



**William R. Peck Full Service Community School
School Improvement Plan for 2011-12
Timeline and Process Checklist**

Overall Timeline	Action	Who is Responsible	By When	Complete?
August 2011 Plan	Introduce DIP/SIP topics to principals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment between DIP & SIP • SIP development process • Principles of SIP development 	Plan Ctte.	August 3	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Share model SIPs for guidance	Plan Ctte.	Early-August	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Review and analyze key school data	Principals	Mid-August	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Action plan and set school targets	Principals	Mid-August	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Provide core-message to use for communication	Plan Ctte.	August 22	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Complete DRAFT SIP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce to school staff • Submit to Assistant Superintendent 	Principals	August 29	<input type="checkbox"/>
September 2011 Implement	Provide feedback on DRAFT SIPs to Principals	Plan Ctte.	September 6	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Provide support to Principals on feedback	Plan Ctte.	Mid-Sept	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Submit FINAL SIP to Assistant Superintendent	Principals	September 16	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Review and approve SIPs	School Ctte.	October 3	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Provide core-message to use for communication	Plan Ctte.	Early Oct	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Share SIP with parents and other stakeholders	Principals	Early Oct	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Share forum and timeline for monitoring progress	Plan Ctte.	Early Oct r	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sept – June 2012 Monitor Progress	School Instructional Leadership teams meet regularly (TBD) to monitor progress on plan, analyze performance data, and action plan for future improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School and district generate data for ongoing monitoring • SILT meeting topics focus on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Generating concrete intervention and improvement strategies <input type="checkbox"/> Sharing what is working via measurable increases in student learning <input type="checkbox"/> Analyzing performance data <input type="checkbox"/> Updating quarterly data to display and share progress towards goals 	Principals with District ILT support	School year	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Share progress towards goals with key stakeholders	Principals	School year	<input type="checkbox"/>

**William R. Peck Full Service Community School
School Improvement Plan
School Year 2011-2012**

Created by: Peck Instructional Leadership Team/P. Hyry-Dermith

Overview of District and School Improvement Planning

District Improvement Planning: The District Accelerated Improvement Plan was created in Summer 2011 to provide a focused plan for action in the Holyoke Public Schools. The plan focuses on improvements that can move the needle to help students this school year.

The plan includes three strategic objectives and 8 initiatives:

1. Instructional Quality
 - a. District Instructional Leadership Team(DILT)
 - b. School Instructional Leadership Team (SILT)
 - c. Teachers
2. Data and inquiry
 - a. District uses data and inquiry to inform instruction and evaluate programs
 - b. School uses data and inquiry to inform instruction and evaluate programs
 - c. Teachers use data and inquiry to inform instruction
3. Focus on literacy
 - a. Develop and implement an aligned standards-based curriculum
 - b. Use common formative assessments to inform instruction
 - c. Provide tiered intervention system to target student needs, particularly ELL and Special Education students

School Improvement Planning: Peck's School Improvement Plan (SIP) aligns to the District Improvement Plan by having school-specific Evidence of Change and Activities for each District Strategic Objective. Peck has a School Instructional Leadership Team that includes representation from all key constituencies in the school: administration, instructional coaches, teachers from multiple grade levels and disciplines, guidance, and Peck's full service community school leader.

In addition to addressing the District Strategic Objectives, Peck's SIP includes two additional core objectives and related initiatives:

4. Strengthening Student Performance in Math
 - a. Continuous improvement of Math Workshop at all grade levels
 - b. Math interventions
5. Implementation of a coherent, tiered system for more effectively managing student behavioral challenges
 - a. Faculty training and support for classroom-level management (Tier I)
 - b. (Non-disciplinary) prevention and intervention supports (Tier II)
 - c. Intensive behavior support coordination for students presenting chronic and serious behavior management challenges (Tier III)

School Analysis of Needs:

Broadest Analysis: 2011 summative assessment data showed significant growth overall in student achievement in math at Peck and growth (though not as significant) in ELA/Reading as measured by the MCAS, and strong growth in ELL performance as measured by the MEPA. We take the overall growth trajectory of the past two years as an indication that Peck is generally headed in the right direction; at the same time, we recognize that Peck's Composite Performance Indexes in virtually all areas, and its overall NCLB performance rating of "Very Low" under NCLB, remain clear indicators that major improvements in learning and teaching continue to be needed at our school. Thus Peck's leadership and faculty continue to accept, without question, responsibility for the need for improvement in student outcomes in 2011-12 and beyond.

Detailed Analysis: During 2010-11 Peck engaged in multiple simultaneous improvement efforts related to:

- Disseminated leadership, including intensive development of the school's Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) and Full-Service Community School Coordinating Committee (FSCS-CC);
- Intensifying Peck's data-driven instruction process involving goal-setting and tracking progress for every student, classroom, and grade level in Literacy and Math posted on large charts ("data walls"), and supporting team meetings to review data and plan steps to adjust and improve instruction;
- Continued program development in Readers'/Writers' Workshop (RWW—including initial roll-out of Leveled Literacy Intervention [LLI] in grades 1-3 and Systems 44 in grades 4-5), English Language Development (ELD), and Math (including extension of Math interventions in grades 3-8 via ALEKS software and initial piloting/implementation of MySkills Tutor software in grades 1-8);
- A whole-school focus on reading comprehension involving implementation of comprehension instruction in every classroom via the Read-Aloud/Think-Aloud (RA/TA) practice; and
- Increased support for students and families through a wide range of wrap-around opportunities and services organized through the Full Service Community School initiative.

