### Strategic Improvement Plan SCHOOL:Julian Curtiss School

**Greenwich Public Schools, Greenwich, Connecticut DATE:** **October 14, 2014**

***1. SCHOOL NARRATIVE***

|  |
| --- |
| ***(Brief background statement on what lead to the focus of the SIP)***  Over the last two years, Julian Curtiss has worked on the implementation of small group instruction as defined by the Greenwich Comprehensive Literacy Framework. Our focus was specifically based on small group instruction during reading. In order to extend and align our school improvement work, the School Data Team has chosen to focus on the writing component of the Greenwich Comprehensive Literacy Framework. Taking into account that there is reciprocity in reading and writing instruction, we can take advantage of this reciprocity, achieving higher-quality processing in both reading and writing by lifting the level of writing instruction.  It has also become increasingly clear that children’s success in many disciplines is reliant on their ability to write. Writing is a skill that develops over time. The following is a summary of research based writing instruction captured in the GPS Achievement Report 2011. Research has not identified one single approach to writing instruction that is effective for every learner (NCTE, 2008). However, many researchers agree upon the following critical components of effective writing curriculum and instruction:   1. Students must have extensive time to *learn to write* and *write to learn* both in school and outside of school (Allington & Cunningham, 2001; Calkins, 1994; Murray, 1990; NCTE, 2004, 2008; Reeves, 2003; Reeves 2010; Sterling et.al., 2004) 2. Most writing opportunities should be authentic (connected to the real world) and provide students with opportunities to write in a variety of forms, structures and genres for a range of purposes (Allington & Cunningham, 2001;Bomer, 2011;Calkins, 1994; Murray, 1990; NCTE 2004,2008) 3. Effective reading and writing instruction occurs when taught in a cohesive, connected manner because reading and writing are innately connected cognitive processes. If one is to write in one genre, it is helpful to first be familiar with structures of that genre (Allington & Cunningham, 2001; Bomer, 2011; Calkins, 1998; NCTE, 2004). Additionally, writing is inherently connected to talk. Oral rehearsal, conferring, small group/partnership discussions support the writing process (Bomer, 2011; Murray, 1990; NCTE, 2004). 4. Writing is best taught in a “workshop” structure to support a reflective, flexible process that provides students with multiple opportunities to generate, revise and edit their writing as individuals. This process is scaffolded by peers, adults and by small writing communities (Bomer, 2011;Calkins, 1994; Culham, 2004; Murray, 1990; NCTE, 2004). Students should be provided with a wealth of opportunities to compose and publish utilizing a variety of modalities and technologies (Culham, 2004; NCTE, 2004, 2008; NGA & CCSSO, 2011). 5. District curricula should emphasize *Writing Across the Curriculum* and demonstrate an increased focus and opportunities for students to write informational, research-based and argumentative texts (Bomer, 2011; Murray, 1990; NGA & CCSSO, 2011; NCTE, 2008; Reeves, 2003; Reeves 2010) 6. Collaborative teams of teachers should work together to utilize analytic scoring rubrics and to calibrate student work. This process helps teachers to provide explicit feedback/language for improvement, reflection and progress-monitoring (Andrade, H. et.al., 2009; Bomer, 2011; Culham, 2004; NGA & CCSSO, 2011; Reeves, 2003; Reeves 201; Sadler & Andrade, 2004; Sterling et. al., 2004)   Upon reflection of the research and analysis of 2012-13 CMT scores in writing, the School Data Team has determined next steps.  CMT scores from 2012-2013, demonstrate a decrease in the number of students achieving goal in writing from Spring 2012 to Spring 2013. Standardized scores for the 2013-2014 school year are unavailable due to the Greenwich Public School System's participation in the SBAC field test. However, performance task data did indicate large numbers of students within the developing range of the reading portion of the Teachers College Writing Performance Assessment Rubric. The School Data Team will work to increase grade-level benchmark achievement to 80% of students in the school.  The Student and Teacher Performance Issue questions posed by the School Data Team are:  What does teacher behavior look like during an exemplary writer’s workshop?  What does student behavior look like during an exemplary writer’s workshop?  What structures do we impose so that students can work independently during writing?  What percent of students are productively engaged during writing workshop?  How do we determine that children are engaged in productive struggle during independent writing?  Definitions:  1. Productive Struggle: “In a productive struggle, **on the other hand,** students grapple with the issues and are able to come up with a solution themselves, developing persistence and resilience in pursuing and attaining the learning goal or understanding. in productive struggles, kids have developed the necessary strategies for working through something difficult. They can also take a teacher's suggestions for help and run with them. (Retrieved from: http://www.shaker.org/Downloads/ProductiveStruggle.pdf)  In order to create a database to document this issue, the team will:   * create a survey to administer to teachers to determine the scope of this problem. * create a checklist for teachers to use in order to assess teacher behavior during a videotaped writing period. * collect On-demand opinion writing pieces 3 times during the 2014-2015 school year and use the Teachers College Opinion Writing Rubric to score. * Analyze student work using completed rubrics to measure change in student outcomes. |

