

SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN

**Worcester Public Schools
2016 - 2017**



**Delivering on High Expectations and Outstanding
Results for All Students**

Burncoat Street

School

Deborah L. Catamero

Principal or Administrator

Maureen Binienda

Superintendent

I. School Instructional Leadership Team Members

School Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) Members shall include:

- Teachers (Representation of each grade level or dept/team-specify position, i.e. 2nd grade teacher, mathematics chair, etc.)
- Representatives of support populations (Special Education, English Language Learners, and other support staff)
- Administration (Principal, Assistant Principal)

The Instructional Leadership Team's primary role is to help lead the school's effort at supporting the improvement of teaching and learning. The ILT makes decisions about the school's instructional program and leads and monitors the implementation of a sound instructional focus. This instructional focus is unique and tailored to the needs of each school.

The ILT carefully monitors student performance data regarding progress toward goals, conducts several internal audits and self assessments to help determine future action plans for the school. In order to maintain steady progress, Instructional Leadership Teams meet regularly and frequently, at least twice a month.

Name	Position	ILT Meeting Dates
Deborah L. Catamero	Principal	Sept: September 22, 2016
John Gribouski	Assistant Principal	Oct: October 20, 2016
Jaime Wheeler	Lead Teacher	Nov: November 30, 2016
Beth Zeena	Focused Instructional Coach	Dec: December 15, 2016
Michelle Aghdam	ELL Teacher	Jan: January 26, 2017
Kathleen Chakarian	Grade 2 Teacher	Feb: February 16, 2017
Linda Luthman	Special Education	Mar: March 16, 2017
Kristie Santos	Grade 4 Teacher	Apr: April 12, 2017
		May: May 11, 2017
		June: June 1, 2017

I. Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Accountability Data

2016 Accountability Data - Burncoat Street

Organization Information			
District:	Worcester (03480000)	School type:	Elementary School
School:	Burncoat Street (03480035)	Grades served:	K,01,02,03,04,05,06
Region:	Commissioner's Districts	Title I status:	Title I School (SW)

Accountability Information		About the Data
Accountability and Assistance Level		
Level 3	Among lowest performing 20% of schools	
This school's overall performance relative to other schools in same school type (School percentiles: 1-99)		
All students:		15

This school's progress toward narrowing proficiency gaps (Cumulative Progress and Performance Index: 1-100)			
Student Group (Click group to view subgroup data)	On Target = 75 or higher - ■		View Detailed 2016 Data
	Less progress	More progress	
All students		84	Met Target
High needs		68	Did Not Meet Target
Econ. Disadvantaged		-	-
ELL and Former ELL		74	Did Not Meet Target
Students w/disabilities		67	Did Not Meet Target
Amer. Ind. or Alaska Nat.		-	-
Asian		-	-
Afr. Amer./Black		-	-
Hispanic/Latino		71	Did Not Meet Target
Multi-race, Non-Hisp./Lat.		-	-
Nat. Haw. or Pacif. Isl.		-	-
White		-	-

II. Comprehensive Needs Analysis

Areas of Strength	
Strength	Evidence
Science - CPI (Composite Performance Index), student growth percentile, and achievement levels increased.	<p>According to the 2016 Science MCAS, 44% of students scored proficient or higher, compared to 32% in 2015 (increase of 12%).</p> <p>The Composite Performance Index (CPI) for Science in 2016 was 74.1, compared to 62.5 in 2015 (an increase of 11.6 points).</p> <p>According to teacher observation, student feedback, and collaboration efforts, Science for Scientists is in its second year of implementation at Burncoat Prep. This program brings real life scientists into the school to work with and reinforce fourth and fifth grade students on standards based concepts they are learning in class.</p>
ELA - The Composite Performance Index, student growth percentile, and achievement levels increased.	<p>According to the 2016 English Language Arts MCAS, 43% of students scored proficient or higher, compared to 38.5% of students in 2015.</p> <p>Grade 3 - 33% of students scored proficient or higher, compared to 29% in 2015.</p> <p>Grade 5 - 55% of students scored proficient or higher, compared to 36% in 2015.</p> <p>Grade 3, Grade 4, Grade 5 - According to the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark in the Fall of 2016, 65%-70% of students in these grades are meeting or exceeding grade level expectations in reading.</p> <p>SRSD (Self Regulated Strategy Development) student writing samples and pre/post assessment data.</p>

Targeted Interventions and Early Literacy Instruction

Tier 3 Intervention Wilson Group - 86% of students increased their Benchmark Assessment level by 2-5 levels.

