

SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN

**Worcester Public Schools
2016 - 2017**



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

Flagg Street

School

Mary E. Labuski

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
Mary Labuski	Principal	Sept: 29
Patricia Henningson	Assistant Principal	Oct: 13, 27
Patricia Genese	Focused Instructional Coach	Nov: 10
Laura Braun-Lush	School Psychologist	Dec: 1, 15
Pamela Brezniak	Kindergarten Teacher	Jan: 5, 19
Lori Degnan	Grade 1 Teacher	Feb: 2, 16
Colleen Murray	Grade 2 Teacher	Mar: 9, 23
Joseph Cunha	Grade 4 Teacher	Apr: 6, 27
Kerrie Plotczyk	Grade 4 Teacher	May: 11, 25
Julie Belisle	Grade 5 & 6 Teacher	June: 8

II. Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Accountability Data

2016 Accountability Data - Flagg Street

Organization Information			
District:	Worcester (03480000)	School type:	Elementary School
School:	Flagg Street (03480090)	Grades served:	K,01,02,03,04,05,06
Region:	Commissioner's Districts	Title I status:	Non-Title I School (NT)

Accountability Information		About the Data
Accountability and Assistance Level		
Level 2	Not meeting gap narrowing goals	
This school's overall performance relative to other schools in same school type (School percentiles: 1-99)		
All students:		74

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		70	Did Not Meet Target
High needs		64	Did Not Meet Target
Econ. Disadvantaged		-	
ELL and Former ELL		68	Did Not Meet Target
Students w/disabilities		-	
Amer. Ind. or Alaska Nat.		-	
Asian		-	
Afr. Amer./Black		-	
Hispanic/Latino		-	
Multi-race, Non-Hisp./Lat.		-	
Nat. Haw. or Pacif. Isl.		-	
White		70	Did Not Meet Target

III. Comprehensive Needs Analysis

Areas of Strength	
Strength	Evidence
Flagg Street School’s overall performance relative to other schools in same school type demonstrates high performance.	2016 Accountability Data Report – Massachusetts Department of Elementary & Secondary Education (DESE) – School Percentiles 1-99 – Flagg Street School 74 th percentile
The percent of students in grades three through six, scoring proficient or higher in English Language Arts indicates strong performance.	2016 MCAS ELA performance reporting: 76% proficient or advanced; Composite Performance Index = 89.2
Student Growth Percentiles (SGP) measure gains in student achievement from year to year. SGPs between 40 and 60 represent moderate growth. Our SGP for Mathematics is in the high range.	2016 MCAS Mathematics performance reporting: Student Growth Percentile (SGP) for all students in mathematics was 63.5.
Massachusetts’ Accountability system provides extra credit for schools meeting or exceeding growth targets for English language proficiency growth. Flagg Street received extra credit.	2016 Accountability Data Report – DESE Target = 60.0 Flagg Street SGPA = 77.0 Extra credit in PPI points
Areas of Concern	
Concern	Evidence
Massachusetts' Framework for District Accountability and Assistance classifies schools and districts on a five-level scale, classifying those meeting their gap narrowing goals in Level 1 and the lowest performing in Level 5. Flagg Street has dropped one level.	2016 Accountability Data Report – DESE Flagg Street School – Level 2 – “Not meeting gap narrowing goals”
The Composite Performance Index (CPI) is a measure of the extent to which students are progressing toward proficiency (a CPI of 100) in ELA and mathematics. There is a significant discrepancy between our Students with Disabilities subgroup and non-disabled.	2016 MCAS English Language Arts Performance Reporting for Subgroups Our CPI for Students with Disabilities subgroup (26 students) was 58.7; non-disabled (203 students) was 92.9