***2. STATEMENT OF STUDENT OUTCOME INDICATOR AND GPS DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLAN GOAL***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Statement of Student Outcome Indicator:***  ***(written as SMART Goal)***  **Students in grades K-5 will increase 0.5 points on the structure, the development, and the language conventions of writing as measured by the K-5 Rubrics published by Teacher’s College Press.** | ***Which District Strategic Improvement Plan Goal is addressed?***  1. Reading  2. Math  **3. Writing**  4. Other (Please specify)  5. Optional (Please specify) For Example: Additional goal for operations; communications; parent satisfaction; etc.) |
| ***Student Outcome Indicator Rationale:***  ***(Why was the Student Outcome Indicator chosen?)***  Greenwich students have been noted to perform better and demonstrate greater efficiency with skills and strategies in the presence of the teacher during mini-lessons, guided reading groups, and strategy instruction. Historically, these same students do not perform as well on standardized tests and during independent reading time. Teachers have identified the need for a way to help the students generalize the skills and strategies they are learning to their independent work.  **Writing** **Performance Data**  The 2012 CMT data indicate:  70% of 3rd graders at or above goal  84% of 4th graders at or above goal  75% of 5th graders at or above goal  The 2013 CMT data indicate:  69% of 3rd graders at or above goal  78% of 4th graders at or above goal  63% of 5th graders at or above goal  2013-2014 Performance Task Data indicate:  80% of 3rd graders at goal  62% of 4th graders at goal  46% of 5th graders at goal  \*Goal was defined by a one-point increase on the reading indicator of the ELA performance task rubric.  2013-2014 Performance Task Data indicate:  47% of 3rd graders did not meet the Effective score (Level 3)  75% of 4th graders did not meet the Effective score (Level 3)  62% of 5th graders did not meet the Effective score (Level 3)  \*Goal defined by the Teachers College Writing Performance Task Rubric (Reading Section)  **Survey Results:**  Too be added in November  **Common Core Connections**:  [CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.CCRA.W.1](http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/CCRA/W/1/):Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence.  [CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.CCRA.W.4](http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/CCRA/W/4/): Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.  [CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.CCRA.W.5](http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/CCRA/W/5/): Develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach.  [CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.CCRA.W.7](http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/CCRA/W/7/): Conduct short as well as more sustained research projects based on focused questions, demonstrating understanding of the subject under investigation.  [CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.CCRA.W.8](http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/CCRA/W/8/): Gather relevant information from multiple print and digital sources, assess the credibility and accuracy of each source, and integrate the information while avoiding plagiarism.  [CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.CCRA.W.9](http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/CCRA/W/9/): Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research. |  |

