATICS	2008 Actual	2009	2010	2011 Target	Gain/2008
Grade 3	71	79	87	95*	24
Grade 4	75	79	87	95*	20
Grade 5	81	82	87	95*	14

READING	2008 Actual	2009	2010	2011 Target	Gain/2008
Grade 3	56	66	76	86*	30
Grade 4	71	66	76	86*	15
Grade 5	66	76	76	86*	20

*Targets based on District Improvement Plan

Action Plan: To achieve these SMART goals, Bielefield School's school wide data team developed an action plan.

The plan includes the following adult actions:

Bielefield School will improve student mathematics and reading achievement through the implementation of the following:

1. Identify, state, and display learning goals to establish a direction for learning. Students will be encouraged to personalize the teacher's goals [*Classroom Instruction that Works*, Marzano 2001].
2. Adapt sustained silent reading (SSR) and implement school wide so that it enhances the academic background knowledge and vocabulary of students through extensive reading and language interaction [*Building Background Knowledge for Academic Achievement*, Marzano, 2004].
3. Expand wrap-around and day school differentiated intervention groups to strengthen learning through increased practice and revision for selected Tier II and Tier III students [*What Works in Schools: Translating Research into Actions*, Marzano 2003; *Art and Science of Teaching*, Marzano 2007].
4. Implement a research-based, tiered guided reading intervention model for reading instruction. [*Strategies that Work*, Harvey & Goudvis 2007]
5. Implement a research-based, tiered intervention model for math instruction [*Classroom Instruction that Works*, Marzano 2001].
6. Expand programs that build the capacity of the home environment to encourage and support student achievement [*What Works in Schools: Translating Research into Actions*, Marzano 2003].

Embedded within all these actions is Connecticut's framework for using the Scientific Research-Based Interventions model adopted by CALI to include earlier identification, focus on prevention, and assessment with clearer implication for academic programming [*Using SRBI: Improving Education for all Students*, CSDE August 2008 and *Response to Intervention: A Framework for Reading Educators*, Fuchs, Fuchs, & Vaughn 2008].

The specific action plans and indicators that are detailed in the pages that follow are among Bielefield School's many recent and long-standing research-based efforts and practices to support student learning and improve teaching. Having supported students' improved learning in the past, the school plans to continue the following:

- Parent Workshops
- Mentor Program
- Reading Recovery
- Grades K-5 balanced literacy program
- School, Family, & Community Partners
- PTA and Parent Involvement Committee
- Effective/Positive Behavioral Support & ROARS Rally
- Academic Enrichment Academy (three-week, grades 3-6 summer program for students needing literacy support)
- TestPrepFun – a web-based, interactive CMT practice program for all grades 3-8
- Common assessments, grades K-5
- Youth Services Bureau – a district and city collaborative effort to support and strengthen our youth's developmental assets
- District pre-school program
- 21st Century After-School programs
- Educational Incentive Grant
- Family School Connection program – an outreach home-visiting program at one elementary
- Standards-based elementary report cards (four levels of achievement, no letter grades)
- Biobus – mobile science laboratory
- Math Club
- Middletown Public Schools Cultural Council – a district sponsored program ensuring rich and equitable fine arts exposure and experiences for all Middletown Public Schools students

The following pages provide detailed information about Bielefield School's action plans.

Action Plan to Implement Strategic Work for School Improvement

High Level Adult Work: Bielefield School will improve student mathematics and reading achievement through the implementation of the following:

- Establish and communicate learning goals embedded within effective lesson plans and engage students in goal setting.
- Enhance students’ background knowledge and build their vocabulary.
- Help students practice and deepen their understanding of new knowledge by finding more time for targeted, progressive interventions within and outside of the school day.
- Augment the efficacy of the home environment in supporting student achievement.

Rationale: If learning goals in mathematics and reading are clear, background knowledge and vocabulary are developed, exposure to and practice of new learning are increased, and families know how to support student learning; then mathematics and reading achievement for all Bielefield School’s students will increase and the achievement gap will narrow.