<p>The percent of students in grades three through six scoring proficient or higher in Mathematics is of concern.</p>	<p>2016 MCAS Mathematics Performance Reporting In 2015, students proficient or higher in Math was 73%; our goal for 2016 was 80% Our actual percent of students proficient or higher in math was 67%, 6 percentage points below 2015 and 13 percentage points below our goal</p>
<p>The percent of students in grade five scoring proficient or higher in Science is of concern.</p>	<p>2016 MCAS Science Performance Reporting Our percent of students proficient or higher in Science was 60%, 8 percentage points below 2015 and 10 points below our goal</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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administration will communicate high expectations and instructional priorities to all staff and prioritize the following Best Practices/Strategies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Progress monitoring in all core subject areas (monthly) ➤ Close analysis of data, looking at student work, researching and planning appropriate interventions ➤ Lesson Study to support our focused instructional practices of Close Reading with Text-Dependent Questions and Units of Study in Writing.
Instructional Leadership Team Implementation	<p>Instructional Leadership Team members will model an effective community of practice. A shared vision, priorities, goals and action steps will be developed and maintained by the ILT and will be shared among all staff through discussions and actions. Results of monthly progress monitoring will be reviewed by ILT. All outcomes will be shared with grade-level colleagues following all ILT meetings. The implementation of lesson study will be planned and monitored at 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"> • Monthly progress monitoring instruments administered • Attendance at and participation in professional collaboration meetings • Lesson Plans as a component of Lesson Study • Reflections/feedback on cycles of Lesson Study • Meeting agendas 	<p>Data Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results of progress monitoring, all core subject areas, all grade levels <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Foundations Unit Tests ▪ Benchmark Assessment System (BAS) Levels ▪ Student Responses to Text-Dependent Questions ▪ Monthly math assessments ▪ Math fluency tests ▪ Reading Responses – monthly samples ▪ On-demand Writing pieces; final products ▪ Rubrics – all subject areas

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

- Administration will communicate high expectations and instructional priorities to all staff and prioritize the following **High-Impact Instructional Strategies**:
 - Student goal setting with reflections on progress
 - Constructive feedback provided from teachers on student work on a timely basis
 - Classroom procedures and routines clear and posted
 - Teacher moves throughout the classroom, interacting with all students
 - Use of small, flexible groups for targeted instruction
- Continue to refine the following **focused instructional practices**: Foundations program in kindergarten, grade one and grade two; Units of Study in Writing – all grade levels; Close Reading with Text-Dependent Questions – all grade levels

Instructional Leadership Team Implementation

- Instructional Leadership Team members will:
- Monitor the implementation of focused instructional practices for fidelity. Request feedback from all faculty on the implementation of high-impact instructional strategies. Review data collected by administration on fidelity of use. Review data from Foundations, Units of Study in Writing, and Close Reading with Text-Dependent Questions; measure the success of initiatives and plan for continued steps in implementation.

School Performance Indicators and Data Sources

ADULT IMPLEMENTATION INDICATOR

STUDENT RESULTS INDICATOR

- Data Source:**
- **High-Impact Instructional Strategies published, posted and in evidence**
 - **Lesson Plans to include small group, guided instruction**
 - **Student Goal setting with reflection**
 - **Student work samples with written, constructive feedback**
 - **Foundations progress reports**
 - **Selections of complex text**
 - **Generation of text-dependent questions**

- Data Source:**
- **Student work samples:**
 - **Foundations**
 - **Units of Study in Writing**
 - **Annotated text and responses to text-dependent questions – all subject areas**

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>In order to meet the needs of our increasingly diverse student population we will prioritize the following Best Practices/Strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade-level teachers and all support professionals will examine data collected through monthly progress monitoring in all subject areas to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>identify</i> the specific needs of students, ➤ <i>identify</i> actions to address those needs, ➤ <i>deliver</i> targeted instruction to address skill gaps, and ➤ <i>review</i> the impact of interventions with students. <p>Students will be reassigned to interventions, enrichment, and supports, as indicated.</p> <p>This targeted collaboration will take place during Common Planning Time, Faculty, Curriculum, and Focused Professional Development Meetings during the 2016-2017 school year.</p>
<p>Instructional Leadership Team Implementation</p>	<p>Instructional Leadership Team members will monitor the identification of student needs, appropriateness of actions/interventions/enrichments/supports and the effectiveness of delivery on all grade levels.</p>