***3. ADULT ACTION INDICATOR(S): ADULT ACTION INDICATOR(S) RATIONALE:***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***(Written as a SMART Goal; what are the adults going to do differently to positively impact the Student Outcome Indicator)***  100% of teachers will move up at least one point on a survey measuring effectiveness of writing instruction.  100% of teachers will move up at least one point on the writing exemplar checklist. | ***(Statement of why you chose this strategy)***  Calkins (2013) delineates 7 essentials of strong writing instruction:   1. ​Writing needs to be taught like any other basic skill, with explicit instruction and ample opportunity for practice. Almost every day, every student in grades ​K-5 needs between 50-60 minutes for writing instruction and writing. 2. Youngsters deserve to write for real, to write the kinds of texts that they see in the world- non fiction chapter books, persuasive letters, stories, lab reports, reviews, poems--and to write for an audience of readers, not just for the teacher's red pen. 3. Writers need to put meaning onto the page. Young people will especially invest themselves in their writing if they write about subjects that are important to them. The easiest way to support this is to let children choose their own topics most of the time. 4. ​Children deserve to be explicitly taught how to write. 5. Children deserve the opportunity and instruction to cycle through the writing process. 6. Writers read. Writers need to study what other writers have done well, and give it a try.​ 7. Children need clear goals and frequent feedback. They need to hear the ways their writing is getting better and what next steps may be.   Assessing teachers’ understanding of each of these 7 essentials through checklist and survey research will elucidate the areas in which the most improvement is needed. |

***4. ACTION PLAN AND RESULTS INDICATORS: (SEE ATTACHED)***

***5. COMMUNICATION PLAN:***

|  |
| --- |
| ***(How and when will the SIP progress be communicated to stakeholders including parents and staff?)***  **Staff:**   * August 22, 2014 Present Problem of Practice to faculty * September 5, 2014 School Data Team analyzed TC rubrics and learning progressions in order to draft the SIP plan 2014-2015 * September 26, 2014 School Data Team will discuss problem of practice * Faculty meetings will include review/updates on the SIP (at least four times during the school year) * School Data Team meetings (SDT) (once per month) will include regular review/updates of the SIP and Action Plans * SDT members will share information from the meetings with their grade level teams during Instructional Data Team meetings * IDT members will share progress on their Action Plans at SDT meetings   **Parents/Community:**   * October 2, 2014 - Introduction of SIP plan goal to parents/community at Open House * October 27, 2014 –SIP Parent Rep to attend meeting with School Data Team members * November 2014 – Parent Presentation * November 2014 – Publish new SIP on website and publish goals in the school newsletter * Communicate to parents through newsletter and weekly highlights what the staff will be doing on the early release days and the connection to the SIP. * Continue monthly updates on website and in school newsletter. * Meet with parent SIP representative for a minimum of 3 sessions this school year to develop plans that will have the parents serve as ambassador to the plan.   **District:**   * Submit SIP to the Greenwich District Data Team in October. * Present SIP to Central Network Team in November * Information and updates on Action Plans will be shared during Deputy Superintendent visits and CIPL visits. |

***Strategic Improvement Plan progress must be communicated to key stakeholders throughout the course of the year. Members of the team are responsible for having the plan posted on their school’s website, and the SIT plan and process should be shared with the school and parent community at meetings and through bulletins, newsletters, and /or the school website.***

