

Schools in Year 1 Improvement School Improvement Plan Form – April 2011

1) School/SU Information:

School Name: Hinesburg Community School	SU Name: Chittenden South Supervisory Union
Principal: Robert Goudreau	Superintendent: Elaine Pinckney
Principal Phone # & Email: 482-6299 rgoudreau@cssu.org	Superintendent Phone # & Email: 383-1224 epinckney@cssu.org
Date of School Board Approval: 11/09/11	Date Plan will be implemented: 11/09/11

2) School Improvement Planning Team:

List the names and contact information of the School Improvement Planning Team members and their position.

Name	Contact Information		Position
	Phone	Email	
Elaine Pinckney	383-1224	epinckney@cssu.org	Superintendent
Robert Goudreau	482-6299	rgoudreau@cssu.org	Principal
Laura Smith	482-2106	lsmith@cssu.org	Special Education Director
Molly McClaskey	383-1213	mmclaskey@cssu.org	Curriculum Coordinator (if applicable)
Betsy Knox	482-2106	bknox@cssu.org	Teachers
Nancy Pollack	482-2106	npollack@cssu.org	
Stephanie Konowitz	482-2106	skonowitz@cssu.org	

List the names and positions of all individuals consulted in developing the plan. The school must consult with parents, school staff, the LEA, and outside experts.

Name	Position
Clare Early	Mathematics Consultant
Claudine Bedell	Middle Level Curriculum Consultant
Bill Rich	DI Consultant
Molly McClaskey	CSSU Curriculum Coordinator

3) Describe below how the school will provide written notice, in a format that parents can understand, about:

- **The school’s identification for improvement:**

We sent a letter home to all parents indicating our identification as a school not meeting AYP. A copy of the letter is attached. (Exhibit A)

- **What the school is doing to address the problem of low achievement:**

As a school community we have been working toward all of our students meeting the standards since they were introduced. We have known that some of our students were being challenged in meeting the standards in particular our low SES and Special Education population. The following are actions that our school has undertaken to address this need:

1. Organized our instructional teams as Pre-K, K-2, 3-5, and 6-8 and asked them to work together in addressing the needs of all students.
2. Each of these teams is provided common planning time once a week during the school day to focus on the School Action Plan as it relates to our student achievement goals. We are working toward a schedule and a culture that would allow for these times to be available daily. (School Action Plan 2011 -2012 Exhibit B)
3. We are implementing PBIS schoolwide.
4. RtI has been introduced in literacy and by the end of this year will be in place Grades K – 6.

5. Our Supervisory Union is implementing a Comprehensive Assessment Plan which we will be a part of. We will begin to investigate this year how RtI might be helpful to us in monitoring mathematics achievement. (CSSU Comprehensive Assessment Plan Exhibit C)
6. Our supervisory Union has developed and implemented a Common Data Collection Tool – Summary Assessment Form, to collect cumulative data for all students in each grade level at all schools. (Exhibit D)
7. Each instructional team will hold a monthly data review meeting this year to review and monitor student progress. We will conduct professional development and support to our staff in this area.
8. Adoption of a mentoring program for students who are challenged to make sure that they have an advocate and a positive role model.

- **What the LEA is doing to help the school address this problem.**

1. Our curriculum coordinator at CSSU has provided leadership in conducting curriculum coordination, assessment, coaching, and funding to help us implement our school action plan.
2. This year we will be implementing a common data collection model which will be available to all of our educators in one location (Exhibit D)
3. CSSU has developed the Tiered Levels of Intervention document which identifies interventions that may be used to support students at Tiers I, II, and III. (Exhibit E)
4. CSSU has created Common Assessment so that we are better able to identify students in need of supports and interventions:
 - a. CSSU Common Math Assessment given at the end of each grade level.
 - b. CSSU Common Fact Fluency assessments three times a year in all grades 2-8.
 - c. Benchmark Assessment Tool is used in grades K-5.
 - d. AIMSweb screenings continue to be given in grades K-6.
 - e. CSSU Writing Prompt will be given two times a year.
 - f. Degrees of Reading Power Screening is given at grades 5-8.

4) Specify the responsibilities of the school and the LEA in implementing the plan:

1. Curriculum Coordinators in our building have been trained using the data collection model and will lead the faculty in learning how to input data and complete data analysis.
2. Curriculum Coordinators in our building have had initial training in coaching in the content areas and will begin working with teachers this year. This coaching model will assist teachers in developing strategies for meeting the needs of all children on a regular basis.