School Performance Indicators and Data Sources

ADULT IMPLEMENTATION INDICATOR	STUDENT RESULTS INDICATOR
<p>Data Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly progress monitoring assessments created • Data reports generated • Targeted interventions identified • Student groups created • Lesson plans including interventions, enrichment, and supports • Attendance at all professional learning opportunities • Agendas from meetings 	<p>Data Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data from progress monitoring assessments • Student work samples • Student growth from targeted interventions • Movement in skills groups • Participation in enrichment opportunities

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

- A **school-wide behavior plan** defines a clear set of behavioral expectations with behavioral supports, as needed, with a focus on *KINDNESS*.
- Administration, Nursing and School Psychologist consistently plan and monitor the delivery of **social-emotional supports** for all students, as needed.
- A robust program of **family and community involvement** exists in our school; regular activities take place that engage families and the community in our school and its programs.

Instructional Leadership Team Implementation

Instructional Leadership Team members work collaboratively to monitor our school climate for both students and teachers and to focus our efforts on high-quality, research based practices designed to result in consistent, improved student performance.

School Performance Indicators and Data Sources

ADULT IMPLEMENTATION INDICATOR

STUDENT RESULTS INDICATOR

- Data Source:**
- **Classroom rules and routines posted**
 - **“Kindness Stars” identified and recognized monthly**
 - **Incident Reports submitted**
 - **Calendar of family/community events**

- Data Source:**
- **Number of office referrals for behavior infractions**
 - **“Kindness Stars” from each classroom**
 - **Participation in family/community events**

V. Worcester Public Schools Professional Learning Plan (PLP)

District Name	School Name	Principal Name	Plan Begin/End Dates
Worcester Public Schools	Flagg Street School	Mary E. Labuski	08/25/16 – 06/12/17

1: Professional Learning Goals:

No.	Goal	Identified Group	Rationale/Sources of Evidence
1	The professional learning community at Flagg Street School will collaborate in literacy teams (reading, writing, language and phonics) to enhance the curriculum and instruction for all students.	All instructional staff – classroom teachers Grs. K-6; the Focused Instructional Coach (FIC); the Teacher of Moderate Special Needs (TMSN); Learning Disabilities Teacher; Assistant Principal and Principal.	Rationale: Need to close achievement gaps for all students, students with disabilities, and English language learners Evidence: Lesson plans; action plans; data reports from progress monitoring; formative and summative assessments
2	Classroom Teachers and support professionals will meet in grade level teams during Common Planning Time (CPT) to look at math data including progress on grade-level math fluency goals and plan interventions to address gaps in conceptual understanding and skills.	All instructional staff	Rationale: Interventions must address specific skill gaps Evidence: Analysis of data and planned interventions; development of skills groups; delivery of interventions; lesson plans; action plans

3	Classroom Teachers and support professionals will meet in grade level teams during Common Planning Time (CPT) to look at MCAS data and the <i>2016 Massachusetts Science and Technology/Engineering (STE) Curriculum Framework</i> .	All instructional staff	Rationale: Conceptual understanding of science/technology and engineering concepts needs strengthening Evidence: Curriculum Maps; teacher-created, interim assessments in Science and Technology/Engineering; resultant data
---	--	-------------------------	---