**SIT Process:**

September/October – Draft with Staff

October – Review and Refine with Network

October – Due to Deputy Superintendent

**3.** **SIT ACTION PLAN AND RESULTS INDICATOR**

**Adult Action Indicator:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Strategies** | **Timeline** | **Person (s) Responsible** | **Fiscal Implications** | **Results Indicators**  **C= Compliance A= Change in Adult Behavior S=Change in Student Performance**  ***(What data will you be collecting during the year to determine the effectiveness of your plan?)*** |
| Survey teachers to test hypothesis and determine baseline:  Create Survey  Administer Survey  Analyze Survey  Determine needs moving forward | September 2014  October 2014  March 2015  May 2015 | Trish McGuire  Brenda Brush  Grace Blomberg  Caren Iannazzo  SDT (analysis) | NA | A - Pre and Post Survey |
| Writing observation checklist  (self-analysis after video viewing) | November 2014  May 2015 | Classroom Teachers | N/A | A- Pre and Post checklist |
| Research Writing Workshop Exemplar Practices  Review and analyze:   * survey results * video observation results * CT Center for School Change Report (re: student independence * Anecdotal student-behavior notes from on-demand writing pretests * sustained time writing * learning progressions from TCRWP | Ongoing | SDT  IDTs  Literacy Department | NA | A, S |
| Administer Independent Work Time 3-point Metric in grades K-5 during the independent writing portion of writing workshop class to determine students’ level of engagement. | November 2014  May 2015 | Classroom teachers | N/A | S, C, A |
| Work with Teacher’s College Staff Developers with a focus on developing methods of writing instruction | September-May  TC Staff Development Dates:  K-2  9/30/14  10/28/14  01/07/15  03/06/15  05/05/15  3-5  10/7/14  12/17/14  02/23/15  04/27/15  05/13/15 | Trish McGuire  Brenda Brush  TC Staff Developers: Liz Dunford (K-2)  Meghan Hargrave (3-5)  Literacy Staff  Classroom Teachers | Achievement Gap Budget  $22,000 | A, S |
| Teacher attendance at Teacher’s College Workshops (including substitutes and transportation) | 9/24  9/30 10/24  10/3 10/28  10/7 11/5  10/8 11/6  10/10 11/7  12/10  12/18 3/6  4/28 5/6 | Classroom teachers and specialists of different grade levels on different days | Achievement Gap Budget  $2,000 |  |
| Principal Membership in Teacher’s College Reading & Writing Project | 10/1  11/5  12/3  1/21  3/4  5/21 | Trish McGuire | Achievement Gap Budget  $2,000 |  |
| Read book:  *Reaching Struggling Writers by M. Colleen Cruz* for strategies to intervene for struggling writers | Winter 2014 | All staff that teaches reading  Literacy Department | $200 = $8/per staff member, 25 staff members  Achievement Gap Budget | A, C |
| Study & discuss State of the Art Units of Writing Instruction | November 4, 2014 PD Day then ongoing | SDT  All staff that teaches reading  Literacy Department | $1,058 per full K-5 set  ELA budget  Achievement Gap Budget | A, C |
| Coaching cycle in writing workshop strategies | Ongoing | All classroom teachers  Literacy Coaches | $1800 for substitutes during the school year.  Building budget | A |
| Use researched strategies from reading & coaching cycles to foster   * explicit teaching within writing workshops * productive struggle * independence | Ongoing | All teachers of reading | N/A | A, C, S |
| Teachers will be able to analyze on-demand writing pre- and post- assessments to determine next steps for effective instructional strategies within three lenses: structure, development, and language conventions. | Ongoing - minimum of  3x per year | Classroom Teachers  Literacy Staff  School Data Team | N/A | A, S, C |
| Determine how after school programs will align with the SIP and will support achievement gap students over and above the school day. | November - May | Trish McGuire  Brenda Brush  Literacy Staff  School Data Team | $ -To be determined  Achievement Gap Budget  Supplemental Funds  Title 1 Budget |  |

### Strategic Improvement Plan Year-End Report SCHOOL*:*

**Greenwich Public Schools, Greenwich, Connecticut DATE:**

***1. STATEMENT OF STUDENT OUTCOME INDICATOR AND GPS DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLAN GOAL***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Statement of Student Outcome Indicator:***  ***(written as SMART Goal)*** | ***Which District Strategic Improvement Plan Goal is addressed?***  1. Reading  2. Math  3. Writing  4. Other (Please specify)  5. Optional (Please specify) For Example: Additional goal for operations; communications; parent satisfaction; etc.) |
| ***Adult Action Indicator:***  ***(Specific statement about what the adults will do to support student outcome indicator)*** |  |

***2. ACTION PLAN AND RESULTS INDICATORS (SEE ATTACHED)***

**3. *STATUS OF STUDENT OUTCOME INDICATORS***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * ***Accomplished*** *(Establish a new goal for the next school year)* | * ***Partially accomplished*** *(Continue with the current goal for the next school year)* | * ***Not accomplished***   *(Continue with the current goal for the next school year)* | * ***Modified***   *(Modify the current goal for the next school year)* |

**SIT Year End Process:**

May/June – Review progress of implementation of SIT Action Plan

August/September – Review status of Student Outcome Indicators

October 25th– Due to Deputy Superintendent

**2.** **SIT ACTION PLAN AND RESULTS INDICATORS**

**Year-End Progress Report**

**Adult Action Indicator:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Strategies** | **Timeline** | **Person (s) Responsible** | **Results Indicators** | **Status/Progress** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |