Wayne Sch

School Level Plan

07/01/2014 - 06/30/2017

School Profile

Demographics

Wayne Sch

650 East Ave
Erie, PA 16503
(814)874-6700

Federal Accountability Designation: Focus
Title I Status: Yes
Principal: Diane Sutton
Superintendent: Jay Badams

Planning Committee

Name	Role
Gina Rullo	Administrator : School Improvement Plan
Jesse Williams	Administrator : School Improvement Plan
Diane Sutton	Building Principal : School Improvement Plan
Boo Hagerty	Business Representative : School Improvement Plan
Timm High	Community Representative : School Improvement Plan
Joseph Kumer	Community Representative : School Improvement Plan
Katy Kloss	Ed Specialist - School Counselor
Chris Nagg	Elementary School Teacher - Regular Education : School Improvement Plan
Haley Noonan	Elementary School Teacher - Regular Education : School Improvement Plan
Cari Rowe	Elementary School Teacher - Regular Education : School Improvement Plan
Holly Tucci	Elementary School Teacher - Regular Education : School Improvement Plan
Jamie Brim	Instructional Coach/Mentor Librarian : School Improvement Plan
Lori Patton	Intermediate Unit Staff Member
Curas Campbell	Parent

Tim Sabol	Student Curriculum Director/Specialist

Assurances

Title I Schools

Title I Priority or Focus Schools

All Title I Schools required to complete improvement plans must assure to the Pennsylvania Department of Education the school's compliance with the following expectations by developing and implementing an improvement plan or otherwise taking actions that meet the expectations described by the Assurances listed below.

Assurances 1 through 12

The school has verified the following Assurances:

- **Assurance 1**: This School Improvement Plan contains Action Plans that address each reason why this school failed to make Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) and/or is identified in the lowest 10% of Title I schools.

- **Assurance 2**: The resources needed for full implementation of the action plans herein documented have been identified and the necessary approvals obtained to allow the procurement and allocation of these resources.

- **Assurance 3**: Documentation of the resources needed for full implementation of the action plans herein documented; including specific, related budgetary information, is available for review upon request by the LEA or SEA.

- **Assurance 4**: If designated as a Priority or Focus School the district has determined whole-school meaningful interventions directly associated with the unmet AMO(s).

- **Assurance 5**: The school improvement plan covers a two-year period.

- **Assurance 6**: The school has adopted and/or continued policies and practices concerning the school's core academic subjects that have the greatest likelihood of improving student achievement.

- **Assurance 7**: High performing LEAs with varied demographic conditions have shown they share common characteristics. The following nine characteristics are embedded in the plan:

  - Clear and Shared Focus

  - High Standards and Expectations

  - Effective Leadership

  - High Levels of Collaboration and Communication

- o Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment Aligned with Standards

- o Frequent Monitoring of Teaching and Learning

- o Focused Professional Development

- o Supportive Learning Environment

- o High Levels of Community and Parent Involvement

- **Assurance 8**: Focus Schools must implement locally developed interventions associated with a minimum of one of the below principles, while Priority Schools must implement all seven:

  - o Providing strong leadership by: (1) reviewing the performance of the current principal; (2) either replacing the principal if such a change is necessary to ensure strong and effective leadership or demonstrating to the State Education Agency that the current principal has a track record in improving achievement and has the ability to lead the turnaround effort; and (3) providing the principal with operational flexibility in the areas of scheduling, staff, curriculum and budget.

  - o Ensuring that teachers are effective and able to improve instruction by: (1) reviewing the quality of all staff and retaining only those who are determined to be effective and have the ability to be successful in the turnaround effort; and (2) preventing ineffective teachers from transferring to these schools.

  - o Redesign the school day, week, or year to include additional time for student learning and teacher collaboration

  - o Strengthen the school's instructional program based on student needs and ensuring that the instructional program is research-based, rigorous, and aligned with state academic content standards.

  - o Use data to inform instruction and for continuous improvement, including providing time for collaboration on the use of data.

  - o Establish a school environment that improves school safety and discipline and addresses other non-academic factors that impact student achievement, such as students' social, emotional and health needs.

  - o Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement

- **Assurance 9**: The school improvement plan delineates responsibilities fulfilled by the school, the LEA and the SEA serving the school under the plan.

- **Statement 10**: Establish specific annual, measurable targets for continuous and substantial progress by each relevant subgroup, which will ensure all such groups of students, update to align with the new AMOs to close the achievement gap

- **Statement 11**: A mentoring/induction program used with teachers new to the school exists; the essential elements of the mentoring/induction program are documented and the documentation is available for review upon request by LEA or SEA authorities.

- **Statement 12**: All parents with enrolled students will receive an annual notification letter which includes the reasons for its identification as Priority or Focus and the school's plan to improve student achievement.

Assurance 13

The school is communicating with parents regarding school improvement efforts via the following strategies:

- School web site
- School newsletter
- District web page
- Board meeting presentations
- District report card
- Yearly letter to parents
- Short Message Systems (phone blasts)
- Family Night/ Open House / Back to School Night/ Meet-the-Teachers Night, etc.
- Special all-school evening event to present improvement plan
- Regular Title 1 meetings
- Parent-Teacher Conferences
- Home-school visits
- Student Handbook

Assurance for Priority Schools (Annually Updated SIP)

The school has indicated the following response to indicate if it has completed an evaluation with the assistance of our Academic Recovery Liaison:

No

Title I Schoolwide program

The school has indicated the following response as to whether or not it intends to run a Title I Schoolwide program :

Yes

A completed Title I Schoolwide program planning addendum is required if the school is running a Title I Schoolwide program.

No file has been uploaded.

Needs Assessment

School Accomplishments

Accomplishment #1:

According to DRA-2 data collected in January 2014, 33% of students are reading at or above grade level.

Accomplishment #2:

According to PVAAS data (2012-2013 School Value Added Report) there is evidence that the school met the standard for PA academic growth in the following areas:

- Grade 6 (Reading)

According to PVAAS data (2012-2013 School Value Added Report) there is moderate evidence that the school met the standard for PA academic growth in the following areas:

- Grade 6 (math)
- Grade 8 (Reading)

According to PVAAS data (2012-2013 School Value Added Report) there is significant evidence that the school met the standard for PA academic growth in the following areas:

- Grade 5 (Reading)
- Grade 7 (Math)
- Grade 7 (Reading)

Accomplishment #3:

According to the 2012-2013 School Performance Profile, Wayne's attendance rate was 91.31%.

School Concerns

Concern #1:

According to DRA-2 data collected in January 2014, 67% of students at Wayne school are reading below grade level.

Concern #2:

According to PVAAS data (2012-2013 School Value Added Report) there is significant evidence that the school did not meet the standards for PA academic growth in the following areas:

- Grade 4 (Reading, Math, Science)

- Grade 5 (Writing)

- Grade 8 (Science, Writing)

According to PVAAS data (2012-2013 School Value Added Report) there is moderate evidence that the school did not meet the standards for PA academic growth in the following areas:

- Grade 5 (Math)

- Grade 8 (Math)

Concern #3:

We do not have data to support our goal indicating effective instructional strategies used by educators.

Concern #4:

- According to the 2012-2013 School Performance Profile, Wayne's indicators of Achievement (including Mathematics/Algebra 1, Reading/Literature, Science/Biology, Writing, and Grade 3 Reading) were below the performance measure of 60.

Concern #5:

Reviewing E-Metric 3 year trend data in Reading, the population of "All Students" has shown a decrease in achievement (Percentages meeting or exceeding proficiency - 2011-33.1% ; 2012 - 30.3% ; 2013 - 25.5%)

Concern #6:

Reviewing E-Metric data in Reading there is a significant Achievement Gap between the "All students" population compared to the "IEP" and "LEP" subgroups:

- All Students   2011 - 33.1%   2012 - 30.3%   2013 - 25.5%

- 2011 - IEP 17.5%   LEP 5.6%

- 2012 - IEP 10%   LEP 11.9%

- 2013 - IEP 11.1%   LEP 3.2%

Prioritized Systemic Challenges

Systemic Challenge #1 *(Guiding Question #4)* Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures consistent implementation of effective instructional practices that meet the needs of all students across all classrooms and aligns with the Pennsylvania Framework for Teaching

Aligned Concerns:

According to DRA-2 data collected in January 2014, 67% of students at Wayne school are reading below grade level.

According to PVAAS data (2012-2013 School Value Added Report) there is significant evidence that the school did not meet the standards for PA academic growth in the following areas:
- Grade 4 (Reading, Math, Science)
- Grade 5 (Writing)
- Grade 8 (Science, Writing)

According to PVAAS data (2012-2013 School Value Added Report) there is moderate evidence that the school did not meet the standards for PA academic growth in the following areas:
- Grade 5 (Math)
- Grade 8 (Math)

We do not have data to support our goal indicating effective instructional strategies used by educators.

- According to the 2012-2013 School Performance Profile, Wayne's indicators of Achievement (including Mathematics/Algebra 1, Reading/Literature, Science/Biology, Writing, and Grade 3 Reading) were below the performance measure of 60.