While not as strong as the prior year's gains, Peck's gains in 2011 were substantial enough for us to believe that the combination of initiatives noted above continued to pay dividends, and thus much of this School Improvement Plan is focused on continuing efforts initiated in prior years. At the same time, it is clear that specific steps need to be taken to strengthen student learning and performance in grade 4, where both the Composite Performance Index and Student Growth Percentile outcomes were far below all other grades in both ELA and Math, with the SGP in Math (8 for Grade 4, with the next lowest being the Grade 5 SGP of 65) surfacing as particularly distressing. This discrepancy is significant enough to make improved achievement at grade 4 a top priority for scheduling, personnel, coaching, and resource allocation in 2011-12.

Subgroup Analysis: With a student population that is approximately 90% Latina/o and more than 90% low-income, a focus on racial or economic subgroups is of limited use for Peck. Thus the ELL (Limited English Proficient) and Special Education subgroups, which comprise approximately 40% and 25% of the school's population respectively, are the most critical groups for analysis and potential action. As the table below makes clear, significant achievement gaps remain between the performance of students in these subgroups and aggregate student performance at Peck. More encouraging news is that, with the exception of Math for Special Education students¹, CPI gains among the students in these subgroups were in fact greater than aggregate CIP gains, which suggests that the achievement gap was slightly decreased in ELA overall and in Math for LEP students at Peck in 2010-11. Student Growth Percentile data in Math shows a more complex picture. For example, while SGPs for Math were generally positive, with Peck's LEP/FLEP and Special Education student groups both making above average growth (SGPs of 70 and 62, respectively) compared to their peers with similar histories statewide, subgroup SGPs lagged behind the aggregate

¹ In the area of Math for Special Education students, an unusually high proportion of students in substantially separate programs who were assessed via the MCAS-ALT "portfolio" process received scores of Incomplete (and thus 0 or 25 CPI points rather than the 50, 75, or 100 CPI points awarded to complete portfolios), resulting in a negative impact on the overall CPI for that subgroup. This helps to explain why Peck's Student Growth Percentile for Special Education students, which does *not* reflect students taking the MCAS-ALT, was above average (62) despite the fact that the CPI for this subgroup (which *does* include students taking the ALT) showed smaller gains than those of other subgroups.

SGP, particularly in for SGP students (62 as opposed to an aggregate 72). Similarly, ELA SGPs for ELL and Special Education subgroups (55 and 51 respectively) lagged behind aggregate SGP.

Peck Aggregate vs. Subgroup Comparisons for 2010 & 2011 CPI gains and Student Growth Percentiles

Test	Group/Subgroup	2010 CPI	2011 CPI	CPI Gain	2011 SGP
ELA MCAS	Aggregate	58.9	63.9	5.0	59
	LEP/FLEP (ELLs)	44.6	51.0	6.4	55
	Special Education	48.0	55.0	7.0	51
Math MCAS	Aggregate	52.2	58.5	6.3	72
	LEP/FLEP (ELLs)	43.2	51.3	8.1	70
	Special Education	48.2	50.8	2.6	62

It is additionally worth noting that Peck’s MEPA results demonstrated significant growth in English language skills on the part of the school’s ELLs, with 69% of students growing at least one ELL level over prior testing results, as compared to fewer than half of students making similar growth in 2009-10.

It is our contention that the whole-school approach to instructional improvement, combined with ongoing development of high-quality core curriculum (English Language Development, Functional Academics) for specific populations and increasingly effective interventions (LLI, Systems 44, Read 180, Math Success, and computer-based individualized Math Skills work), will lead to continued growth in student achievement on the part of Peck’s subgroups as well as its aggregate population. At the same time, Peck will need to focus more strongly on Inclusion Special Education and Sheltered English Immersion instruction over time in order to continue to close the achievement gap at our school.

Behavior Management Initiative: Finally, an analysis of disciplinary data over the past three years demonstrates that while overall disciplinary incidents decreased very significantly (by approximately 23%) from SY 08-09 to SY 09-10, and decreased again (by about 12%) from SY09-10 to SY10-11, the overall number of disciplinary incidents, suspension rates, and days lost to suspension at Peck remain too high, with too much student time on learning being lost as a result. This understanding led to the formation of Peck’s Behavior Management Working Group in 2009-10 as part of Peck’s ongoing transformation into a Full Service Community School. The Behavior Management working group met as a study group for a year and a half and presented to Peck’s FSCS Coordinating Committee/School Council its recommendations for a school-wide behavior management initiative in spring 2011. After receiving approval to move to implementation planning, the Working Group has developed an implementation plan to strengthen student behavior management beginning in 2011-12, with the goal of reducing disciplinary incidents and days lost to suspension by at least 20% school-wide for each of the next five years.

