

SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN

**Worcester Public Schools
2016 - 2017**



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

Canterbury Street School

School

Mary G. Sealey

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
Kathy Ranaghan	Kindergarten Teacher	Sept: 12 & 26
Karalyn Masiello	First Grade Teacher	Oct: 3 & 24
Jocelyn Aulo	Fourth Grade Teacher	Nov: 7 & 24
Leandra Wallin	Fifth Grade Teacher	Dec: 5 & 19
Patricia Wisler	ESL Teacher	Jan: 9 & 30
Elizabeth Merchant	Focused Instructional Coach (FIC)	Feb: 6 & 27
Kerrie Kelly	Asst. Principal	Mar: 6 & 20
Mary G. Sealey	Principal	Apr: 3 & 24
		May: 1 & 15
		June: 5 & 19

II. Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Accountability Data

2016 Accountability Data - Canterbury

Organization Information			
District:	Worcester (03480000)	School type:	Elementary School
School:	Canterbury (03480045)	Grades served:	PK,K,01,02,03,04,05,06
Region:	Commissioner's Districts	Title I status:	Title I School (SW)

Accountability Information		About the Data
Accountability and Assistance Level		
Level 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:	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; width: 100%;"> Lowest performing Highest performing </div>	

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		72	Did Not Meet Target
High needs		94	Met Target
Econ. Disadvantaged			-
ELL and Former ELL		78	Met Target
Students w/disabilities		26	Did Not Meet Target
Amer. Ind. or Alaska Nat.			-
Asian		99	Met Target
Afr. Amer./Black			-
Hispanic/Latino		69	Did Not Meet Target
Multi-race, Non-Hisp./Lat.			-
Nat. Haw. or Pacif. Isl.			-
White			-

III. Comprehensive Needs Analysis

Areas of Strength	
Strength	Evidence
<p>OVERALL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Increased overall Accountability Level from 3 to 2 -Increased overall percentile 10 points from 15 to 25 -Reached or exceeded cumulative PPI in High Needs, ELL, and Asian subgroups -English Language Proficiency Growth remained high/exceeded target – 65.5 	<p>2016 DESE School Accountability Data</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Writing is a relative strength in grades 5 and 6 on Open Response Type Questions -Fifth grade students exceeded the district and state on three of four, and were even with the state on the fourth question. -Sixth grade students exceeded the district and state on two of four questions and were even with the state on the third question. <p>ELA Proficiency Gap Narrowing - CPI in subgroups as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -White increased from 72.4 to 76 <p>ELA Extra Credit – Increased percent of ADV in all subgroups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -All Students ADV from 2.9 to 6.4 -High Needs from 3.0 to 6.2 -Econ Disadvantaged from 3.8 to 5.4 -ELL and Former ELL from 2.0 to 7.2 -Asian from 6.5 to 12.8 -Hispanic/Latino from 2.4 to 4.5 <p>ELA Growth - High</p> <p>Increased Above Target over 6-year SGP Goal of 51 in all subgroups as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -All Students SGP 63 -High Needs SGP 63 -Econ. Disadvantaged SGP 62 -ELL and Former ELL SGP 63 -Hispanic/Latino SGP 62 	<p>2016 MCAS ELA Data</p>

MATH Proficiency Gap Narrowing - CPI in subgroups as follows:

- All Students increased from 60.5 to 66.8
- High Needs increased from 61.4 to 66.4
- Econ. Disadvantaged increased from 58.7 to 63.8
- ELL/Former ELL increased from 60.4 to 64.5
- Asian increased from 75.8 to 80.8
- Hispanic/Latino from increased 56.0 to 60.5
- White increased from 60.3 to 69.2

MATH Extra Credit

Increased % of ADV - Subgroups:

- All Students from 5.3 to 8.8
- High Needs from 5.5 to 9.4
- Econ. Disadvantaged from 6.2 to 7.0
- ELL/Former ELL from 6.9 to 9.1
- Students with Disabilities from 0.0 to 2.4
- Asian from 9.7 to 17.9
- White from 0.0 to 7.7

Decreased % of Warning - Subgroups:

- All Students from 36.3 to 22.4
- High Needs from 35.4 to 22.5
- Econ. Disadvantaged from 39.2 to 24.0
- Asian from 12.9 to 5.1
- Hispanic/Latino from 40.5 to 31.8
- White from 44.8 to 19.2

MATH Growth – High

Increased Above Target over 6-year SGP Goal of 51 in all subgroups as follows:

- All Students from 39 to 79
- High Needs from 40 to 78
- Econ. Disadvantaged from 38.5 to 79
- ELL/Former ELL from 44 to 74.5

2016 MCAS Math Data

SCIENCE Proficiency Gap Narrowing - CPI in subgroups as follows:

- All Students from 58.5 to 72.5
- High Needs from 58.6 to 73
- Econ. Disadvantaged from 57.7 to 70.6

SCIENCE Decreased % of Warning - Subgroups:

- All Students from 31.7 to 5.0
- High Needs from 31.6 to 5.3
- Econ. Disadvantaged from 38.5 to 5.9

Areas of Concern	
Concern	Evidence
<p>OVERALL Increase cumulative PPI in the following areas: -All students from 72 to 75 or above -Students with disabilities from 27 to 75 or above -Hispanic students from 69 to 75 or above</p>	DESE School Accountability Data
<p>ELA -Earned a rating of No Change in the following subgroups: All Students, High Needs, and Econ. Disadvantaged, ELL/Former ELL -Earned a rating of Declined in the Students with Disabilities subgroups -Increased % of students in Warning in all subgroups</p>	2016 MCAS ELA Data
<p>MATH Proficiency Gap Narrowing -Decreased CPI for Students with Disabilities from 67.2 to 61.0</p>	2016 MCAS Math Data

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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School leaders understand the importance of high expectations and positive regard between leadership, staff and students, and implement strategies/activities to ensure that these elements are in place. (Turnaround Practice 1.2) 2. School leaders prioritize improvement initiatives and are actively engaged in monitoring the implementation of turnaround efforts, communicate progress and challenges, and seek input from staff, and continuously and systematically monitor progress. (Turnaround Practice 1.4) 3. The schedule includes adequate time for professional development opportunities and collaboration for most teachers. There is a process in place for evaluating the schedule based on collected data to maximize opportunities for teacher professional development and ensure it helps all educators continually improve their practice (e.g., targeted coaching, peer observations) and collaboration time. (Turnaround Practice 1.6)
Instructional Leadership Team Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ILT meetings are a priority and are scheduled with meetings on the first and third Monday of each month • Analyze data (formative/summative/anecdotal) at both school and grade levels every 4-6 weeks to determine level of goal attainment, instructional priorities, and RTI groups • Design PD for delivery at staff and PLC meetings – focus ELA, Math, and Science • Discuss PD feedback from instructional staff
School Performance Indicators and Data Sources	
ADULT IMPLEMENTATION INDICATOR	STUDENT RESULTS INDICATOR
Data Source: Teacher Lesson Plans and observations, ILT and PLC Minutes, Staff Meeting Agendas/Feedback Forms	Data Source: Student assessment data, looking at Student Work protocol, Student Work Samples (Writing/Journals), Formal and Informal Observations

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 .

1. Formal teaming and collaboration strategies, processes (e.g., instructional leadership team, collaborative planning, professional learning communities), and protocols are consistently used to address individual students' academic needs by: (1) using data, (2) identifying actions to address student learning needs, and (3) regularly communicating action steps among all staff and teams to build and sustain a professional culture of learning.
(Turnaround Practice 2.3)
2. Instructional leaders conduct weekly or daily classroom observations (e.g., learning walkthroughs) focused on strengthening teachers' instructional practices and provide specific and actionable feedback on the quality and effectiveness of instruction to individual teachers and teacher teams. These data inform instructional conversations and the provision of targeted and individualized supports (e.g., coaching) for teachers, as needed.
(Turnaround Practice 2.4)
3. Structures, practices, and use of resources (e.g., collaborative meeting time, coaching, supports for implementing the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks) to support data-driven instruction, the use of research-based instructional strategies, and differentiation are in place and consistently implemented, resulting in rigorous instruction, reflective of the shifts in cognitive demand for the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, that meets the needs of each student.
(Turnaround Practice 2.7)

Instructional Leadership Team Implementation	Administration, ILT and teacher leaders: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor, enhance, and align teachers’ understanding and implementation of core instruction and school-wide best practices through observations, co-observations, feedback, and collegial collaboration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Balanced Literacy – Reader’s/Writer’s Workshop, Interactive Read Aloud, Guided Reading, Word Work, Fluency, Vocabulary, Close Reading, Writing Across the Curriculum - Math Workshop Model – Mini Lesson/Modeling, guided practice, independent practice (GRRM) goal setting, self-monitoring, math fact fluency - Experiential Science – provide hands on inquiry based science exploration and related content reading, writing, and vocabulary instruction • Identify and implement high quality instructional resources for instruction in all content areas. • Use formative assessments to provide differentiated instruction and refine common assessments in ELA and math. • Will identify teachers in need of support, develop a plan, conference and observe to provide a continuous loop of support and feedback to teachers.
School Performance Indicators and Data Sources	
ADULT IMPLEMENTATION INDICATOR	STUDENT RESULTS INDICATOR
Data Source: Teacher lesson plans, formal and informal observations, feedback meetings, ILT & PLC minutes, staff meeting agenda/feedback forms	Data Source: Student assessment data, student work samples, looking at Student Work (LASW) protocol, formal and informal observations

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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All students experience research- based academic interventions appropriate for their specific needs. These best practices and enrichment opportunities are implemented systematically during regularly scheduled school time and for all core content areas through a robust tiered system of support. (Turnaround Practice 3.2) 2. Most staff members are provided with training and support to ensure that they: (1) identify cues when students need additional assistance (both academic and nonacademic) and (2) respond appropriately to those cues. (Turnaround Practice 3.2) 3. Student learning and academic performance is regularly reviewed (at least once a month) throughout the school year, using a wide array of ongoing assessments to identify student-specific and school-wide emerging needs. Students are reassigned to interventions, enrichment, and supports, as needed, throughout the school year. (Turnaround Practice 3.3)
<p>Instructional Leadership Team Implementation</p>	<p>Administration, ILT and teacher leaders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a school and classroom culture of goal-oriented, motivated students who know their strengths and areas of need, as well as the steps they need to take for improvement • Implement tiered approach to reading RTI using research-based strategies and materials for student in grades K-6. • All instructional staff continuously analyze data (formative and summative) to inform instruction for groups of students and individual students • Utilize support staff to minimize group size and maximize services to identified students

School Performance Indicators and Data Sources

ADULT IMPLEMENTATION INDICATOR	STUDENT RESULTS INDICATOR
<p>Data Source: Teacher lesson plans, observations, PLC meeting minutes, formative assessments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data Source: Formal and Informal Observations, Looking at Student Work (LASW) protocol, Student Assessment Data – BAS, Foundations, LLI Running Records, Sight Words

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

1. The school-wide behavior plan includes a defined set of behavioral expectations, and the system and set of structures for positive behavioral supports are aligned to those expectations. In addition, most staff members implement the procedures outlined in the school-wide behavior plan. Leaders monitor implementation using data.
(Turnaround Practice 4.1)
2. Structures (e.g., structured advisories, mentor programs) are in place to support relationships among students and adults and deliver social-emotional supports. These supports are monitored actively to determine whether they are meeting the needs of the school.
(Turnaround Practice 4.2)
3. Leaders and staff are aware of the needs of families to support education through wraparound services (e.g., health, housing referrals) and provide these resources to families, as needed.
(Turnaround Practice 4.4)

Instructional Leadership Team Implementation	Administration, ILT, and teacher leaders: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor the systemic implementation of PBIS school-wide strategies ensuring that supports are implemented as appropriate – Tier 1 Universal, Tier 2 Targeted, and Tier 3 Intensive. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tier 1 - Ensure common language and expectations for behavior are taught and reinforced (5Bs, PBIS Matrix, Clip-Up Chart). ○ Implement Check and Connect for targeted/intensive students with supportive adult for continuous behavior improvement. • Conduct case conferences to check progress and interventions in place and modify as needed. • Provide incentives for good behavior, such as menu items and monthly party. • Utilize SSP process and PBIS committee meetings to identify students in need of Tier 2 and Tier 3 social/emotional interventions for students. • Maintain a seamless approach to support for students and families including all appropriate staff including, SAC, district clinicians, special education staff, ETC, nurse, and administration.
---	--

School Performance Indicators and Data Sources

ADULT IMPLEMENTATION INDICATOR	STUDENT RESULTS INDICATOR
Data Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal and Informal Observations • PBIS Matrix • Classroom Behavior Charts (Clip Up/Individual) • Character Education 	Data Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office Referrals • SSPs • PLC Minutes • Case Conference Notes

V. Worcester Public Schools Professional Learning Plan (PLP)

District Name	School Name	Principal Name	Plan Begin/End Dates
Worcester Public Schools	Canterbury St. School	Mary G. Sealey	August 2016-June 2017

1: Professional Learning Goals:

No.	Goal	Identified Group	Rationale/Sources of Evidence
1	ELA: Teachers will refine and further develop their knowledge and practice of the elements of Balanced Literacy in their daily instruction including: Interactive Read Aloud, Shared Reading/Writing, Independent Reading/Writing, Guided Reading, Close Reading.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom Teachers TMSN ESL Teachers IAs / Tutors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom Observation F & P Reading Levels Student Work/Writing Samples
2	Math: Teachers will implement and refine the Math Workshop model, using formative assessments to guide in inform flexible groups for reattaching and support.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom Teachers TMSN ESL Teachers IAs / Tutors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom Observation Formative Assessments Summative Assessments Student Work
3	Science: Teachers will develop and implement science instruction that emphasizes opportunities for student discovery through inquiry and practical application. Science instruction will support the background knowledge and hands on learning developed through the engagement and exploration piece.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom Teachers TMSN ESL Teachers IAs / Tutors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom Observation Formative Assessments Summative Assessments Student Work

2: Professional Learning Activities

PL Goal No.	Initial Activities	Follow-up Activities (as appropriate)
1	Teachers will observe (via peer observation as well as video) model lessons demonstrating exemplary practices in guided reading. Teachers will discuss attributes of the lesson and collaborate in grade level teams to create lesson plans for selected level texts implementing effective strategies seen in the model lessons.	Walk-throughs of guided reading lessons, follow up coaching, presenting/sharing student written work as a result of guided reading lessons.
	Teachers will conduct close reads on guided reading and balanced literacy research. ILT members will lead an exploration of the Fountas & Pinnell continuum of learning. Teachers will work in grade level teams to identify and plan meaningful lessons and activities to develop student literacy.	Presenting/sharing student work, walk-throughs of ELA instruction, follow up coaching
2	ILT members will present the math block framework and discuss practices within the math block that should be aligned within the building. Teachers will unpack curriculum resources (common core state standards, scope and sequence, unit guides, go math alignment documents, MCAS/PARCC released test items) to map out the year at a glance.	Walk-throughs of math instruction, follow up coaching, presenting/sharing student work.
	Teachers will examine example math assessments (MCAS, PARCC, Engage NY, Go Math, etc.) as well as example math rubrics. ILT members will lead an exploration into the expectations of assessments (rigor, question type, etc.).	Collaborative unit assessment creation, examine unit assessment results
3	Teachers will conduct a close read of select Nell Duke articles regarding project based instruction. ILT members will train teachers in Moodle and teachers will explore science resources available. Teachers will work to plan units that emphasize engagement and exploration through hands on discovery and investigation to boost background knowledge and meaningful understanding of the content.	Moodle deep dive, creation of centers/hands on carts, walk-throughs of science instruction, presenting/sharing student work.

3: Essential Resources

PL Goal No.	Resources	Other Implementation Considerations
1	Articles and research journals about guided reading and balanced literacy, LLI materials, F&P Continuum	
2	WPS Math curriculum documents, Go Math/CCSS alignment documents, released assessments	
3	Articles and research journals about project based learning (Nell Duke), Moodle, hands on science kits	

4: Progress Summary

PL Goal No.	Notes on Plan Implementation	Notes on Goal Attainment
1	We monitor student reading progress every four weeks with running records/comprehension checks to move students' reading groups (flexible grouping) and ensure that expected progress is being made. Below level students participate in RTI double dose groups based on their need area.	At this time we have varying degrees of success toward goal attainment at each grade level. We are actively re-working implementation plans based on specific student needs to deliver RTI that will meet the needs of each student and will result in catch-up growth to effectively close the reading gap.
2	Teachers are implementing the math workshop model and using formative assessments to monitor progress. During our math meetings, we are analyzing causes for lack of student proficiency on end of unit assessments.	Due to the inconsistent progress toward proficiency on math unit assessments, teachers will give a mixed skill weekly quiz to gain more insight to student proficiency before the end of the unit.
3	Teachers are engaged in unit planning with a focus on inquiry based exploration, and teacher moves that focus on open ended questions that allow for students to explore concepts rather than obtain a correct or incorrect answer.	As each unit is implemented teachers will keep anecdotal notes that will allow them to determine if the new approach increases concept knowledge and vocabulary development.