Action Plan Strategies:

Strategy 1: Identify, state, and display learning goals to establish a direction for learning. Students will be encouraged to personalize the teacher’s goals [*Classroom Instruction that Works*, Marzano 2001].

- *Year one (2008-09)*

action plan	timeline	results indicators	costs	person(s) responsible
Identify conceptual and procedural objectives in lesson plans, which are verbally communicated and displayed.	January 2009 – June 2009	Lesson plans include conceptual and procedural objectives. Conceptual and procedural objectives are communicated in kid friendly language and on display in all classrooms as reflected in monthly walkthroughs. Students will be able to state these objectives in their own words.	Some in-house PD @ no cost	Classroom Teachers, EIST, Principal

action plan	timeline	results indicators	costs	person(s) responsible
Students identify goals that they will attain within the context of the larger goals established by the teacher.	January 2009 – June 2009	Grade 3, 4, 5 students personalize goals as reflected in contracts. Grades 3, 4, 5 students will be able to chart their progress relative to their goals through data walls, graphs, and/or charts.		Classroom Teachers, EIST, Principal, Students

▪ *Year two (2009-10) and Year three (2010-2011)*

action plan	timeline	results indicators	costs	person(s) responsible
Evaluate impact and revise lesson plan objectives procedure.	September 2009 - June 2010 & September 2010 - June 2011	Teachers will create weekly lesson plans with the required components. Conceptual and procedural objectives are communicated in kid friendly language and on display in all classrooms as reflected in monthly walkthroughs. Greater numbers of students will be able to state these objectives in their own words.	Continued in-house PD as needed @ no cost	Classroom Teachers, EIST,

action plan	timeline	results indicators	costs	person(s) responsible
Students identify goals that they will attain within the context of the larger goals established by the teacher.	September 2009 - June 2010 & September 2010 - June 2011	Greater number of students in Grades K-5 will be able to personalize goals as reflected in contracts and be able to chart their progress relative to their goals to their goals through data walls, graphs, and/or charts.		Classroom Teachers, Students

Strategy 2: Adapt sustained silent reading (SSR) and implement school wide so that it enhances the academic background knowledge and vocabulary of students through extensive reading and language interaction [*Building Background Knowledge for Academic Achievement*, Marzano, 2004].

▪ *Year one (2008-09)*

action plan	timeline	results indicators	costs	person(s) responsible
Provide training to teachers relative to Scaffolded Silent Reading (ScSR) and Marzano's sustained silent reading (SSR) Five-Step Process to enhance students' academic background knowledge and build vocabulary through wide reading and spoken or written response (in tandem with Marzano's content-specific vocabulary instruction program).	February 2009 – June 2009	Training completed. Improved DRA (grades K-2) and DRP (grades 3-5).	Substitute Teachers @ \$80 per diem per teacher	Literacy Coach ,EIST

action plan	timeline	results indicators	costs	person(s) responsible
Implement Scaffolded Silent Reading (ScSR) based on Marzano's Five-Step Process at all grade levels.	February 2009 – June 2009	Implementation in grades K-5 classrooms 2 times weekly for 30 minutes as reflected in lesson plans and monthly walkthroughs. Improved DRA (grades K-2) and DRP (grades 3-5).		Classroom Teachers

▪ *Year two (2009-10) and Year three (2010-2011)*

action plan	timeline	results indicators	costs	person(s) responsible
Evaluate impact and revise implementation of Scaffolded Silent Reading (ScSR) based on Marzano's Five-Step Process.	Sept.2009 - June 2010 & Sept. 2010 – June 2011	ScSR revised as needed. Continued implementation in grades K-5 classrooms 2 times weekly as reflected in lesson plans and monthly walkthroughs. Improved DRA (grades K-2) and DRP (grades 3-5).	Continued in-house PD as needed @ no cost	Classroom Teachers, EIST, Principal

Strategy 3: Expand wrap-around and day school differentiated intervention groups to strengthen learning through increased practice and revision for selected Tier II and Tier III students [*What Works in Schools: Translating Research into Actions*, Marzano 2003; *Art and Science of Teaching*, Marzano 2007].