3. HCS building leaders are coordinating all of the assessments as listed above, the analysis, and the resulting interventions and programming put into place.

5) Describe below the policies and practices the school will adopt concerning the school's core academic subjects that have the greatest likelihood of ensuring that all groups of students will meet the State's proficient level of achievement on NECAP.

We have always looked for ways to make certain that all of our students were successful. In the past four years the following practices have been put in place:

- We have worked with local pre-school child care centers and providers to support them in the development of appropriate research based curriculum.
- We have sponsored pre-school family literacy, mathematics and parenting workshops to share school readiness activities that can be done at home.
- We introduced an after school program to extend the school day for students in need of additional support.
- We have an after school homework club to assist students who need focused time and instruction to complete assigned work.
- We have created Professional Learning Communities within the school by K-2, 3-5, and 6-8 and provided time within the school day for them to plan and discuss student outcomes based on data driven decision making.
 - These Professional Learning Communities have decision making power to restructure the delivery of instruction to better meet the needs of the students.
- We have created bi-monthly meetings for each grade level to focus on data driven review and progress monitoring of students to determine if our interventions for students are truly working or not.
- We have begun the first year of professional development for all of our K-8 teachers on Best Practices in the Teaching of Mathematics. The first part of year 1 focuses on the training of Best Practices for our K-2 and some of our 3-5 teachers. These same teachers are beginning the second part of year 1, which involves ongoing practice of mathematically productive teaching routines through studio classroom work. Year 2 of this program will begin with coursework for the rest of our grade

3-5 teachers and the 6-8 teachers this spring. Their studio classroom work will commence in the Fall of 2012. The overarching goals of implementing Best Practices in Teaching Mathematics are:

- to raise achievement and participation levels for all students.
 - to transform mathematics instruction and the culture of mathematics professional learning across the school
- We have a consultant, Bill Rich, who has begun working with our Middle School staff on Differentiated Instruction along with another middle school consultant Claudine Bedell.

- We started three years ago with training and the implementation of student progress monitoring with RtI. RtI is implemented Grades 1-5 currently and we are training Grade 6 teachers this year. RtI has been implemented for literacy and we are investigating this year its implementation for mathematics instruction as well.
- We have revised our EST system school-wide to insure that appropriate interventions are in place for students in need. The system now incorporates a strong emphasis on the use of data driven decision making to determine and evaluate the delivery of instruction. By regular use of data we are better able to adjust programming to meet the needs of our students.
- We have implemented the Bridges in Mathematics Program in grades K-5 as our primary tool for Math instruction. Ongoing training for implementation is in place for grades 1-5.
- In grade 5-8 we have implemented a system of teachers as math specialists for teaching mathematics. These teachers are focused on teaching mathematics only. Our goal is to have instruction be delivered by teachers with strong expertise in a given content area.
- We have implemented a system of co-teaching in several classrooms. This model has regular education teachers working together with special education teachers to develop and deliver instruction that meets the needs of all students in one classroom.
- We have created blocks of instructional time in literacy and math in order to have a more effective use of staff for each Tier of the instructional pyramid. (Exhibit F - Pyramid)
- We continue to use best practices in the creation of a positive learning environment for our students and staff through PBIS. We are improving the culture of our whole school population (Tier I) to ensure that all students have a positive climate in which to learn.
- We have initiated training and implemented several intervention/support programs:
 - In Mathematics:
 - The Fasttmath (web-based) program is now accessible from home as well as in school so that students have ample opportunities to develop fluency with basic math facts.
 - Symphony Math: Through strong use of visual models, this web-based program helps students develop a strong foundation of conceptual understanding in critical mathematical concepts, fluency with number relationships and solving story problems.
 - In Literacy:
 - Lexia
 - Read Naturally
 - Read 180

- 6) What Results are We Currently Getting?
Achievement NECAP Data: Complete the Chart below.