Reviewing E-Metric 3 year trend data in Reading, the population of "All Students" has shown a decrease in achievement (Percentages meeting or exceeding proficiency - 2011-33.1% ; 2012 - 30.3% ; 2013 - 25.5%)

Reviewing E-Metric data in Reading there is a significant Achievement Gap between the "All students" population compared to the "IEP" and "LEP" subgroups:

- All Students   2011 - 33.1%   2012 - 30.3%   2013 - 25.5%

- 2011 - IEP 17.5%   LEP 5.6%

- 2012 - IEP 10%   LEP 11.9%

- 2013 - IEP 11.1% LEP 3.2%

Systemic Challenge #2 *(Guiding Question #2)* Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures school-wide use of data that is focused on school improvement and the academic growth of all students

Aligned Concerns:

- According to the 2012-2013 School Performance Profile, Wayne's indicators of Achievement (including Mathematics/Algebra 1, Reading/Literature, Science/Biology, Writing, and Grade 3 Reading) were below the performance measure of 60.

Reviewing E-Metric 3 year trend data in Reading, the population of "All Students" has shown a decrease in achievement (Percentages meeting or exceeding proficiency - 2011-33.1% ; 2012 - 30.3% ; 2013 - 25.5%)

Reviewing E-Metric data in Reading there is a significant Achievement Gap between the "All students" population compared to the "IEP" and "LEP" subgroups:

- All Students   2011 - 33.1%   2012 - 30.3%   2013 - 25.5%
- 2011 - IEP 17.5%   LEP 5.6%
- 2012 - IEP 10%   LEP 11.9%
- 2013 - IEP 11.1% LEP 3.2%

Systemic Challenge #3 *(Guiding Question #5)* Ensure that the organizational structure, processes, materials, equipment, and human and fiscal resources within the school align with the school's goals for student growth and continuous school improvement.

Systemic Challenge #4 *(Guiding Question #3)* Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures consistent implementation of a standards aligned curriculum framework across all classrooms for all students.

Systemic Challenge #5 *(Guiding Question #1)* Ensure that there is a system in the school and/or district that fully ensures the principal is enabled to serve as a strong instructional leader who, in partnership with the school community (students, staff, parents, community, etc.) leads achievement growth and continuous improvement within the school.

Systemic Challenge #6 *(Guiding Question #6)* Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures a safe and supportive environment for all students.

School Level Plan

Action Plans

Goal #1: Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures consistent implementation of effective instructional practices that meet the needs of all students across all classrooms and aligns with the Pennsylvania Framework for Teaching

>   **Indicators of Effectiveness:**
>>   Type: Interim
>>   Data Source: DRA2
>>   Specific Targets: Wayne will increase students reading at grade level with the following targets:
>>   *2014-2015 40%
>>   *2015-2016 50%
>>   *2016-2017 60%
>>
>>   Type: Annual
>>   Data Source: PVAAS
>>   Specific Targets: 14/14 targets on the School Value Added Report will be green, indicating evidence that the School met the standard for PA Academic Growth by the end of the 2015-2016 School Year.
>>
>>   Type: Annual
>>   Data Source: EMetric Data
>>   Specific Targets: According to the EMetric data, Wayne will reverse the 3 year trend that shows a decrease in achievement with the following targets:
>>   * 2014-2014 : 33%
>>   * 2015-2016 : 38%
>>   * 2016-2017 : 45%
>>
>>   Type: Annual
>>   Data Source: School Performance Profile
>>   Specific Targets: According to the School Performance Profile Wayne will increase the performance measure by the following targets:
>>   * 2014-2015 : 60
>>   * 2015-2016 : 70
>>   * 2016-2017 : 75
>>
>>   Type: Annual
>>   Data Source: EMetric

Specific Targets: According to the EMetric data, Wayne will decrease the achievement gap shown between the "All Student" population compared to the "IEP" and "LEP" subgroup with the following targets:

2014-2015 : IEP 19%   LEP 11%

2015-2016 : IEP 27%   LEP 19%

2016-2017 : IEP 35%   LEP 27%

Strategies:

Interpret and Implement the PA Core / Common Core Content and Practice Standards

Description:

As a school we will unpack and interpret the PA Core / Common Core Content and Practice Standards to meet the goal of fully understanding the expectations of what students should know and be able to accomplish. Our district curriculum is written to reflect the shifts and requirements of the PA Core / CCSS. Data from district created assessments, as well as teacher created formative assessments, will be reviewed to determine the next necessary teaching moves.

SAS Alignment: Standards, Assessment, Curriculum Framework, Instruction, Materials & Resources

Differentiated Instruction and Student Discourse

Description:

Professional development and training will occur, in large and small group situations, around the effective instructional practices of differentiating instruction and student discourse. According to Carol Tomlinson the idea of differentiating instruction is an approach to teaching that advocates active planning for and attention to student differences in classrooms, in the context of high quality curriculums. This approach along with multiple opportunities to process, solidify, and explain their thinking (student discourse) leads to an increase in achievement.