• *Year one (2008-09)*

action plan	timeline	results indicators	costs	person(s) responsible
Provide reading intervention groups before school 2 times weekly for Tier II and Tier III students based on individual goals. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grades 3-5 Oct.– March • Grades 2-4 April –June • 7:45-8:45 AM 	January 2009 – June 2009	Reading intervention program implemented. Improved DRA (grade 2) and DRP (grades 3-5). TestPrepFun reading results charted.	\$26.76 per hour x 5 hours per week.	Title I Tutor 21c Classroom Connect Liaison

action plan	timeline	results indicators	costs	person(s) responsible
Expand math and reading interventions after school for Tier II and Tier III students (21c, Education Incentive Grant, Title I). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide sessions 2 times weekly after school with transportation provided for students in grades 2-5 during January-March 3:30-5:00 PM. • Provide sessions 2 times weekly during the day in addition to regular math instruction in grades 3 and 4 (January-June). 	January 2009 – June 2009	Math and reading interventions 2 times weekly. Improved DRA (grade-2), DRP (grades 3-5), and math benchmark results (grades 3-5). TestPrepFun math and reading results charted (grades 3-5) by students.	\$26.76 per hour x 5 hours per week. Transportation @ \$80 per day, twice weekly for 8 weeks	After School staff 21c Program Coordinator After School staff and classroom teachers will monitor student charting.

• *Year two (2009-10) and year three (2010-2011)*

Evaluate impact and revise before school reading intervention program provided for Tier II and Tier III students based on individual goals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grades 3-5 Oct.– March • Grades 2-4 March–June • 7:45-8:45 AM 	September 2009 - June 2010 & September 2010 - June 2011	Before school reading intervention program implementation continued or revised. Improved Fountas & Pinnell (grades 2-5), DRP (grades 2-5), and math benchmark results (grades 3-5). TestPrepFun reading results charted (grades 3-5) by students.	\$26.76 per hour x 5 hours per week.	Title I Tutor 21c Classroom Connect Liaison After School staff and classroom teachers will monitor student charting.
---	---	---	--------------------------------------	--

action plan	timeline	results indicators	costs	person(s) responsible
Evaluate impact and revise math and reading interventions provided after school and during the day program for Tier II and Tier III students: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide sessions 2 times weekly after school provided for students in grades 3-5 during January-March 3:30-5:00 PM. Provide sessions 2 times weekly during the day in addition to regular math and reading instruction in grades 3, 4, 5. 	September 2009 - June 2010 & September 2010 - June 2011	Math and reading intervention groups provided 2 times weekly. Improved Fountas & Pinnell (grades 2-5), DRP (grades 2-5), and math benchmark results (grades 3-5). TestPrepFun math and reading results charted (grades 3-5) by students.	\$26.76 per hour x 5 hours per week. Transportation @ \$80 per day, twice weekly for 8 weeks	After School teachers and tutors After School staff and classroom teachers will monitor student charting.

Strategy 4: Implement a research-based, tiered guided reading intervention program model for reading instruction. [Strategies that Work, Harvey & Goudvis 2007]

• *Year one (2008-09)*

action plan	timeline	results indicators	costs	person(s) responsible
Provide training to grades 3 and 4 teachers on implementing a tiered guided reading intervention model based on SRBI model to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> cross-grade level flexible groups differentiated instruction provided by the grade level's classroom teachers, resource teachers, and Title I teacher 60 minutes daily during the 90 minute literacy block 	January 2009 – June 2009	Just-in-time training provided to teachers on an ongoing basis (classroom and resource teachers, grades 3-4). Coverage for collaboration of grade level teachers and EIST as needed.	Substitute Teachers @ \$80 per diem per teacher	Principal, EIST, Classroom Teachers