Subgroups (list each subgroup identified)	Reading (check here if subgroup is identified)	Math (check here if subgroup is identified)
Special Education	X	X
SES	X	X

Data Analysis:

List all data/information analyzed:

- NECAP Reading (Low SES) population – For the last three years our low SES population test results indicates little improvement. The data has remained at approximately 75% of this population of students meeting the standard.
- NECAP Math (Low SES) population – For the last three years our low SES population test results indicates little improvement. The data has remained at approximately 58% of this population of students meeting the standard.
- NECAP Reading (IEP) population – For the last three years the population of students who have IEPs have had little improvement in their test results as well.. The data has remained at approximately 24% of this population of students meeting the standard.
- NECAP Math (IEP) population – For the last three years the population of students who have IEPs have had little improvement in their test results as well.. The data has remained at approximately 20% of this population of students meeting the standard.

Explain what the data revealed.

- See Above

Prior Action Plan Strategies:

What prior Action Plan strategies have been successful in increasing student achievement?

- Training for key personnel (administration, coordinators, and lead teachers) in the use of the Data Teams model to use and analyze assessment data to target instruction.
- Math
 - Program Alignment (EDM) to GEs in order to prioritize instruction at all grade levels.
 - Created and/or procured instructional resources to target GEs not addressed in the program.
 - Established a bank of resources to support classroom instruction and homework for all students.
 - Created pre- and post-assessments for each unit of instruction
 - Math coordinator provided embedded professional development around Best Practices in Mathematics Instruction.
 - Begun developing systems for collecting, organizing and analyzing data to inform instruction.
 - Integrated NECAP released tasks into instructional programming.
 - Increased awareness of deepening the depth of knowledge in instructional questioning as well as on written tasks.
 - Established support option for each grade level by restructuring personnel and creating flexible groupings.
 - Lengthened math instructional blocks.
- Literacy
 - Created mandatory daily amount of minutes devoted to literacy instruction for each grade level.
 - Created regular collaborative work time for classroom teachers, special educators, Title I, and support personnel to discuss and refine delivery of instruction.
 - Developed and implemented a common assessment plan for each grade level, K-8.
 - Created a system for assessing new and incoming students to HCS, in order to better plan for meeting their needs in reading and writing.
 - Developed and implemented on-going training for support personnel in all areas of a balanced literacy program.
 - K-8 focus on providing intentional instruction using constructed responses and use of informational texts.
 - Implemented professional development in Balanced Literacy Programs in grades K-6.
 - Implemented the use of AIMSweb screenings and the Benchmark Assessment Tool to better target students who have instructional needs.

What evidence have you collected that demonstrates the success of these improvement/strategies?

- We have anecdotal data that many of these items from our previous action plan were successful. We are fully aware that there was mixed success for some of these action plan steps as well. However, in many cases, we were not intentional about collecting and/or recording evidence thereof. Some examples of evidence are:
 - Using AIMSweb screenings and the Benchmark Assessment tool allowed us to track individual students by progress monitoring those who were receiving interventions.

- We have participated in meetings using a data teams format to collaborate in structured, scheduled meetings. Some of our newly formed teams have begun to analyze the effectiveness of teaching and learning that is happening in classrooms, and making changes as deemed necessary by working through this process.

Which prior efforts in your Action Plan had little impact on increasing student achievement?

- See response above.

What is the evidence?

- Some of these action plan steps were in initial phases of implementation and we have not had the benefit of time to analyze the success, or lack thereof of these initiatives.

7) Why Are We Getting These Results? Root Cause Identification:

(for an explanation of root cause analysis, go to: <http://rpd.net/adm/uploads/admin/1242RootCauseAnalysisToolkit.pdf> & check Appendix X)

- Based upon the analysis of student performance data, prior strategies in the Action Plan, and other applicable information, explain the root cause and evidence supporting this conclusion. Be sure that your plan is treating the root cause and not just the symptoms.

Root Causes:

- NECAP assessment systems were not designed to demonstrate growth for our students with Individual Education Plans.
- Time and Coordination– Historically, time and coordination of instructional delivery models are important factors in meeting student needs. At HCS, we have realized that in order to do this work we need to provide the time for people to work together. To that end we have:
 - Implemented common planning time for teachers in each grade level and grade spans.
 - Restructured our faculty meeting time to include one hour each week after school dedicated to school improvement (Exhibit H):
 - Coordination of instruction – Tier I
 - Discussing specific children’s needs
 - Progress Monitoring
 - Analyzing data

8) Vermont School Improvement Plan - Two Year Plan (2011-2013)

Measurable Goal 1: Percentage of students in our AYP targeted subgroups (IEP and SES) at Hinesburg Community School meeting or exceeding the standard in reading will increase.