2: Professional Learning Activities

PL Goal No.	Initial Activities	Follow-up Activities (as appropriate)
1	Collaboration will include, but is not limited to professional learning and book study in Text Dependent Questions: <u>Pathways to Close and Critical Reading</u> , completed in two phases. (Phases 1 will be for teachers new to a grade level and teachers in grades kindergarten and grade 1. Phase 2 will include teachers who participated in the professional learning started in the 2015-2016 year.) Participation includes reading and annotating the professional text, participation in the online videos and/or online modules, discussion, development of leveled questions, reading related professional articles, teacher reflection. Foundations: Practices in implementation in Grade 2, Lucy Calkins Units of Study in Writing, Analysis of student work, student formative and assessment data, RTI planning and collaboration and lesson study.	Based on the professional learning goals and collaboration in literacy teams, teachers will participate in Lesson Study in three phases. Teachers will work in collaboration to plan lesson (Phase 1). The lesson will be observed and observations will be recorded on data collection form (Phase 2). The lesson will be analyzed and discussed (Phase 3). The goals of lesson study include positively impacting the ability of teachers to differentiate instruction, increase teacher collaboration, and adopt change and transferable skills.
2	Common Planning Time teams will focus on the students in the lowest 20% based on multiple measures (MAP, MCAS, formative assessments, fluency assessments)	Based on teachers' Student Learning Goals, time will be dedicated monthly to Looking at Student Work (LASW). Teams will compare common assessments and new district assessments to show growth in areas of answering text-based questions, reaching math fluency expectations, and conceptual understanding of mathematical concepts

3	The 2016 Massachusetts Science and Technology/Engineering (STE) Curriculum Framework includes a recommendation for the amount of time elementary students should have for instruction in science and integration of science with ELA and Math.	Based on teachers' Student Learning Goals, Teachers will read complex texts, answer science-based, text-dependent questions, complete and compare common assessments. Teachers will use district quarterly planning documents for pacing and planning. Time will be dedicated monthly to Looking at Student Work (LASW). Teams will compare common assessments and new district assessments to show growth in science/technology and engineering standards
---	--	--

3: Essential Resources

PL Goal No.	Resources	Other Implementation Considerations
1	Essential Resources- resources include the text, <u>Text Dependent Questions: Pathways to Close and Critical Reading</u> , Foundations Materials for Gr 2 teachers with Study Groups taking place at Flagg Street School this year, Substitute teachers for classroom coverage during collaboration time.	90-minute, monthly curriculum meetings Bi-weekly, grade-level Common Planning Time Meetings Technology resources to support literacy development Focused Instructional Coach (FIC) to design and implement professional learning activities
2	Essential Resources-School-based common assessments, District-wide common assessments; supplemental math instructional materials; technology integration	Bi-weekly, grade-level Common Planning Time Meetings LASW Protocols Grade-level math fluency goals Technology resources to support skill development
3	Essential Resources- Complex Texts, Science/Technology & Engineering curriculum materials, Science Kits	90-minute, monthly curriculum meetings Bi-weekly, grade-level Common Planning time Meetings Technology resources to support conceptual understanding

4: Progress Summary

PL Goal No.	Notes on Plan Implementation	Notes on Goal Attainment
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Text Dependent Questions: Pathways to Close and Critical Reading</u> purchased for all teachers ▪ District-provided implementation materials for Gr. 2 Foundations; purchased K and Gr. 1 materials ▪ Hosting Foundations training sessions for Gr. 2 program implementation w/ District Trainer ▪ Independent Study module developed by FIC and distributed to all teachers; Phase I and Phase II modules and Gr. 2 Foundations module (October, 2016) ▪ Follow-up professional learning session scheduled to kick off Lesson Study component (December, 2016) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All texts purchased and in use ▪ At mid-year in second year of Foundations implementation; all materials purchased and in use ▪ Two Foundations training sessions completed ▪ Independent study modules for <i>Close Reading</i> completed ▪ Lesson Study work begins Jan. 23, 2017
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data reports generated – MCAS, MAP, Common Assessments ▪ LASW Protocols researched and generated ▪ Computer-based math fluency builders adopted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Generation of data reports ongoing; MCAS and MAP data analyzed and used to inform instruction ▪ Common Assessments, 1Q and 2Q administered, analyzed and used to inform instruction and small group development ▪ LASW protocols adopted ▪ Math fluency builders used regularly at school and home
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>2016 Massachusetts Science and Technology/Engineering (STE) Curriculum Framework</i> documents generated ▪ Science Kits in place – all grade levels ▪ District-generated, quarterly planning documents utilized in lesson planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All Frameworks distributed; quarterly planning documents distributed and used in planning ▪ Science Kits in all classrooms, K-6 ▪ Close Reading and TDQs used in science study