SAS Alignment: Standards, Curriculum Framework, Instruction

Implementation Steps:

Planning for Strategy One: Determine grade level expectations according to shifts of PA and CC Standards

Description:

In whole group and small group settings with the administrative team, teachers will review and discuss the specifics of grade level expectations according to the shifts and requirements in the PA and Common Core Standards. Monthly meetings will take place during the 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-2016 school years. The goal is for 100% of teachers to post daily learning targets written in student friendly language. Our expectation for walk throughs is that all instruction matches the standards based learning target.

Indicators of implementation for planning will include a yearly calendar that indicates monthly team meetings, and a schedule of administrative walkthroughs.

Start Date: 4/1/2014   **End Date:** 11/23/2015

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- Interpret and Implement the PA Core / Common Core Content and Practice Standards

Professional Development for Strategy One: Create learning targets for PA and CC Standards

Description:

Building adminstration and Instructional coach will lead teaching teams through training and application of PA and Common Core State Standards as evidenced in Learning Targets. Teacher meetings will occur on a monthly basis for all teachers. We will use the resources of the SAS portal (PDE), Achievethecore.org, and Connie Moss (Learning Targets) to guide our learning.

Evidence of implementation will be examples of meeting agendas.

Start Date: 9/8/2014   **End Date:** 6/10/2016

Program Area(s): Professional Education, Special Education, Gifted Education

Supported Strategies:

- Interpret and Implement the PA Core / Common Core Content and Practice Standards

Implementation for Strategy One: Engagement of PA and CC Standards through effective teaching strategies.

Description:

In 100% of classrooms, faculty will engage students in PA and CC Standards through standards-based curriculum and effective teaching strategies. Administration will use lesson plans and walk through data to monitor implementation.

Notes found in the walkthrough section of PA-ETEP address both lesson alignment to standards and teaching strategies that target those standards.

Start Date: 8/24/2015   **End Date:** 6/8/2017

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- Interpret and Implement the PA Core / Common Core Content and Practice Standards

Monitoring for Strategy One: Review student work according to PA and CC Standards

Description:

Teaching teams with academic coach and/or administration will meet to review student work samples to determine mastery of a required skill or strategy as delineated by the CCSS and/or PA Core. Discussion will include teaching strategies that were successful as well as necessary steps for differentiation. Plans for enrichment and reteaching will be developed as necessary. These plans will be reflected in teacher lesson plans. Students will take ownership for monitoring their growth by using individual goal sheets.

The indicator of implementation is a yearly calendar that delineates specific dates each month to review student work to determine mastery of a required skill or strategy as delineated by the PA or CC Standards.

Start Date: 9/21/2015   **End Date:** 6/9/2017

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- Interpret and Implement the PA Core / Common Core Content and Practice Standards

Evaluation for Strategy One: Review of various assessments to rate effectiveness

Description:

As a school Wayne will use the following assessments to evaluate effectiveness:

- DRA-2 (At least 60% of students will read at or above grade level)
- PSSA (At least 45% of students will score proficient or advanced in Reading and Math)
- PVAAS (School Performance Profile score will be 75)

Indicators of implementation include a spreadsheet of DRA-2 scores for each grade level showing growth toward our goal of at least 60% of students reading at or above grade level by June 2017, and Annual School Performance Profile Report.

Start Date: 1/4/2016   **End Date:** 6/9/2017

Program Area(s): Professional Education, Special Education, Gifted Education

Supported Strategies:

- Interpret and Implement the PA Core / Common Core Content and Practice Standards

Planning for Strategy Two: Determine expectations for use of Differentiated Instruction and Student Discourse

Description:

In whole group and small group settings with the administrative team and academic coach, teachers will review and discuss the expectations around differentiated instruction and student discourse. Monthly meetings will take place for ongoing discussion and learning. The goal is for 100% of classrooms to use effective differentiated instruction and student discourse strategies.

Indicators of implementation for planning will include a yearly calendar that indicates monthly team meetings and a schedule of administrative walk throughs.

Start Date: 4/1/2014   **End Date:** 6/10/2016

Program Area(s): Professional Education, Special Education, Gifted Education

Supported Strategies:

- Differentiated Instruction and Student Discourse

Professional Development for Strategy Two: Educate teachers on value and research of Differentiated Instruction and Student Discourse

Description:

Building Administration and academic coach will lead teacher teams through training on the value and research behind differentiated instruction and student discourse. Planning for differentiated instruction and opportunities for student discourse improve student learning. Teacher meetings will occur on a monthly basis with all teachers participating. Flexible groups will be identified on lesson plans and observable during observations and walk throughs. Classroom observations will indicate a 70/30 ratio of teacher talk and student voice.