Grade 4 (N=13 students in the targeted subgroups of IEP and SES) from **31%** (4 students) to **54%** (7 students out of the 13) as measured by Grades 4 & 5 NECAP Reading Assessments 2011 and 2012.

Grade 5 (N=6students in the targeted subgroups of IEP and SES) from **33%** (2 students) to **67%** (4 students out of the 6) as measured by Grades 5 & 6 NECAP Reading Assessments 2011 and 2012.

Grade 6 (N=10 students in the targeted subgroups of IEP and SES) from **30%** (3 students) to **50%** (5 students out of the 10) as measured by Grades 6 & 7 NECAP Reading Assessments 2011 and 2012.

Grade 7 (N=13 students in the targeted subgroups of IEP and SES) from **46 %** (6 students) to **62%** (8 students) as measured by Grades 7 & 8 NECAP Reading Assessments 2011 and 2012.

Goal 1 Objectives:

	Year 1 (2011-2012)	Year 2 (2012-2013)
Strategies/Action Steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect baseline data for “Time Spent Reading” (daily, small group, whole group, content reading, independent reading). • Analyze data to identify needed next steps for each grade level cluster (K-2, 3-5, 6-8, UA) • Provide opportunities for professional development for all personnel and supporting staff in Best Practices in writing and reading instruction. • Provide opportunities for grade level clusters to create consistency in terms of language, expectations, and instructional practices. • “Habits of Mind”: Each grade level explore the research and the connections to the Common Core. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan and prioritize instructional time to reflect findings from “Time Spent Reading” studies. • Generate /Develop/Use a list of higher order “key language” to be used for instruction across all content areas. (reference Common Core) • Use the Common Core to identify developmentally appropriate benchmarks for literacy at each grade level.
Success Indicators/Measurable Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grades 6-8: Pilot Habits of Mind Rubric & Instruction (contribution, persistence, organization) • Grades 3-5: Adopt a rubric to reflect Habits of Mind instruction. • Literacy Leader meeting notes reflect analysis of baseline data for “Time Spent Reading” and next steps for each grade level cluster. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of benchmarks and/or Common Core exemplars to measure expectations in literacy at each grade level.
Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data Collection Tools developed for “Time Spent Reading.” • Habits of Mind rubrics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common Core
Person(s) Responsible	Literacy Coordinators, Literacy Leaders, HCS teachers of Literacy	Literacy Coordinators, Literacy Leaders, HCS teachers of Literacy

Measurable Goal 2: Percentage of students in our AYP targeted subgroups (IEP and SES) at Hinesburg Community School meeting or exceeding the standard in math will increase.

Grade 4 (N=13 students in the targeted subgroups of IEP and SES) from **37%** (4 students) to **46%** (6 students out of the 13) as measured by Grades 4 & 5 NECAP Math Assessments 2011 and 2012.

Grade 5 (N=6students in the targeted subgroups of IEP and SES) from **50%** (3 students) to **83%** (5 students out of the 6) as measured by Grade 5 & 6 NECAP Math Assessments 2011 and 2012.

Grade 6 (N=10 students in the targeted subgroups of IEP and SES) from **50%** (5 students) to **60%** (6 students out of the 10) as measured by Grade 6 & 7 NECAP Math Assessments 2011 and 2012.

Grade 7 (N=13 students in the targeted subgroups of IEP and SES) from **31 %** (4 students) to **39%** (5 students out of the 13) as measured by Grades 7 & 8 NECAP Math Assessments. 2011 and 2012.

Goal 2 Objectives

Percentage of all students meeting the expectations for each operation as measured by the CSSU Math Fact Fluency assessment administered in the spring of each year will increase from:

	Add.	Sub.	Multi.	Div.
2011-2012	45% to 55%	24% to 34%	40% to 50%	51% to 61%
2012-2013	55% to 65%	34% to 44%	50% to 60%	61% to 71%
2013-2014	65% to 75%	44% to 54%	60% to 70%	71% to 81%

Strategies/Activities	Resources	Timeline	Person Responsible
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distribute and explain the CSSU Fact Fluency Toolkit Teachers require regular fact fluency practice. 	CSSU Fact Fluency Kit; Common Planning time for coordination and discussion	2011-2012 and ongoing	Math Coordinators, HCS Math leaders and teachers of mathematics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement FasttMath upgrade.: 4 times/week And use reports to identify strengths/needs in usage and students' needs for intervention 	FASTTMATH Program; Training time for teachers to learn how to run relevant reports disaggregated by identified subgroups	2011 and beyond	Technology and Math Coordinators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop structures for intervention at each grade cluster. 	Common Planning time	2011 and ongoing	Math Coordinators, HCS Math leaders and teachers of mathematics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers meet cross grade level to share strategies for promoting fact fluency growth. 	Common Planning time	2011	Math Coordinators, HCS Math leaders and teachers of mathematics