Leveled Literacy Intervention - Of the students that participated in the intervention, 100% of students increased their Benchmark Assessment level between 4 and 8 levels during the intervention period. 50% of the students exited the group with meeting or exceeding expectations. 50% of the group was approaching expectations and remained in the group for extended intervention.

Foundations - Implemented with fidelity. At least 80% of students score 80% or higher on their unit assessments in order to go on to the next unit of instruction. Teachers form small groups for re-teaching of targeted skills and re-test as needed to meet the 80% benchmark.

Common Planning Time - This time is used to collaborate with grade level team members, as well as across various grade levels. Student assessment and targeted instruction is discussed and teachers have the opportunity to plan and focus their lessons based on student need.

Professional Development - Close Reading strategies, read-alouds and modeling thinking across grade levels. Notice and Note is being utilized, specifically the signposts for reading comprehension. Teacher observation and student work has shown positive impacts on students analyzing text.

Areas of Concern	
Concern	Evidence
<p>MCAS Math Proficiency levels, pacing of current math programs, and additional resources needed to teach math concepts to mastery.</p>	<p>MCAS: All grades - 33.5% of students scored proficient, compared to 32.5% in 2015 (only a 1% increase). Grade 4 - 23% Proficient in 2016, compared to 29% in 2015 (decrease 6%). Grade 5 - 20% Proficient in 2016, compared to 23% in 2015 (only 3% decrease). Grade 6 - 38% Proficient in 2016, compared to 41% in 2015 (decrease 3%). School Results in MCAS Math by Standards indicate that not enough time was spent on teaching certain concepts to mastery: Grade 3 - There was a -20 point difference between the state and Grade 3 for topics related to Measurement and Data and understanding how concepts of area relate to multiplication and division. Grade 4 - There was a -22 point difference between the state and Grade 4 for topics related to Measurement and Data. For extending understanding of equivalent fractions and ordering, there was a -28 point difference. Grade 5 - There was a -38 point difference between the state and Grade 5 for topics related to Measurement and Data. Grade 6 - There was a -32 point difference between the state and Grade 6 for topics related to Geometry. Other resources need to be included to teach math standards to mastery. Use of GoMath as a resource, not our math program. Focus on teaching the standards and using various resources, not one particular program.</p>

<p>Reading Levels based on students' accuracy and comprehension - Grade 1 and Grade 6</p>	<p>According to the fall Benchmark Assessment data: Grade 1 - Meets/Exceeds - 44% Approaches - 10% Does not meet - 46% *61% of students that require intensive intervention are new students this year. *There are 9 students reading at a level A, upon entering Grade 1. Dibels - 50% of students require Intensive and Strategic support. Grade 6 - Meets/Exceeds - 39% Approaches - 6% Does not Meet - 55% *70% of students reading below grade in Grade 6 are Special Education or ELL students.</p>
<p>Formative Assessments</p>	<p>There is not an established routine of monitoring and reviewing formative assessments collaboratively. There needs to be an established routine of culture, collaboration, and sharing among staff members in regards to formative assessments. Formative assessments may be given, but not discussed enough among colleagues in regards to planning upcoming targeted lessons and for making "student-specific" changes to instruction. Formative assessments need to be part of the lesson plan with specific, clear expectations for teachers. There needs to be more frequent monitoring of student progress between the end of unit assessments for Math, Benchmark Assessment and pre/post data for Writing. Our overall proficiency levels for Math and ELA for last year can be evidence for this concern: Math - 33.5% Proficient - All grades ELA - 43% Proficient - All grades</p>