Indicator of implementation will be meeting agenda examples.

Start Date: 10/1/2014   **End Date:** 6/9/2016

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- Differentiated Instruction and Student Discourse

Implementation for Strategy Two: Engagement of PA and CC Standards through Differentiated Instruction and Student Discourse

Description:

In 100% of classrooms, faculty will implement the engagement strategies of differentiated instruction and student discourse as a way to ensure access to grade

specific curriculum which is aligned to CCSS and PA Core. Administration will use lesson plan and walk through data to monitor implementation.

The indicator of implementation is data on PA-ETEP that addresses ratio of teacher to student voice, differentiation opportunities, and lesson alignment to standards both in planning and practice.

Start Date: 8/24/2015   **End Date:** 6/8/2017

Program Area(s): Professional Education, Special Education, Gifted Education

Supported Strategies:

- Differentiated Instruction and Student Discourse

Monitoring for Strategy Two: Review of student work to determine effective implementation of Differentiated Instruction and Student Discourse

Description:

Teaching teams and administration will meet to review student work samples to determine mastery of a required skill or strategy as delineated by the CCSS and/or PA Core. Discussion will include teaching strategies that were successful as well as necessary steps for differentiation. Plans for enrichment and reteaching will be developed as necessary. These plans will be reflected in teacher lesson plans. Students will take ownership for monitoring their growth by using individual goal sheets.

The indicator of implementation is a yearly calendar that delineates specific dates each month to review student work and plan for differentiation and student discourse.

Start Date: 9/21/2015   **End Date:** 6/8/2017

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- Differentiated Instruction and Student Discourse

Evaluation for Strategy Two: Review of various assessments to rate effectiveness of engagement strategies

Description:

As a school Wayne will use the following assessments to evaluate effectiveness:

- DRA-2 (At least 60% of students will read at or above grade level)
- PSSA (At least 45% of students will score proficient or advanced in Reading and Math)
- PVAAS (School Performance Profile wil indicate a score of 75))

Indicators of implementation include a spreadsheet of DRA-2 scores for each grade level showing growth toward our goal of at least 60% of students reading at or above grade level by June 2017, and Annual School Performance Profile Report.

Start Date: 1/4/2016   **End Date:** 6/8/2017

Program Area(s): Professional Education, Special Education, Gifted Education

Supported Strategies:

- Differentiated Instruction and Student Discourse

Appendix: Professional Development Implementation Step Details

LEA Goals Addressed:	Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures consistent implementation of effective instructional practices that meet the needs of all students across all classrooms and aligns with the Pennsylvania Framework for Teaching	Strategy #1: Interpret and Implement the PA Core / Common Core Content and Practice Standards

Start	End	Title	Description
9/8/2014	6/10/2016	Professional Development for Strategy One: Create learning targets for PA and CC Standards	Building adminstration and Instructional coach will lead teaching teams through training and application of PA and Common Core State Standards as evidenced in Learning Targets. Teacher meetings will occur on a monthly basis for all teachers. We will use the resources of the SAS portal (PDE), Achievethecore.org, and Connie Moss (Learning Targets) to guide our learning.

Evidence of implementation will be examples of meeting agendas. |

Person Responsible	SH	S	EP	Provider	Type	App.
Building administration, building coach, and members of the instructional leadership team	1.0	15	55	Building Administration	School Entity	No

Knowledge	Teachers will have a deep understanding of the expectations set forth in the PA and Common Core State Standards. They will demonstrate this understanding by creating systematic and effective learning targets for daily instruction.

Supportive Research	SAS Portal (PDE) ; Achievethecore.org (Student Achievement Partners) ; Learning Targets (Connie Moss) ; EngageNY

Designed to Accomplish

For classroom teachers, school counselors and education specialists:	Enhances the educator's content knowledge in the area of the educator's certification or assignment. Increases the educator's teaching skills based on research on effective practice, with attention given to interventions for struggling students.
For school and district administrators, and other educators seeking leadership roles:	Provides the knowledge and skills to think and plan strategically, ensuring that assessments, curriculum, instruction, staff professional education, teaching materials and interventions for struggling students are aligned to each other as well as to Pennsylvania's academic standards. Empowers leaders to create a culture of teaching and learning, with an emphasis on learning.
Training Format	Series of Workshops School Whole Group Presentation Professional Learning Communities

Participant Roles	Classroom teachers Principals / Asst. Principals School counselors Paraprofessional Other educational specialists	**Grade Levels**	Elementary - Primary (preK - grade 1) Elementary - Intermediate (grades 2-5) Middle (grades 6-8)