Measurable Goal 3:

Goal 3 Objectives : 100% of HCS teachers of math will be trained in Best Practices in Teaching Mathematics

Strategies/Activities	Resources	Timeline	Person Responsible
Provide initial coursework/training for teachers in each grade span	Professional Development time allotted for coursework to occur.	2011-2012	Consultants from Teacher Development Center; HCS Administration; Math Coordinator
Studio Classroom work – Lesson Study (Pre-Planning, observation and post-lesson reflection)	Release time from classrooms to participate in studio days	2011-2015	Consultants from Teacher Development Center; HCS Administration; Math Coordinator; Resident teachers

Measurable Goal 4: The number of teachers involved in a coaching experience will increase from 0 to at least 15 over the course of two years.

Goal 4 Objectives:

1. Literacy Coordinator develops and implements a coaching model with at least 3 teachers each year.
2. Math Coordinator develops and implements a coaching model with at least 3 teachers each year.
3. K-2 Instructional Leader for Literacy develops and implements a coaching model with at least 3 teachers each year.

Strategies/Activities	Resources	Timeline	Person Responsible
Coaches participate in weekly meetings to share strategies, successes and challenges.	Meeting time	Ongoing	Coordinators and instructional leaders
Each coach meets regularly with their participating teachers to develop and implement a coaching model.	CSSU coaching contract, Time for meeting	Ongoing	Coordinators and instructional leaders

9) Describe how the LEA will monitor (a) implementation of the plan, and (b) the impact of the plan’s strategies on student achievement:

HCS will monitor its plan through regularly scheduled meetings with the administrative team and the staff. Our Literacy and Math co-ordinators along with our Special Education Director. Weekly the administrative team of Principal, Assistant Principal and Special Education Director meet. Twice a month the Principal, Special Education Director, and the Co-ordinators for Literacy and Mathematics meet. Grade Level Teams meet weekly to discuss progress and challenges relative to the schoolwide action plan which includes our AYP goals.

Our school is currently learning the data team process and we will be holding monthly data team meetings to monitor all student progress. Each week we are using our staff meetings to provide staff development, share data or discuss curriculum delivery options as we continue to provide best instruction for all students. Quarterly the school team will review our progress and adjust as needed sharing our progress with our district administrators and the school community as a whole.

10) Peer Review: the LEA should assemble a peer review team utilizing the parameters established below as they appear in the Federal guidance.

“Peer reviewers must consider a proposed plan for school improvement within 45 days of its submission, through a process established by the LEA. The LEA should involve as peer reviewers teachers and administrators from schools or districts similar to the one in improvement, but significantly more successful in meeting the learning needs of their students. Staff with demonstrated effectiveness and recognized expertise in school improvement will be able to evaluate the plan’s quality and the likelihood of its successful implementation, and make suggestions for revisions.” §1116(b)(3)(E)

Name	Position	School/District/Organization	Contact Information (email & phone)
Elaine Pinckney	Superintendent	CSSU	epincknet@cssu.org
Molly McClaskey	Curriculum Director	CSSU	mmclaskey@cssu.org
Jackie Parks	WCS Principal	WCS	jparks@cssu.org

Describe the changes you made, if any, as a result of this peer review:

ASSURANCE FORM

The Superintendent will assure:

- 1) That the school will spend not less than 10 percent of the funds made available to the school under section 113 for each fiscal year that the school is in school improvement status, for the purpose of providing to the school's teachers and principal high-quality professional development that:
 - Directly addresses the academic achievement problem that caused the school to be identified for school improvement;
 - Meets the requirements for professional development activities under section 1119; and
 - Is provided in a manner that affords increased opportunity for participating in that professional development.
- 2) That the identified school receives technical assistance focused on strengthening and improving the school's instruction program in the areas of data analysis, identification and implementation of strategies and budget analysis.
- 3) If applicable, that school choice is provided for children whose parents wish to transfer them from the school identified for improvement.

Superintendent's Signature

Date