School Theory of Action:

We believe that **IF**:

- Peck’s instructional leaders become increasingly effective in setting specific student performance goals and then facilitating with the Peck faculty a continuous process of using assessment data to monitor progress, reflect, and plan instructional adjustments and improvements ; and
- All of Peck’s teachers become increasingly adept at implementing specific instructional practices—including practices supporting literacy—that have been demonstrated to help improve student achievement; and
- Peck students who need additional support in literacy and/or math receive high-quality interventions; and
- Peck’s faculty implements a comprehensive, tiered system for student behavior management that increases time on learning for all students; **then**

Student achievement at the Peck Full Service Community School will continue to improve in 2011-12, and we will have made substantial progress toward Peck’s overall goal of sending every student to high school ready to achieve at his/her maximum potential.

Grade Level	Indicator		Latest	Historic		
			2010-11	'09-'10	'08-'09	'07-'08
Grades K-8	Student attendance		92.0%	92.1%	91.0%	---
	Teacher attendance		97.3%	97.4%	97.8%	---
	Disciplinary incidents		2,123	2,419	3,128	---
Kindergarten	% reading at grade level (level B/C)		55%	44%	--	---
Grade 1	% reading at grade level (level I/J)		64%	46%	--	---
Grade 2	% reading at grade level (level L/M)		55%	38%	--	---
Grade 3	ELA	MCAS proficient and above	22%	22%	8%	---
		SGP	N/A	N/A	N/A	---
		CPI	54.3	58.9	39.4	---
	Math	MCAS proficient and above	55%	33%	4%	---
		SGP	N/A	N/A	N/A	---
		CPI	79.8	68.5	36.2	---
Grade 4	ELA	MCAS proficient and above	11%	9%	6%	---
		SGP	23.5	31.0	15.0	---
		CPI	42.2	37.7	32.5	---
	Math	MCAS proficient and above	7%	0%	6%	---
		SGP	8.0	35.0	30.0	---
		CPI	43.0	36.3	33.5	---
Grade 5	ELA	MCAS proficient and above	27%	23%	6%	---
		SGP	68.0	69.0	34.5	---
		CPI	62.0	56.7	43.3	---
	Math	MCAS proficient and above	15%	12%	2%	---
		SGP	65.0	55.0	40.0	---
		CPI	55.7	42.3	27.4	---
Sci.	MCAS proficient and above	4%	8%	8%	---	
Grade 6	ELA	MCAS proficient and above	17%	10%	8%	---
		SGP	52	42.0	39.0	---
		CPI	55.2	46.1	58.1	---
	Math	MCAS proficient and above	22%	16%	14%	---
		SGP	81.0	67.0	36.0	---
		CPI	55.4	46.1	52.5	---
Grade 7	ELA	MCAS proficient and above	36%	39%	16%	---
		SGP	71.5	81.5	29.5	---
		CPI	66.4	79.0	53.6	---
	Math	MCAS proficient and above	23%	20%	17%	---
		SGP	91.5	82.0	69.0	---
		CPI	57.8	64.1	47.2	---
Grade 8	ELA	MCAS proficient and above	61%	30%	46%	---
		SGP	63	75.5	54.5	---
		CPI	83.8	67.5	74.3	---
	Math	MCAS proficient and above	26%	16%	7%	---
		SGP	74.0	80.0	41.0	---
		CPI	60.6	53.7	42.3	---
Sci.	MCAS proficient and above	3%	4%	6%	---	
All Grades	ELA	MCAS proficient and above	26%	23%	17%	---
		SGP	59.0	57.0	33.0	---
		CPI	64.0	58.9	51.6	---
	Math	MCAS proficient and above	24%	15%	9%	---
		SGP	72.0	63.0	41.0	---
		CPI	58.5	51.9	40.5	---

Performance Targets

District Performance Targets (based on 2010 data):

- District MCAS ELA proficiency will increase by the end of SY2011-12
 - 1st graders reading on grade level (I or J) will increase by 10 percentage points
 - 3rd grade MCAS proficiency will increase to 34% from 25%
 - 5th grade MCAS proficiency will increase to 31% from 23%
 - 7th grade MCAS proficiency will increase to 40% from 32%
 - 8th grade MCAS proficiency will increase to 52% from 44%
- District MCAS Math proficiency will increase by the end of SY2011-12
 - 3rd grade MCAS proficiency will increase to 34% from 25%
 - 5th grade MCAS proficiency will increase to 31% from 23%
 - 7th grade MCAS proficiency will increase to 40% from 32%
 - 8th grade MCAS proficiency will increase to 52% from 44%

School performance targets (annual outcomes)

- Peck's CPI for **ELA** will increase from 64.0 to **76.0** by the end of SY2011-12. **Grade level targets:**
 - Kindergarteners reading at or above grade level (Benchmark C) will increase from 55% to **70%**
 - 1st graders reading at or above grade level (Benchmark I) will increase from 64% to **70%** (a 15% increase over this cohort's performance in Kindergarten)
 - 2nd graders reading at or above grade level (Benchmark M) will increase from 55% to **79%** (a 15% increase over this cohort's performance in Grade 1)
 - 3rd grade MCAS CPI will increase from 54.2 to **70** (based on 2010-11 Grade 2 cohort analysis)
 - 4th grade MCAS CPI will increase from 42.2 to **69.4** (based on 2011 Grade 3 cohort results)
 - 5th grade MCAS CPI will be **61.4** (based on 2011 Grade 4 cohort results)
 - 6th grade MCAS CPI will increase from 55.2 to **74.6** (based on 2011 Grade 5 cohort results)
 - 7th grade MCAS CPI will increase from 66.4 to **70.1** (based on 2011 Grade 6 cohort results)
 - 8th grade MCAS proficiency will be **77.6** (based on 2011 Grade 7 cohort results)
- Peck's CPI for **Math** will increase to **72** from **58.5** by the end of SY2011-12. **Grade level targets:**
 - 1st graders scoring 80% or higher on the spring Envisions assessment will increase to **60%**
 - 2nd graders scoring 80% or higher on the spring Envisions assessment will increase to **60%**
 - 3rd grade MCAS CPI will increase from 79.8 to **86**
 - 4th grade MCAS CPI will increase from 43.0 to **83** (based on 2011 Grade 3 cohort results)
 - 5th grade MCAS CPI will increase from 55.7 to **60** (based on 2011 Grade 4 cohort results)
 - 6th grade MCAS CPI will increase from 55.4 to **69** (based on 2011 Grade 5 cohort results)
 - 7th grade MCAS CPI will increase from 57.8 to **67** (based on 2011 Grade 6 cohort results)
 - 8th grade MCAS CPI will increase from 60.6 to **63** (based on 2011 Grade 7 cohort results)
- Peck's ELLs' performance on the Spring 2012 **MEPA** will improve as follows:
 - **80%** of the students starting the year at Levels 1-4 will increase at least one level
 - **100%** of the students starting the year at Level 5 will achieve Formerly Limited English Proficient (FLEP) status

School performance targets (mid-year outcomes)

ELA:

- **100%** of **first graders** who were at or above grade level according to the Benchmark in September will increase by at least **three** guided reading levels by January
- **75%** of **first graders** who were below grade level according to the Benchmark in September will increase by at least **four** guided reading levels by January
- **At least 50%** of **second graders** who were at or above grade level according to the Benchmark in September will increase by **at least three** guided reading levels by January
- **All remaining second graders** who were at or above grade level according to the Benchmark in September will increase by at least **two** guided reading levels by January
- **75%** of **second graders** who were below grade level according to the Benchmark in September will increase by at least **three** guided reading levels by January

For Grades 3-8:

- **100%** of **3rd through 8th graders** who were at or above grade level according to the MAP in September will increase their scores by **at least half** of the average annual growth for their grade levels on the January MAP
- **50%** of **3rd through 8th graders** who were below grade level according to the MAP in September will increase by **at least 75%** of the average annual growth for their grade levels on the January MAP (and will thus be on target for gaining the equivalent of 1.5 grades by the spring)

Math:

- **60%** of **1st and 2nd graders** will score at least **70%** on the January Envisions assessment
- **100%** of **3rd through 8th graders** who were at or above grade level according to the MAP in September will increase their scores by **at least half** of the average annual growth for their grade levels on the January MAP
- **50%** of **3rd through 8th graders** who were below grade level according to the MAP in September will increase by **at least 75%** of the average annual growth for their grade levels on the January MAP (and will thus be on target for gaining the equivalent of 1.5 grades by the spring)

ELL: 80% of Peck's ELLs will gain at least one stage on the Speaking & Listening component of the Rigby ELL assessment from September to January.

Strategic Objective #1: Build instructional quality

District Activities:

- Forming a district-wide instructional leadership team
- Forming school-based instructional leadership teams
- Defining effective instruction
- Implementing a walkthrough tool that measures effective instruction
- Using data from walkthroughs and assessments to examine and improve instructional quality

School Non-Negotiables

- Build an instructional leadership team
- Build a common understanding of what is effective instruction
- Use data and inquiry to identify student needs and improve instruction