action plan	timeline	results indicators	costs	person(s) responsible
Implement a tiered guided reading intervention model based on SRBI model to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cross-grade level flexible groups • differentiated instruction provided by the grade level's classroom teachers, resource teachers, and Title I teacher • 60 minutes daily during the 90 minute literacy block • Grades 3-4 	January 2009 – June 2009	Implementation of a tiered guided reading intervention model in grades 3 and 4. Groups meet for 60 minutes during the 90-minute literacy block as evidenced by weekly lesson plans and monthly walkthroughs. Improved DRA (grade-2), DRP (grades 3-5), and math benchmark results (grades 3-5). Improvement in students' Reading Response journal rubric scores for literature based questions (grades 3-4).		Principal, EIST, Classroom Teachers

• *Year two (2009-10) and Year three (2010-11)*

action plan	timeline	results indicators	costs	person(s) responsible
Provide training as needed to grades 5, 1, and 2 teachers on implementing a tiered guided reading intervention model based on SRBI model to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • flexible groups • differentiated instruction provided by the grade level's classroom teachers, resource teachers, and interventionist • 30/60 minutes model daily during the 90 minute literacy block 	Sept. 2009 - June 2010 & Sept. 2010 June 2011	Just-in-time training provided to teachers on an ongoing basis (Year Two: grades 5 classroom and resource teachers; Year Three: grades 1 and 2 classroom and resource teachers). Improved Fountas & Pinnell (grades 2-5), DRP (grades 2-5). Coverage for collaboration of grade level teachers and EIST as needed.	Substitute Teachers @ \$80 per diem per teacher	Principal, EIST, Classroom Teachers

action plan	timeline	results indicators	costs	person(s) responsible
Expand tiered guided reading intervention model based on SRBI model to grades 5, 1, and 2 during 90 minute literacy block. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • flexible groups • differentiated instruction provided by the grade level's classroom teachers, resource teachers, and interventionist • 30/60 minutes model daily during the 90 minute literacy block • 	Sept. 2009 - June 2010 & Sept. 2010 - June 2011	Implementation of a tiered guided reading intervention model based on SRBI as evidenced by weekly lesson plans and monthly walkthroughs. Improved Fountas & Pinnell (grades 2-5), DRP (grades 2-5). Improvement in students' Reading Response journal rubric scores for literature based questions (grades 1-5).		Principal, EIST, Classroom Teachers

Strategy 5: Implement a research-based, tiered intervention model for math instruction.

Year one (2008-09)

action plan	timeline	results indicators	costs	person(s) responsible
Follow math pacing guide to provide direct explicit instruction of math standards/GLE's using research-based mathematics strategies in differentiated flexible groups: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increase student math talk in the classroom, • model and encourage students to demonstrate metacognition of problem solving strategies in a spoken, written, and/or nonlinguistic form, • fully implement Marzano's 	January 2009 – June 2009	Consistent implementation of these research-based math strategies as reflected in lesson plans and monthly walkthroughs. Vocabulary notebooks completed weekly in all grades 1-5 classrooms. Math journals reflect student thinking. Results of math benchmark assessments and Common Formative Assessments (grades K-5)		Principal, EIST, Classroom Teachers

Vocabulary Program (<i>Building Background Knowledge</i> , 2001)				
---	--	--	--	--

action plan	timeline	results indicators	costs	person(s) responsible
Provide Training in Math Talk strategies.	January 2009 - June 2009	Training Provided.		Principal, EIST, Classroom Teachers

action plan	timeline	results indicators	costs	person(s) responsible
Implement tiered math interventions in grades 3 and 4 based on SRBI model that includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • grade level flexible groups • differentiated instruction provided by the grade level’s classroom teachers, resource teachers, and Title I teacher • coaching provided by EIST as needed to support teacher professional development. 	January 2009 - June 2009	Consistent implementation of the tiered intervention model 2 times weekly as reflected in lesson plans and monthly walkthroughs. Coaching provided as needed by EIST. Results of benchmark assessments and Common Formative Assessments (grades K-5), and CMT results (3-5)		Principal, EIST, Classroom Teachers