Follow-up Activities	Team development and sharing of content-area lesson implementation outcomes, with involvement of administrator and/or peers Analysis of student work, with administrator and/or peers Creating lessons to meet varied student learning styles Peer-to-peer lesson discussion Lesson modeling with mentoring Joint planning period activities Journaling and reflecting	Evaluation Methods	Classroom observation focusing on factors such as planning and preparation, knowledge of content, pedagogy and standards, classroom environment, instructional delivery and professionalism. Student PSSA data Standardized student assessment data other than the PSSA Classroom student assessment data Review of participant lesson plans

LEA Goals Addressed:	Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures consistent implementation of effective instructional practices that meet the needs of all students across all classrooms and aligns with the Pennsylvania Framework for Teaching	Strategy #1: Differentiated Instruction and Student Discourse

Start	End	Title	Description
10/1/2014	6/9/2016	Professional Development for Strategy Two: Educate teachers on value and research of Differentiated Instruction and Student Discourse	Building Administration and academic coach will lead teacher teams through training on the value and research behind differentiated instruction and student discourse. Planning for differentiated instruction and opportunities for student discourse improve student learning.

Teacher meetings will occur on a monthly basis with all teachers participating. Flexible groups will be identified on lesson plans and observable during observations and walk throughs. Classroom observations will indicate a 70/30 ratio of teacher talk and student voice.

Indicator of implementation will be meeting agenda examples.

Person Responsible	SH	S	EP	Provider	Type	App.
Building leadership - Administrative team, academic coach, members of the instructional leadership team	1.5	10	45	Building Administration and teacher leadership team	School Entity	No

Knowledge

Specific differentiated instruction practices including small group reading instruction and mathematics instruction.

Effectiveness of student discourse as a comprehension strategy. How to effectively incorporate student discourse into daily lessons.

Strategies that Work - Stephanie Harvey and Anne Goudvis;

Supportive Research

Research for Better Teaching - Observing and Analyzing Teaching - 1; The Skillful Teacher by Saphier, Haley-Speca and Gower, Skillful Leader II by Platt, Trip, Fraser, Warnock, Curtis

According to Carol Ann Tomlinson, "You need to systematically move kids among similar readiness groups, varied readiness groups, mixed learning-profile groups, interest groups, mixed interest groups, and student choice groups." (2010)

Designed to Accomplish

For classroom teachers, school counselors and education specialists:

Increases the educator's teaching skills based on research on effective practice, with attention given to interventions for struggling students.

	For school and district administrators, and other educators seeking leadership roles:	Empowers leaders to create a culture of teaching and learning, with an emphasis on learning.	
Training Format	Series of Workshops School Whole Group Presentation		
Participant Roles	Classroom teachers Principals / Asst. Principals Other educational specialists	**Grade Levels**	Elementary - Primary (preK - grade 1) Elementary - Intermediate (grades 2-5) Middle (grades 6-8)
Follow-up Activities	Analysis of student work, with administrator and/or peers Creating lessons to meet varied student learning styles Peer-to-peer lesson discussion Joint planning period activities	**Evaluation Methods**	Classroom observation focusing on factors such as planning and preparation, knowledge of content, pedagogy and standards, classroom environment, instructional delivery and professionalism. Classroom student assessment data PVAAS data

Assurance of Quality and Accountability

We, the undersigned, hereby certify that the school level plan for Wayne Sch in the Erie City SD has been duly reviewed by a *Quality Review Team* convened by the Superintendent of Schools and formally approved by the district's Board of Education, per guidelines required by the Pennsylvania Department of Education.

We hereby affirm and assure the Secretary of Education that the school level plan:

- Addresses all the **required components** prescribed by the Pennsylvania Department of Education

- Meets **ESEA requirements for Title I schools**

- Reflects **sound educational practice**

- Has a **high probability of improving student achievement**

- Has sufficient **District leadership and support to ensure successful implementation**

With this *Assurance of Quality & Accountability*, we, therefore, request that the Secretary of Education and the Pennsylvania Department of Education grant formal approval to implement the school level plan submitted by Wayne Sch in the Erie City SD for the 2014-2017 school-year.