IV. Action Plan

Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration <i>Establishing a community of practice through leadership, shared responsibility for all students, and professional collaboration</i> (Focus on improving core instruction and tiered interventions systems using a variety of data)	
Prioritized Best Practices or Strategies	<p>Gradual Release of Responsibility Model across content areas.</p> <p>Focus on student discourse and higher order thinking, and questioning to promote deeper comprehension. Teachers will begin to expose students to the Signposts in Grade 2 and implement the Signposts within their balanced literacy block in Grades 3-6.</p> <p>Balanced Literacy - Access to grade level text, close reading, modeling and think alouds during whole group. Differentiated instruction during guided reading and targeted small groups based on student need. The balanced literacy block includes reading, writing, speaking, and listening.</p>
Instructional Leadership Team Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Common Planning Time - Teachers and leaders will collaborate on current initiatives and review student data. *Focused classroom observations with relevant and reflective feedback. *Provide Professional Development on current initiatives and use Common Planning Time to check-in on past initiatives. *On-going evaluation of tiered interventions.
School Performance Indicators and Data Sources	
ADULT IMPLEMENTATION INDICATOR	STUDENT RESULTS INDICATOR
<p>Data Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Common Planning Time minutes *Teacher/leader participation *Review of assessments and relevant data *Participation in targeted Professional Development *Implementation of formative assessments *Lessons follow the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model 	<p>Data Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Dibels, MAP (Measures of academic progress for Math and ELA), and Benchmark Assessment data *Student work samples across content areas *Student goal setting sheets *MCAS scores *SRSD (Self-Regulated Strategy Development) pre/post and formative assessment data

Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction

Employing intentional practices for improving teacher-specific and student-responsive instruction

(Focus on refining the use of observations and student-specific data so that constructive feedback to teachers is provided and student-specific needs are clearly identified to inform instructional responses)

Prioritized Best Practices or Strategies	<p>Informal observations with a focus on reflective feedback for the educator.</p> <p>Thorough review of data that includes “student-specific” needs and development of lessons to target areas of concern.</p> <p>Flexible groups that change according to student need. These groups target areas of concern for specific students.</p>
Instructional Leadership Team Implementation	<p>*Work together to develop varied reflective feedback templates that can be used for informal observations. Observations can be routine, or initiated by the educator as way for them to self-monitor their practice.</p> <p>*Use of CPT to analyze student data and develop formative assessments.</p> <p>*Monthly ILT meetings.</p>

School Performance Indicators and Data Sources

ADULT IMPLEMENTATION INDICATOR	STUDENT RESULTS INDICATOR
<p>Data Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Teacher/student observation. *Tiered system of support. *Evidence of formative assessment and how it was used to adjust/target instruction. *Development of flexible groups based on student need. 	<p>Data Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Dibels, MAP (Measures of Academic Progress, and Benchmark Assessment System data *Student work samples across content areas *Student goal setting sheets *MCAS scores *SRSD (Self-Regulated Strategy Development for writing) pre/post and formative assessment data *Running records *Informal assessments

Providing Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students

Providing student-specific supports and interventions informed by data and the identification of student-specific needs
 (Focus on developing a sophisticated approach to using systems of assessments, responding to assessments to deploy interventions and resources, and continuously reviewing the impact of interventions with students)

<p>Prioritized Best Practices or Strategies</p>	<p>Targeted Interventions - Target small groups in classrooms. Consistent reteaching of strategies as needed.</p> <p>Foundations - Core instruction for all students with an upcoming component of progress monitoring and intervention. Explicit instruction of letter formation, sounds in isolation, blending, segmenting, spelling, and sight words.</p> <p>Balanced Literacy - Access to grade level text, close reading, modeling and think alouds during whole group. Differentiated instruction during guided reading and targeted small groups based on student need. The balanced literacy block includes reading, writing, speaking, and listening.</p>
<p>Instructional Leadership Team Implementation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Review and analyze running records as part of the Leveled Literacy Intervention Program. *Review and analyze Foundations unit assessments. *Focus CPT meetings to include a system of responding to assessments by providing interventions and resources. *Help facilitate the development of flexible groups within classrooms as needed.