• *Year two (2009-10) Year three (2010-11)*

action plan	timeline	results indicators	costs	person(s) responsible
Evaluate impact and revise implementation of direct explicit instruction of math standards/GLE’s in pacing guide using research-based mathematics strategies in differentiated flexible groups that include increased math talk, demonstration of metacognition, and full implementation of Marzano’s Vocabulary Program. Implement tiered math interventions in grades 3, 4, and 5 based on SRBI model that includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • flexible groups • differentiated instruction provided by the grade level’s classroom teachers, 	September 2009 – June 2010 September 2010 – June 2011	Direct explicit instruction using research-based math strategies revised as needed and reflected in lesson plans and monthly walkthroughs. Results of benchmark assessments, Common Formative Assessments (K-5), and CMT(grades 3-5)		Principal, EIST, Classroom Teachers

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> resource teachers, and Title I teacher coaching provided by EIST as needed to support teacher professional development. 				
---	--	--	--	--

Strategy 6: Expand programs that build the capacity of the home environment to encourage and support student achievement [*What Works in Schools: Translating Research into Actions*, Marzano 2003].

- Year one (2008-09)*

action plan	timeline	results indicators	costs	person(s) responsible
Initiate implementation of Family School Connection (FSC) Home Visitor Program to build capacity of families to support achievement at home for selected students in Tier II and Tier III.	February 2009 – June 2009	<p>Social Worker and two home visitors hired. Workspace established.</p> <p>Staff attends required training provided November – June 1.</p> <p>Home visitors program initiated with fidelity to Children’s Trust Fund model Children’s Trust Fund model (January –June) as documented in log.</p> <p>Parents report of outcomes for their families and students.</p> <p>Referred students’ improvement on benchmark assessments, progress reports, and CMT.</p>	Per CTF Grant	<p>Grants Coordinator</p> <p>Principal</p> <p>Program Supervisor</p> <p>Home Visitors</p> <p>School Social Worker</p>

- Year two (2009-10) Year three (2010-11)*

action plan	timeline	results indicators	costs	person(s) responsible
Full implementation of Family School Connection (FSC) Home Visitor Program to build capacity of parents to support achievement at home.	September 2009 – June 2010 September 2010 – June 2011	Greater number of home visits completed with fidelity to Children’s Trust Fund model Children’s Trust Fund model (January –June) as documented in log. Parents report of outcomes for their families and students. Referred students’ improvement on benchmark assessments, progress reports, and CMT.	Per CTF Grant	Grants Coordinator Principal Program Supervisor Home Visitors

action plan	timeline	results indicators	costs	person(s) responsible
Evaluate and revise Family School Connection (FSC) Home Visitor Program to build capacity of parents to support achievement at home.	September 2009 – June 2010 September 2010 – June 2011	Greater number of home visits completed with fidelity to Children’s Trust Fund model Children’s Trust Fund model (January –June) as documented in log. Parents report of outcomes for their families and students. Referred students’ improvement on benchmark assessments, progress reports, and CMT.	Per CTF Grant	Grants Coordinator Principal Program Supervisor Home Visitors

GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

1. **CALI:** [Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative - The goal of the Connecticut Accountability for Learning Initiative (CALI) is to develop and offer a model of state support to districts and schools to support the process of continuous school and district improvement and to accelerate the closing of Connecticut's achievement gaps.]
2. **SRBI:** [Scientific Research-Based Interventions - Instructional practices and interventions that have been researched and determined to be effective for improved student outcomes or proven to excel student learning as evidenced by data.]
 - a. **Tier I:** the general education core curriculums, instruction and social/behavioral supports for all students with differentiation that is the norm in the general education environment.
 - b. **Tier II:** short-term interventions for students who have not responded adequately to the general education core curriculums and differentiation of instruction that is the norm in the general education environment.
 - c. **Tier III:** more intensive or individualized short-term interventions in the general education environment for students who fail to respond adequately to Tier I and/or Tier II interventions.
3. **STANDARD:** [An officially sanctioned description of what a student is expected to learn and how well it should be learned in specific subjects taught in school.]
4. **GLE:** [An objective that states a goal or benchmark that students are expected to meet at a particular grade level in a particular subject.]
5. **BENCHMARK:** [A benchmark is a standard for judging performance.]
6. **BENCHMARK ASSESSMENT:** [Benchmark assessments are given a few times during the year to tell what students know by a particular stage of their schooling. Benchmark Assessments are used to set benchmarks and/or to determine whether students are achieving grade level standards.]
7. **CMT** [Connecticut Mastery Tests]
8. **DATA TEAMS:** [Teams of educators that are responsible for data analysis and decision making and that function at the level of the district, school, and grade (or content area) as well as across grade levels in the same content area (i.e. vertical teams).]
9. **CFA:** [Common Formative Assessments – assessments conducted during the process of student learning that are used primarily to inform instruction. They are not standardized tests, but rather teacher-created, teacher-owned assessments that are collaboratively scored and that provide immediate feedback to students and teachers.]
10. **DIFFERENTIATED INSTRUCTION:** [A form of instruction that seeks to meet differing needs of a group of students within the general education setting.]
11. **S.M.A.R.T. GOALS:** [Specific, Measureable, Achievable, Realistic, Timely]
12. **CAMBRIDGE EDUCATION GROUP:** [Cambridge Education Group Quality Review program engages schools and districts in a process of quality reviews and continuous improvement. Quality review reports for Middletown Public School District and individual school reports are available on the district and school web sites]
13. **INTERVENTION:** [A program that does something different instructionally from what was done before in an attempt to improve learning. For example, using a new strategy to help students with reading.]

Strategy 1: Identify, state, and display learning goals to establish a direction for learning. Students will be encouraged to personalize the teacher’s goals [Classroom Instruction that Works, Marzano 2001].

<i>Year Two (2009-10)</i>	timeline	results indicators	results indicators	person(s) responsible
Identity conceptual and procedural objectives in lesson plans.	2009-2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson Plans include C.O and P.O. • Monthly walkthroughs. 		Classroom Teachers EIST Principal
C.O. and P.O. are verbally communicated.	2009-2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives communicated • Monthly walkthroughs 		Classroom Teachers EIST Principal
C.O. and P.O. are displayed.	2009-2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C.O and P.O. displayed. • Monthly walkthroughs 		Classroom Teachers EIST Principal
Students can state C.O. and P.O. objectives in their own words.	2009-2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly walkthroughs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students state objectives in their own words orally and in writing. 	Classroom Teachers EIST Principal
Students identify goals they will attain within context of larger goals est. by teacher.	2009-2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students personalize goals orally • Student contracts. 	Classroom Teachers EIST Principal
Students set goals in a contractual context.	2009-2010		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student contracts • Students set goals in contracts. 	Classroom Teachers EIST Principal
Students chart progress relative to their goals.	2009-2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly walkthroughs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data Walls • Charts 	Classroom Teachers EIST Principal

Strategy 2: Adapt sustained silent reading (SSR) and implement school wide so that it enhances the academic background knowledge and vocabulary of students through extensive reading and language interaction [*Building Background Knowledge for Academic Achievement*, Marzano, 2004].

<i>Year Two (2009-10)</i>	timeline	results indicators	results indicators	person(s) responsible
Implement ScSR based on Marzano's Five-Step Process at all grade levels (minimum of 2 times per week in addition to 90 minute reading block.)	2009-2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation in grades K-5 classrooms minimum of 2 times weekly • Monthly walkthroughs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRA (K-2) • DRP (2-5) • Reading Logs • Reading Response Journals 	Classroom Teachers
ScSR is implemented in tandem with Marzano's content-specific vocabulary instruction program.	2009-2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation in grades 1-5 classrooms 3-5 times weekly • Monthly walkthroughs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRA (K-2) • DRP (2-5) • Vocabulary Notebooks 	Classroom Teachers

Strategy 3: Expand wrap-around and day school differentiated intervention groups to strengthen learning through increased practice and revision for selected Tier II and Tier III students [*What Works in Schools: Translating Research into Actions*, Marzano 2003; *Art and Science of Teaching*, Marzano 2007].

<i>Year Two (2009-10)</i>	timeline	results indicators	results indicators	person(s) responsible
Provide reading intervention groups before school 2 times weekly for Tier II and Tier III students based on individual goals.	October 2009- June 2010 (Grades 3-5) March-June 2009 (Grades 2-4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program implemented. • TestPrepFun math and reading results charted. 	DRA (2) DRP (grade 2-5)	Title I Tutor 21c Classroom Connect Liaison
Expand math and reading interventions after school for Tier II and Tier III students 2 times weekly (Grades 3 -5).	January 2009- June 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Math and reading interventions provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRA (2) • DRP (grade 3-5) • Math Benchmark results (3-5) • TestPrepFun math and reading results charted (3-5) 	After School Staff 21c Program Coordinator
Provide sessions two times weekly in addition to regular math instruction (Grades 3 & 4).	2009-2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Math interventions provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Math Benchmark results (3-4) 	Classroom Teachers After School Staff 21c Program Coordinator

Strategy 4: Implement a research-based, tiered guided reading intervention program model for reading instruction. [*Strategies that Work*, Harvey & Goudvis 2007]

<i>Year Two (2009-10)</i>	timeline	results indicators	results indicators	person(s) responsible
		.		
Tiered guided reading intervention program based on SRBI model implemented.	2009-2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of program daily in grades 3 & 4 • Lesson Plans • Data Team Minutes • Monthly walkthroughs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRA • DRP • Benchmarks • CMT • Reading Response Journals 	Principal EIST Classroom Teachers
Program includes tiered, flexible groups.	2009-2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson Plans • Data Team Minutes 		Principal EIST Classroom Teachers
Program includes differentiated instruction.	2009-2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson Plans • Data Team Minutes 		Principal EIST Classroom Teachers
Effective Teaching Strategies implemented.	2009-2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson Plans • Data Team Minutes 		
Adopt 30/60 minutes model daily during the 90 minute literacy block.	2009-2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson Plans • Data Team Minutes 		Principal EIST Classroom Teachers
Reading Response Journals with rubric scores implemented.	2009-2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson Plans • Data Team Minutes 	Reading Response Journals	Principal EIST Classroom Teachers

Strategy 5: Implement a research-based, tiered intervention model for math instruction.

<i>Year Two (2009-10)</i>	timeline	results indicators	results indicators	person(s) responsible
Follow math pacing guide to provide direct explicit instruction of math standards/GLE's using research-based mathematics strategies in differentiated flexible groups.	2009-2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson Plans • Monthly walkthroughs • Data Team minutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Math Benchmark assessments • CFA's 	Principal EIST Classroom Teachers
Instruction includes increased student math talk in the classroom.	2009-2010	Same as above		Principal EIST Classroom Teachers
Teachers model and encourage students to demonstrate metacognition of problem solving strategies in a spoken, written, and/or nonlinguistic form/	2009-2010	Same as above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Math Journals 	Principal EIST Classroom Teachers
Instruction includes full implementation of Marzano's Vocabulary Program.	2009-2010	Same as above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vocabulary Notebooks 	Principal EIST Classroom Teachers
Common Formative Assessments developed and implemented	2009-2010	CFA's		Principal EIST Classroom Teachers

Strategy 6: Expand programs that build the capacity of the home environment to encourage and support student achievement [*What Works in Schools: Translating Research into Actions*, Marzano 2003].

<i>Year Two (2009-10)</i>	timeline	results indicators		person(s) responsible
Initiate implementation of Family School Connection (FSC) Home Visitor Program to build capacity of families to support achievement at home for selected students in Tier II and Tier III.	2009-2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSC initiated • Social Worker and two home visitors hired. • Training provided to FSC staff. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referred students' benchmark assessments, progress reports, and/or CMT 	Grants Coordinator Principal Program Supervisor Home Visitors