No signature has been provided

Superintendent/Chief Executive Officer

No signature has been provided

Board President

No signature has been provided

IU Executive Director

Evaluation of School Improvement Plan

Describe the success from the first year plan

Strategy 1: Interpret and Implement the PA Core/Common Core Content and Practice Standards

Planning for Strategy 1: Determine grade level expectations according to shifts of PA and CC Standards

Grade level meeting dates: 9.17.14, 09.18.14, 10.15.14, 10.16.14, 12.10.14, 12.11.14, 1.14.15, 1.15.15, 2.11.15, 2.12.15, 3.11.15, 3.12.15, 4.8.15, 4.9.15, 5.13.15, 5.14.15, 6.8.15, 6.9.15

Walkthrough dates: week of October 14, 2014; December 8, 2014; February 18, 2015

Professional Development for Strategy 1: Create learning targets for PA and CC Standards

Evidence will be examples of meeting agendas

Implementation for Strategy 1: Engagement of PA and CC Standards through effective teaching strategies

Evidence is found on PA-ETEP in the anecdotal notes tab

Monitoring for Strategy 1: Review student work according to PA and CC Standards

Grade level meeting dates: 9.17.14, 09.18.14, 10.15.14, 10.16.14, 12.10.14, 12.11.14, 1.14.15, 1.15.15, 2.11.15, 2.12.15, 3.11.15, 3.12.15, 4.8.15, 4.9.15, 5.13.15, 5.14.15, 6.8.15, 6.9.15

Study Group dates: 01.07.15, 01.13.15, 1.29.15, 2.3.15, 2.4.15, 3.3.15, 3.4.15, 3.25.15, 3.26.15

Evaluation for Strategy 1: Review of various assessments to rate effectiveness

DRA2 Scores

Grade	Winter 2014 % of students at/above benchmark	Winter 2015 % of students at/above benchmark	Winter 2016 % of students at/above benchmark
K	77%	72%	81%
1	22%	23%	16%
2	29%	23%	39%
3	8%	29%	22%
4	31%	48%	40%
5	51%	49%	52%
6	29%	34%	33%
7	37%	27%	29%
8	18%	35%	48%

Overall percentage at/above benchmark K-8 - 34% in Winter 2014; 38% in Winter 2015.

Our targets by June 2015 - 40%; June 2016 - 50%; June 2017 - 60%.

Focus on K-3 to eliminate any achievement gap as students enter grade 4.

Our whole group and small groups sessions focusing on the shifts and requirements of the standards have been the springboard for teachers posting learning targets. Walkthoughs and observations have shown that 70% of our teachers have a learning target posted.

Strategy 2: Differentiated Instruction and Discourse
Planning for Strategy 2: Determine expectations for use of differentiated instruction and student discourse
Faculty meeting dates: 09.02.14, 10.6.14, 12.8.14, 1.5.15, 2.2.15, 3.2.15, 4.13.15, 5.4.15, 6.1.15
ILT dates: 10.20.14, 12.15.14, 2.9.15, 3.9.15
Walkthrough dates: October 14, 2014; December 8, 2015; February 18, 2015
Professional Development for Strategy 2: Educate teachers on value and research of differentiated instruction and student discourse
Evidence will be examples of meeting agendas
Implementation for Strategy 2: Engagement of PA and CC Standards through differentiated instruction and student discourse
Evidence is found on PA-ETEP in the anecdotal notes tab
Monitoring for Strategy 2: Review of student work to determine effective implementation of differentiated instruction and student discourse
Grade level meeting dates: 9.17.14, 09.18.14, 10.15.14, 10.16.14, 12.10.14, 12.11.14, 1.14.15, 1.15.15, 2.11.15, 2.12.15, 3.11.15, 3.12.15, 4.8.15, 4.9.15, 5.13.15, 5.14.15, 6.8.15, 6.9.15
Study Group dates: 01.07.15, 01.13.15, 1.29.15, 2.3.15, 2.4.15, 3.3.15, 3.4.15, 3.25.15, 3.26.15
Evaluation for Strategy 2: Review of various assessments to rate effectiveness of engagement strategies   DRA2 Scores (above)
We have had monthly meetings addressing the definition of student discourse, and how to plan for opportunities for discourse. These meetings have produced a heightened awareness of the need for students to talk about their thinking. Walkthrough data from December 2014 showed 4 classrooms with an increase in effective student talk time.

Describe the continuing areas of concerns from the first year plan

30% of our classroom teachers do not have learning targets posted on a regular basis. Lesson content does not always match the posted learning target.
Four grade levels show a decrease in percentage of students reading on grade level from last year to this year (winter DRA scores).
While we recognize an increase in student talk opportunities, the level of conversation needs to become more authentic, meaningful, and rigorous.

Describe the initiatives that have been revised

While we recognize some grade levels did not show an increase in students reading on grade level, we remain committed to the goals of our three year original plan. We believe the teacher is the critical factor in learning for our children. Our staff turnover rates (48% from SY2012-2013; 30% from SY2013-2014) indicate a need to continue staff development toward our original goals.
Additional instances (monthly) of data collection (learning targets posted, lesson content

matching the posted target, script of student conversation) will be collected and shared with individual teachers and collectively to the Instructional Leadership Team.

Describe the success from the past year.

Continued work on interpreting and implementing PA Core/Common Core Content and Practice Standards
Continued work on Small group, differentiated reading in large group, grade level, and voluntary small group settings.
Video analysis in ILT, colleague-to-colleague classroom visits are becoming more frequent.
Faculty Meeting Dates: 09.08.15, 10.05.15, 11.02.15, 12.07.15, 01.04.16, 02.01.16, 03.07.16, 04.04.16
ILT Meeting Dates: 09.28.15, 10.26.15, 11.16.15, 12.21.15, 01.25.16, 02.29.16, 04.25.16
Grade Level Meeting Dates: 09.16.15, 09.17.15, 09.30.15, 10.01.15, 10.14.15, 10.15.15, 10.28.15, 10.29.15, 11.11.15, 11.12.15, 12.02.15, 12.03.15, 12.16.15, 12.17.15, 01.13.16, 01.14.16, 01.20.16, 01.21.16, 02.03.16, 02.04.16, 02.17.16, 02.18.16, 03.02.16, 03.03.16, 03.30.16, 03.31.16
Team Planning Dates:09.02.15, 09.03.15, 09.09.15, 09.10.15, 10.07.15, 10.08.15, 11.04.15, 11.05.15, 12.09.15, 12.10.15, 01.06.16, 01.07.16, 02.10.16, 02.11.16, 03.09.16, 03.10.16
BEST (Building Education Support Team) Meeting Dates: 09.22.15, 09.23.15, 10.19.15, 10.20.15, 11.16.15, 11.17.15, 12.21.15, 12.22.15, 01.25.16, 01.26.16, 02.22.16, 02.23.16, 03.14.16, 03.15.16
DRA2 Scores

Grade	Winter 2015	Winter 2016
	% of students at/above benchmark	% of students at/above benchmark
K	72%	81%
2	23%	39%
5	49%	52%
8	35%	48%

Winter 2016

Grade:	# students @/above benchmark	# students below benchmark	# students assessed	% students @/above benchmark	Questions:
K	50 students	12students	62students	81%	What strategies do these students have secure?
1	11students	57students	68 students	16%	1H-27%/101-9%/107-1%
2	20 students	51 students	71 students	39%	2C-48%/2N-27%/2T-5%
3	13 students	46 students	59 students	22%	3F-14%/3N-16%/3T-37%
4	23 students	34 students	57 students	40%	4St
5	29 students	27 students	56 students	52%	5Q
6	14 students	29 students	43 students	33%	6R

7	14 students	34students	48 students	29%	7C
8	29 students	32 students	61 students	48%	8K
K-8				40%	Goal=50% K-8 May 2016

Based on walkthrough data, 90% of our classroom teachers have learning targets posted on a regular basis. Students in 75% of classrooms can identy target and specific content, when asked.

Student talk continues to become more content focused. Teachers have visited one another, and participated in video analysis of opportunnities for student talk/discussion/conversation.

Describe the continuing areas of concerns from the first two years.

Achievement remains too low, despite growth.

DRA 2

| Grade | Winter 2014 | Winter 2015 | Winter 2016 |
	% of students at/above benchmark	% of students at/above benchmark	% of students at/above benchmark
K	77%	72%	81%
1	22%	23%	16%
2	29%	23%	39%
3	8%	29%	22%
4	31%	48%	40%
5	51%	49%	52%
6	29%	34%	33%
7	37%	27%	29%
8	18%	35%	48%

DIBELS Next - Winter 2016

Grade	%At Risk	%Some Risk	%Low Risk
K	92	8	0
1	84	8	9
2	81	8	11

easyCBM - Winter 2016

Grade	%At Risk	%Some Risk	%Low Risk
K	57	25	18
1	57	22	21
2	51	22	27

3	30	31	39
4	54	16	30
5	71	19	10
6	49	21	30
All	53	22	25

Based on walkthroughs, 15% of classrooms do not have learning targets posted on a regular basis.

Lesson content does not always match posted learning target.

Describe the initiatives that have been revised.

While we recognize some grade levels did not show an increase in students reading on grade level, we remain committed to the goals of our three year original plan. We believe the teacher is the critical factor in learning for our children. Our staff turnover rates (48% from SY2012-2013; 30% from SY2013-2014; 30% from SY2014-2015) indicate a need to continue staff development toward our original goals.

Additional instances (monthly) of data collection (learning targets posted, lesson content matching the posted target, script of student conversation) will be collected and shared with individual teachers and collectively to the Instructional Leadership Team. Video taped lessons will be shared with the Instrucional Leadership Team to analyze teacher practice and build a common experience from which to springboard our conversation and collective growth.