Evidence of Change	Activity	Person(s) Responsible	Target Date	Complete ?
<p>90% of Peck teachers are consistently developing and implementing instructional plans grounded in clear and specific student learning objectives by June 2012.</p>	<i>Initial professional development for faculty on student learning objectives.</i>	<i>Principal & ILT</i>	<i>8/22 and 8/29/11 (reinforced at 9/12/11 faculty meeting)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Cycle 1. <i>Classroom visits to obtain baseline data about student learning objectives</i>	<i>Principal</i>	<i>9/15/11</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>ILT determines needs for, and approaches to, next steps of teacher professional learning about student learning objectives</i>	<i>Principal & ILT</i>	<i>9/30/11</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Next steps of professional learning about student learning objectives are carried out with full faculty</i>	<i>Principal & ILT</i>	<i>11/30/11</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Cycle 2. <i>Classroom visits to obtain updated data about student learning objectives</i>	<i>Principal</i>	<i>12/15/11</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>ILT determines needs for, and approaches to, next steps of teacher professional learning about student learning objectives</i>	<i>Principal & ILT</i>	<i>12/23/11</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Next steps of professional learning about student learning objectives are carried out with full faculty</i>	<i>Principal & ILT</i>	<i>2/17/12</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Cycle 3. <i>Classroom visits to obtain updated data about student learning objectives</i>	<i>Principal</i>	<i>3/9/12</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>ILT determines needs for, and approaches to, next steps of teacher professional learning about student learning objectives</i>	<i>Principal & ILT</i>	<i>3/26/12</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Next steps of professional learning about student learning objectives are carried out with full faculty</i>	<i>Principal & ILT</i>	<i>5/25/12</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Final review <i>of teacher planning documents to obtain updated data about student learning objectives & sharing at final faculty meeting</i>	<i>Principal</i>	<i>6/11/12</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<p>90% of teachers are consistently implementing strategies for checking for understanding on the part of all students (“CU”, AKA daily formative assessment) by June 2012.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>90% of teachers are consistently implementing explicit reading comprehension instruction (via Read-Aloud/Think-Aloud or “RA/TA”) in their classrooms by June 2012</p>	<p><i>Initial professional development for faculty on CU and RA/TA, including sharing of tools and process that will be used for classroom walkthroughs</i></p>	<p><i>Principal & ILT</i></p>	<p><i>8/22 & 8/29/11 (reinforced at 9/12/11 faculty meeting)</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p><i>Sharing of walkthrough tools and what teachers can expect (from school and district leadership) in terms of walkthroughs and Shared Self-Assessment</i></p>	<p><i>Principal</i></p>	<p><i>9/12/11 faculty meeting</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p>Cycle 1. <i>Initial walkthroughs to determine baseline for classroom implementation of CU and RA/TA</i></p>	<p><i>Principal</i></p>	<p><i>9/15/11</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p><i>ILT determines needs for, and approaches to, next steps of teacher professional learning about CU and RA/TA</i></p>	<p><i>Principal & ILT</i></p>	<p><i>9/30/11</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p><i>Next steps of professional learning about CU and RA/TAs are carried out with full faculty</i></p>	<p><i>Principal & ILT</i></p>	<p><i>11/30/11</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p>Cycle 2. <i>Shared Self-Assessment (SSA) to obtain updated data about CU and RA/TA implementation</i></p>	<p><i>Principal & ILT</i></p>	<p><i>12/15/11</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p><i>ILT determines needs for, and approaches to, next steps of teacher professional learning about CU & RA/TA</i></p>	<p><i>Principal & ILT</i></p>	<p><i>12/23/11</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p><i>Next steps of professional learning about CU and RA/TA are carried out with full faculty</i></p>	<p><i>Principal & ILT</i></p>	<p><i>2/17/12</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p>Cycle 3. <i>Shared Self-Assessment (SSA) to obtain updated data about CU and RA/TA implementation</i></p>	<p><i>Principal</i></p>	<p><i>4/27/12</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p><i>ILT determines needs for, and approaches to, next steps of teacher professional learning about student learning objectives</i></p>	<p><i>Principal & ILT</i></p>	<p><i>5/4/12</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p><i>Next steps of professional learning about student learning objectives are carried out with full faculty</i></p>	<p><i>Principal & ILT</i></p>	<p><i>5/25/12</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p>Final Shared Self-Assessment (SSA) to obtain updated data about CU and RA/TA implementation</p>	<p><i>Principal & ILT</i></p>	<p><i>6/8/12</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p><i>Sharing of final data about CU and RA/TA implementation at last faculty meeting</i></p>	<p><i>Principal</i></p>	<p><i>6/11/12</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>

Strategic Objective #2: Use data and inquiry

District Activities

- Developing and implementing a common district-wide inquiry process focused on improving instruction
- Consistently collecting, analysing and using quality data at the district, school and classroom level
- Using data from formative assessments to examine and improve instructional quality

School Non-Negotiables

- Use an inquiry process in ILT, PLC, data team settings to analyze data focused on improving instruction
- Develop a system to input and verify quality of school data
- Administer ELA and math assessments and use data templates to submit assessment data to the district per established protocols

Evidence of Change	Activity	Person(s) Responsible	Target Date	Complete?
<i>End-of-year targets, short-term targets, and full-year calendar for assessments, data meetings, and professional learning is in place and communicated to all faculty by August 30</i>	<i>Finalize annual outcome targets</i>	<i>Principal, ILT</i>	8/8/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Develop and finalize short-term outcome targets</i>	<i>Principal, ILT</i>	8/16/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Develop and finalize full-year assessment calendar</i>	<i>Principal, ILT (based on district guidelines)</i>	8/22/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Distribute and review targets and assessment calendar to faculty</i>	<i>Principal, ILT</i>	8/30/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Assessments are carried out according to the calendar with at least 98% of students participating in all assessments</i>	<i>Plan for administration of assessments (develop schedules, gather materials, etc.)</i>	<i>Coaches, teachers</i>	Per calendar	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Administer assessments according to calendar, including making provisions for make-ups for absent students</i>	<i>Teachers</i>	Per calendar	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>100% of data is verified for quality at the school level and submitted to the district within 10 days of completion of assessments</i>	<i>Receive and review district data planning and submission tools</i>	<i>Principal, ILT</i>	[pending receipt from district]	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Submit data to school leadership according to protocols established by district</i>	<i>Teachers</i>	Within 5 school days of assessment completion	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Review and submit data to district according to protocols</i>	<i>Coaches, Principal</i>	Within 10 days of assessment completion	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Inquiry process is in place and used at SILT and grade-level meetings to monitor assessment data by 11/4/11</i>	<i>Develop protocols for grade-level data review meetings (identifying areas of strength & weakness, prioritizing, and action planning)</i>	<i>Coaches, FOR Consultant, principal</i>	8/30/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Monthly grade-level data review meetings carried out according to protocols</i>	<i>Principal, coaches, grade level teams</i>	October-May per calendar	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>ILT reviews of grade-level data review meeting results and mid-year outcomes compared to targets</i>	<i>Principal, ILT</i>	October-May per calendar	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>MCAS-ALT portfolios submitted from Peck will be 100% complete*</i>	<i>Substantially separate special education (RISE and Functional) program teachers will report consistent progress and mutual support for portfolio development during meetings with principal.</i>	<i>Principal, substantially separate program staff</i>	Meetings in Oct & Dec 11 and , Feb/Mar 12	<input type="checkbox"/>

*Exception: Severely physically disabled students unable to attend school enough for complete portfolio development.

Strategic Objective #3: 85% of all Holyoke children will be proficient readers by the end of third grade by 2014

District Activities:

- Identifying and implementing effective early literacy instruction
- Implementing and analyzing data from walkthroughs and assessments to ensure instruction is meeting the needs of every K-3 student
- Providing ongoing professional development and technical assistance to instructional staff to ensure best practices (K-3) are being implemented across all schools
- Developing parent centers at each school that will serve to provide parents/guardians with appropriate information and guidance in helping to advance the reading ability of their students to proficiency
- Providing regular communication and outreach to parents of young children focused on the importance of early literacy skills and being prepared to succeed in school
- Initiating a citywide effort to increase public awareness of the district's 85% literacy proficiency goal and providing professional development to all early childhood education providers and caretakers on best practices in early literacy and school readiness

School Non-Negotiables

- Implement effective early literacy instruction
- Use data and inquiry to ensure instruction is meeting the needs of every K-3 student
- Develop a parent center that will serve to provide parents/guardians with information and guidance in helping students become proficient readers
- Provide focused communication and outreach to parents of young children focused on the importance of early literacy skills and becoming proficient readers

Evidence of Change	Activity	Person(s) Responsible	Target Date	Complete ?
<i>90% of K-3 teachers are consistently developing and implementing instructional plans based on effective early literacy practices.</i>	Weekly Professional Learning Community sessions for K-3 teachers focused on high-quality implementation of the Readers/Writers' Workshop	Literacy Coach (J. Holloway)	Weekly 9/11 through 6/12	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Professional learning in Guided Reading and Interactive writing for K-3 teachers	ELA/Humanities Director (Marie Cole)	January-June 2012	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Professional learning in Leveled Literacy Intervention for Literacy Specialist teachers in grades 1-3	ELA/Humanities Director (Marie Cole)	Three times/yr per ELA PD plan	
	Targeted individual coaching for teachers based on identified needs and/or teacher requests	Literacy Coach (J. Holloway)	Ongoing	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Teachers report classroom utilization of practices learned in PLCs and PD sessions when asked during PLC sessions.	Teachers (facilitated by Literacy Coach)	September 2011 ongoing	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Administrator walk-throughs reveal consistent integration of identified effective early literacy practices in an increasing percentage of classrooms over the course of the year, reaching 90% of classrooms by June 2012.	School and district administrators	Walkthroughs beginning January 2012 and continuing to June 2012	
<i>Students in grades K-3 are provided appropriately tiered instruction based on analysis of relevant data to determine their literacy strengths and needs</i>	Identification of tiered instructional needs of students in grades 1-3 based on Fall Benchmark Assessment results	Classroom & Literacy Specialist teachers	10/7/2011	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Development of prioritized list of students for classroom groupings and supplementary literacy interventions (Guided Reading & LLI grades 1-3; Systems 44 in Grade 3)	Classroom & Literacy Specialist teachers	10/14/11	
	Implementation of tiered instruction for students in grades 1-3 based on prioritized list above	Classroom & Literacy Specialist teachers	10/17/11	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Team and individual teacher presentations in data meetings with principal include identification of areas of progress and continued struggle in each classroom in grades K-3	Classroom teachers, Literacy Coach, Principal	Bi-monthly beginning 11/11 (beginning 2/12 for Kinder)	
	Implementation of literacy interventions (LLI and/or supplemental Guided Reading) to kindergarten students identified as able to benefit	Literacy Specialist &/or retired teachers	Beginning after 2/12 data meeting	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Peck third grade students' MCAS Open Response (OR) and Short Response (SR) results will improve from 38% of all possible points (2011 testing) to at least 50% of all possible points on the 2012 test.</i>	Monthly OR and SR assessments for Grade 3 students based on MCAS-like (early in year) and MCAS release reading passages (mid-year on)	Principal, Literacy Coach, Grade 3 teachers	Monthly October 2011-March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Utilization of MCAS rubrics and Looking at Student Work (LASW) protocol to identify student strengths and needs re: OR & SR performance	Literacy Coach, Grade 3 teachers	Monthly October 2011-March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Targeted instruction to build on identified strengths, and address identified needs, on OR & SR items, including <i>use of Readers' Notebooks as an ongoing formative assessment tool</i>	Grade 3 teachers with support from Literacy Coach	Monthly October 2011-March 2012	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Peck first and second grade teachers will take specific steps to improve students' readiness for success in third grade on Open Response and Short Response questions.</i>	Review of third grade MCAS Reading passages, related SR & OR items, and standard-meeting responses by early literacy teachers.	Coach (facilitated in PLC)	November 2011	
	Grades 1-2 teachers brainstorm ideas then develop action plan for addressing OR/SR readiness. (May include increased time on writing in response to reading, specific shared writing activities, etc.)	Grades 1-2 teachers (facilitated by coach)	November 2011	
	Ongoing cycle of implementation of action plans, reflection on results, and adjustment of action plans to continuously strengthen student OR/SR readiness	Gr 1-2 teachers (facilitated by coach)	December 2011- June 2012	
At least 75 Peck families with young children participate in activities promoting early literacy and family literacy.	Parents In the Classroom (PIC) project: parents from at least one classroom per grade level are invited to literacy lessons observe, participate interactively with their children, and debrief afterward about ways to extend the learning into their homes.	Family Engagement Workgroup, FAEC Coordinator, teachers	October 2011- June 2012	<input type="checkbox"/>
	All monthly <i>charla</i> (informal family workshop series) sessions will incorporate discussion, sharing, and promotion of home literacy practices.	<i>Family Engagement workgroup, FAEC</i>	November 2011- June 2012	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Honoring Family Literacy workshop series for families of students in grades K & 1 in collaboration with Enchanted Circle Theater	<i>Family Engagement workgroup, FAEC, teachers, ECT</i>	October- December 2011	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Implementation of the Ready For Peck initiative results in identification of, development of relationships with, and targeted support for the families of at least 50 children who will attend Peck in 2012-13.</i>	Identify families of four and five year old children living in the Peck Attendance Zone via student surveys, speaking with parents, and collaboration with early childhood and pediatric providers.	Ready for Peck Coordinator	October 2011- August 2012	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Contact, develop relationships with, and assess the strengths and needs of identified families and their future kindergarten students.	Ready for Peck Coordinator	November 2011- August 2012	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Provide tiered support (referrals, individual & group education, intensive support) via group sessions, home visits, and phone calls to identified families.	Ready for Peck Coordinator	November 2011- August 2012	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Organize and carry out "Orientation to Peck" series for identified families.	November 2011-Aug 2012	May-August 2012	<input type="checkbox"/>

Strategic Objective #4: Focus on Literacy in Grades 4-8

District Activities

- Measuring and monitoring student progress in literacy
- Improving achievement of students who struggle through the implementation and monitoring of interventions in literacy
- Identifying skills required for increasing student achievement in literacy and providing teachers with professional development and instructional coaching

School Non-Negotiables

- Ensure English Language Learners have access to core literacy instruction specifically designed to meet their needs
- Identify struggling readers and schedule appropriate interventions with the most qualified literacy staff
- Administer assessments and analyze data to improve instruction to meet student needs
- Provide job-embedded coaching and professional development to improve the quality of literacy instruction

Evidence of Change	Activity	Person(s) Responsible	Target Date	Complete ?
<i>Intervention plan is in place, interventions are initiated by October 17, 2011, and intervention groups and strategies are revised/redeveloped over the course of the year based on ongoing assessment of student progress and needs</i>	Students are prioritized for immediate intervention in grades 4-8 (Systems 44, Read 180) based on prior-year assessment data	Guidance counselors, S44/R180 teachers, Asst. Principals	8/30/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Grades 6-8 Read 180 initiated	Read 180 teacher	9/2/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Grades 4-5 Systems 44 initiated	S44 teacher	10/7/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Fall Benchmark (BAS) assessments in grades 4-8	ELA teachers, literacy specialists, Literacy coach	10/7/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Continuous progress monitoring in LLI groups, S44 & R180 classes, and grade-level literacy classrooms, with intervention revisions & reassignments based on this assessment	Intervention & classroom literacy teachers at all grades	11/1/11 ongoing	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Principal walk-throughs and shared self-assessments reveal consistent utilization of high-quality instructional practices in 90% of literacy classrooms by June 2012</i>	Refresher trainings for experienced literacy teachers, and initial training for teachers of literacy new to Peck/Holyoke, in the BAS	District Humanities Director, Literacy Coach	Per district calendar	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Professional learning sessions for teachers of literacy utilizing cycle of inquiry (Looking At Student Work/assessment results; identification of focus strategies for shared learning; shared learning about focus strategies; teacher implementation of strategies in classroom; back to LASW/assessment review)	Literacy coach	At least bi-weekly starting week of 9/12/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Principal walk-throughs and shared self-assessments to identify degree of implementation of focus strategies in literacy classrooms	Principal, ILT	Walk-throughs & SSAs per schedule under SO 1	<input type="checkbox"/>

ADDITIONAL NOTES:

1. While this is not a "change", Peck will continue to implement its well-established, comprehensive English Language Development 1 & 2 programming for early-stage ELLs, and Sheltered English Immersion programming for intermediate and advanced ELLs.
2. See also the final "evidence of change" statement ["90% of teachers are consistently implementing explicit reading comprehension instruction (via Read-Aloud/Think-Aloud or "RA/TA") in their classrooms by June 2012"] and related activities for Peck's plan regarding school-wide focus on literacy.

School Based Strategic Objective (Objective #5): Strengthen Student Performance in Math

School Strategic Objective: Meet mid- and end-of-year performance targets by combining excellent instruction in the Math Workshop (core curriculum) with effective interventions for struggling students.

Key School Activities

- Ongoing cycle of assessment, reflection, and adjustments to instruction results in continuous improvement in quality of teaching in learning in Math Workshop (core curriculum) in all Math classrooms
- Identify struggling math students and schedule appropriate interventions with the qualified Math staff
- Provide job-embedded coaching and professional development to improve the quality of Math instruction

Evidence of Change	Activity	Person(s) Responsible	Target Date	Complete ?
<i>Math data review meeting outcomes show that 100% of math teachers have analyzed key assessments (unit pre- & post-tests, Envisions & MAP, and MySkills & ALEKS reports) to identify areas of strength & need in student performance and have related action plans to maximize student results.</i>	<i>The cycle of inquiry for math—assessments, data review meetings according to established protocols including action planning, and ILT review—is identified under District/School Strategic Objective 2.</i>	Principal, Math Coach, Teachers of Math	Per calendar (Math data review mtgs in Nov., Jan., March)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Intervention plan is in place, interventions are initiated according to schedule, and intervention groups and strategies are revised/redeveloped over the course of the year based on ongoing assessment of student progress and needs</i>	<i>Intervention plan completed</i>	Math Coach	8/30/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Students prioritized for immediate intervention in grades 4-8 are identified</i>	Math Coach	8/30/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Intervention in grades 6-8 (via Math Success course) initiated</i>	Math Coach, Math Success teachers	8/31/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Teachers who will Math interventions are trained in MySkills Tutor</i>	Math coach	9/15/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Math interventions initiated in grades 4-5</i>	Math Coach, Gr 4-5 Math teachers	10/1/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Students prioritized for intervention in grades 2-3 are identified</i>	Math Coach, Gr 2-3 teachers	10/15/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Math interventions initiated in grades 2-3</i>	Math Coach, Gr 2-3 teachers	11/1/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Students prioritized for intervention in grade 1 are identified</i>	Math Coach, Gr 1 teachers	12/20/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Math interventions initiated in grades 2-3</i>	Math Coach, Gr 1 teachers	1/9/12	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Continuous progress monitoring of progress in Math Workshop and Math interventions classes; intervention plan revisions & reassignments based on this monitoring</i>	Math teachers (with support from Math coach)	Sept 2011-ongoing	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>As a result of Math vertical meetings and individualized support by coach for high-priority teachers of math, principal walk-throughs and shared self-assessments reveal consistent utilization of high-quality instructional practices in 90% of Math classrooms by June 2012</i>	<i>Math vertical meeting schedule completed</i>	Math coach (with principal)	10/31/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Vertical meetings held according to schedule</i>	Math coach & teachers	11/11-ongoing	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Teachers prioritized for individualized support identified</i>	Math coach (with principal)	8/30/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Prioritized teachers receive targeted support (co-planning, modeling, observation & feedback) from coach</i>	Math coach	9/11-ongoing	<input type="checkbox"/>

School Based Strategic Objective: Behavior Management System

School Strategic Objective: Implementation of a coherent, tiered system of behavior management results in continuous increase in time on learning for all students, as evidenced by a decrease of at least 20% in both disciplinary referrals and days lost to suspension during SY 2011-12.

Key School Activities

- Faculty training and ongoing consultation about expectations and available support for classroom management of challenging student behaviors [Tier I]
- Establishment of, and ongoing support for, a Caring Adult Team (CAT) to provide additional support for classroom management of challenging student behaviors to selected middle school teachers [Tier I]
- Deployment of Masters-level Social Work interns to provide (non-disciplinary) prevention/intervention support (brief time-outs) to students upon contact by teachers [Tier II]
- Intensive Behavioral Support services for selected students [Tier III]

Evidence of Change	Activity	Person(s) Responsible	Target Date	Complete ?
<i>80% of faculty members participate in initial training, and 30% of teachers participate in ongoing consultation support, related to classroom-level behavior management expectations and strategies. [Tier I support]</i>	Initial faculty training in tiered behavior management system (expectations, supports, and strategies)	AP (Jennings), Beh. Man. Workgroup	8/26/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Ongoing consultation support for faculty members regarding classroom behavior management expectations and strategies—weekly in September, bi-weekly in October/November, monthly Dec-June	AP (Jennings), Consultant (NEARI)	June 2012 (frequency as noted at left)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Classroom-level supports offered by CAT members [Tier 1] and graduate social work interns [Tier 2] contribute to 20% reduction in disciplinary referrals and suspension days</i>	Recruitment, scheduling, orientation, and initial placements of CAT volunteers	AP (Jennings), FSCS PM (Harding)	9/30/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Orientation and deployment of social work interns	AP (Jennings), FSCS PM (Harding)	9/9/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Monthly “community of practice” (learning & problem-solving) sessions for CAT volunteers and social work interns	AP (Jennings), FSCS PM (Harding), Consultant (NEARI)	October-ongoing	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Comprehensive supports (direct work with students, collaboration with other faculty members and family, and connection with external referral outlets) for students demonstrating serious and chronic behavioral challenges contribute to 20% reduction in disciplinary referrals and suspension days</i>	Hiring & initial orientation of Intensive Behavior Support Coordinator (IBSC)	School admin team	9/9/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Development of protocols and forms for IBSC work	IBSC, w/support from Jennings, Harding	9/30/11	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Assignment of IBSC caseload	Referral & Results Review Team (RRRT)	9/7/11 ongoing	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Development, implementation, and monitoring of comprehensive individual behavior support plans for students in caseload	IBSC	Sept. 2011 ongoing	<input type="checkbox"/>