School Performance Indicators and Data Sources

ADULT IMPLEMENTATION INDICATOR	STUDENT RESULTS INDICATOR
<p>Data Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Lesson plans. *Common Planning Time minutes *Intervention “check-ins” with staff running the targeted interventions. *Participate in “student-specific” data discussion 	<p>Data Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Dibels, MAP, and BAS data *Student work samples across content areas *Student goal setting sheets *MCAS scores *SRSD pre/post and formative assessment data *Running records *Informal assessments

A Safe, Respectful, and Collegial Climate for Teachers and Students

Establishing a safe, orderly and respectful environment for students and a collegial, collaborative and professional culture among teachers (Focus on developing a safe and orderly climate that supports student learning within and outside the classrooms as well as a supportive and professional climate for teachers to collectively focus on and pursue efforts to increase student achievement)

Prioritized Best Practices or Strategies	<p>Common Planning Time - All staff participate in Common Planning time. Each day of the week has a different focus to ensure that we are covering all content areas. Student data is analyzed, lessons are constructed based on student need, and teachers have the opportunity to share ideas and ask questions of their colleagues.</p> <p>PBIS - Positive Behavior Intervention Strategies</p> <p>Professional Development- This is a focused, teacher and student-driven practice.</p>
Instructional Leadership Team Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Common Planning Time *Meeting Minutes *SWIS Data *Observation

School Performance Indicators and Data Sources

ADULT IMPLEMENTATION INDICATOR	STUDENT RESULTS INDICATOR
<p>Data Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Lesson plans *Exit slips for focused Professional Development *Finished products *Discussion and participation *School-wide implementation of PBIS for all students *Holding all students to a high expectations *Knowledge of clear, consistent expectations for students 	<p>Data Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *SWIS Data *Pink and red card data *Parent Communication Log *Office Discipline Referrals

V. Worcester Public Schools Professional Learning Plan (PLP)

District Name	School Name	Principal Name	Plan Begin/End Dates
Worcester Public Schools	Burncoat Street Prep	Deborah Catamero	

1: Professional Learning Goals:

No .	Goal	Identified Group	Rationale/Sources of Evidence
1	Math - All teachers will participate in ongoing, collaborative professional development in the area of Guided Math. Teachers will design purposeful centers that focus on current concepts while providing opportunities for students to strengthen their foundational skills.	All teachers	The rationale is based on our 2015 Math MCAS data. Evidence collected will be specific centers designed using the Math MCAS Data that is reported by standard, participation in PD and teacher lesson plans.
2	ELA - All teachers will participate in SRSD Professional Development. They will peer score and use data from formative assessments to design necessary mini lessons and writing tasks.	All teachers	The rationale is based on our 2015 ELA MCAS data and Burncoat Quadrants SRSD initiative. Evidence collected will be teacher lesson plans, google docs data sheets, and analysis of formative assessment document on google docs.
3	Science - All teachers will participate in professional development on integrating science skills/content within the writing curriculum.	All teachers	Our school had a 12% increase in proficiency on the 2015 Science MCAS. The rationale is that we continue and improve our focus on integrating science within writing to continue this progress. Evidence collected will be formative assessments and analysis of formative assessment documents, as well as, anticipated professional development with the district's science liaison.

2: Professional Learning Activities

PL Goal No.	Initial Activities	Follow-up Activities (as appropriate)
1	Professional development focused on Guided Math, identifying areas of need and designing purposeful student centers to meet those needs.	Observe successful implementation of Guided math at other schools in the district.
2	Monthly grade level common planning meetings and bi weekly coaches meetings that focus on effective implementation of the SRSD strategies.	School based common planning and informal teacher observations of successful implementation of strategies.
3	School based common planning to design writing routines that include science content.	Develop a system of routine formative assessment so that student progress can be closely measured.

3: Essential Resources

PL Goal No.	Resources	Other Implementation Considerations
1	<i>Guided Math</i> by Laney Sammons, <i>Math Workstations</i> by Debbie Diller, school-based Professional Development, Common Planning Time, WPS Math Liaison, Envision Centers.	Observation of other schools
2	District based Professional Development, Peer scoring, Common Planning Time, Coach meetings, Grade level meetings	
3	Observe the WPS Science Liaison model lessons. Incorporate Science content into SRSD open response writing.	

4: Progress Summary

PL Goa 1 No.	Notes on Plan Implementation	Notes on Goal Attainment
1		