# William Fallon Elementary School
# School Improvement Plan
**May 2013**

## PIM Team Members

**Nancy Takis-Conway, Principal**

**Cynthia Anderson- Teacher**
**Cindy Hennessey-Teacher**
**Amy Conant-Greene - Teacher**

## School Council Members

**Nancy Takis-Conway – Principal**
**Ellen Patterson - Teacher**
**Cindy Hennessey – Teacher**
**Joan Rogers - Teacher**
**Sara Tetrault – Parent**
**Brianna Sverker– Parent**
**Dineen Dusablon- Parent**

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## School Profile and Demographics

The William Fallon Elementary School is a special education program for students in grades Pre- K through six who have been unsuccessful in a traditional school setting due to mental health diagnosis that result in social/ emotional and behavioral challenges. Students may also have developmental delays, or significant intellectual impairment. The William Fallon Elementary School facilitates the transitioning of students from more restrictive programs such as hospitals or residential programs back into the LPS. Collaboration with parents, therapists and outside agencies ensures a coordinated team effort. It is the only alternative elementary school among Lynn's nineteen elementary schools.

## Enrollment Data 2012-2013

As of October 1, 2013, there were 46 students enrolled at the William Fallon Elementary School. 100% of the students have Individualized Educational Plans with social/emotional and behavioral disabilities. The students often have significant cognitive disabilities and learning disabilities.

| School | Number | % African American | % Asian | % Hispanic | % Native American | % White | % Multi Race, Non-Hispanic | % FLNE | % LEP | % Low Income | % Special Ed | % High Needs |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fallon | 46 | 19.6 | 2.2 | 45.7 | 0 | 28.3 | 4.3 | 28.3 | 8.7 | 91.3 | 100 | 100 |
| Lynn | 14,139 | 11.3 | 9.8 | 53.1 | 0.3 | 22 | 3.5 | 54.2 | 17.5 | 82.6 | 16.4 | 86.2 |
| State | 954,773 | 8.6 | 5.9 | 16.4 | 0.2 | 66 | 2.7 | 17.3 | 7.7 | 37 | 17 | 47.9 |

## Accountability Status

In February of 2012, Massachusetts received a waiver of certain aspects of the federal No Child Left Behind Act. Beginning with the 2012-2013 school year, the NCLB goal of 100 percent proficiency will be replaced with a new goal of reducing proficiency gaps by half by the end of the 2016-2017 school year. NCLB accountability labels have been replaced by state accountability and assistance levels (Levels 1-5). Instead of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) reporting, Massachusetts will report district and school progress toward narrowing proficiency gaps using a new 100-point Progress and Performance Index (PPI). PPI combines information on up to seven indicators (where applicable) that include: (1-3) Narrowing proficiency gaps in ELA, mathematics and science, (4-5)Growth in ELA and mathematics, (6) Annual dropout rates, and (7) Cohort graduation rates. Most districts, schools, and groups will receive an annual PPI based on improvement over two years and a cumulative PPI that measures improvement over four years. Extra credit is awarded for reducing the percentage of students scoring *Warning/Failing* and/or by increasing the percentage of students scoring *Advanced* on English language arts, mathematics, or science MCAS tests. To be considered on target for a given indicator, a group must earn 75 points. It is important to note that if NCLB is reissued or changed, the new Massachusetts Accountability Reporting System could be discontinued.

**PPI Indicators (all students) Based on 2012 Washington School Data**

| Proficiency Gap Narrowing | 2011 CPI | 2012 CPI Target | 2012 CPI | PPI Points | Target Rating | Extra Credit Increase Advanced | Extra Credit Decrease Warning |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ELA | 45 | 49.6 | 44.6 | 25 | No Change | 0 | 25 |
| Math | 45.2 | 49.8 | 40.7 | 0 | Declined | 0 | 0 |
| Science | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| Student Growth (SPG) | 6 Yr Goal | 2011 SGP | 2012 SGP | PPI Points | Target Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ELA | 51 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Math | 51 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| |
|---|
| **Accountability and Assistance Level- No Status** |
| **Cumulative PPI (all students)- 58** |

# MCAS Results

| Grade 3 Reading | P+ | | Proficient | | Needs Improvement | | Warning | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | Lynn | School | Lynn | School | Lynn | School | Lynn |
| 2009<br>2010<br>2011<br>2012 | Not enough students in Cohort | | | | | | | |

| Grade 3 Math | P+ | | Proficient | | Needs Improvement | | Warning | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | Lynn | School | Lynn | School | Lynn | School | Lynn |
| 2009<br>2010<br>2011<br>2012 | Not enough students in Cohort | | | | | | | |

| Grade 4 ELA | Advanced | | Proficient | | Needs Improvement | | Warning | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | Lynn | School | Lynn | School | Lynn | School | Lynn |
| 2009<br>2010<br>2011<br>2012 | Not enough students in Cohort | | | | | | | |

| Grade 4 Math | Advanced | | Proficient | | Needs Improvement | | Warning | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | Lynn | School | Lynn | School | Lynn | School | Lynn |
| 2009<br>2010<br>2011<br>2012 | Not enough students in Cohort | | | | | | | |

| Grade 5 ELA | Advanced | | Proficient | | Needs Improvement | | Warning | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | Lynn | School | Lynn | School | Lynn | School | Lynn |
| 2009<br>2010<br>2011<br>2012 | Not enough students in Cohort | | | | | | | |

| Grade 5 Math | Advanced | | Proficient | | Needs Improvement | | Warning | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | Lynn | School | Lynn | School | Lynn | School | Lynn |
| 2009<br>2010<br>2011<br>2012 | Not enough students in Cohort | | | | | | | |

| Grade 6 ELA | Advanced | | Proficient | | Needs Improvement | | Warning | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | Lynn | School | Lynn | School | Lynn | School | Lynn |
| **2009** | 0 | 6 | 10 | 41 | 30 | 36 | 60 | 17 |
| **2010** | 0 | 4 | 10 | 41 | 50 | 33 | 40 | 22 |
| **2011** | NA | 5 | NA | 37 | NA | 37 | NA | 21 |
| **2012** | NA | | NA | | NA | | NA | |

| Grade 6 Math | Advanced | | Proficient | | Needs Improvement | | Warning | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | Lynn | School | Lynn | School | Lynn | School | Lynn |
| **2009** | 0 | 10 | 9 | 28 | 45 | 33 | 45 | 30 |
| **2010** | NA | 10 | NA | 26 | NA | 30 | NA | 34 |
| **2011** | NA | 10 | NA | 26 | NA | 30 | NA | 34 |
| **2012** | NA | | NA | | NA | | NA | |

| All Grades ELA | Advanced | | Proficient | | Needs Improvement | | Warning | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | Lynn | School | Lynn | School | Lynn | School | Lynn |
| **2009** | 0 | 5 | 3 | 34 | 21 | 41 | 76 | 19 |
| **2010** | 0 | 5 | 7 | 43 | 27 | 36 | 67 | 16 |
| **2011** | 0 | 7 | 4 | 44 | 48 | 34 | 48 | 15 |
| **2012** | 0 | 43 | 7 | 33 | 43 | 33 | 50 | 17 |

| All Grades Math | Advanced | | Proficient | | Needs Improvement | | Warning | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | Lynn | School | Lynn | School | Lynn | School | Lynn |
| **2009** | 0 | 9 | 6 | 28 | 35 | 34 | 59 | 28 |
| **2010** | 4 | 13 | 15 | 27 | 35 | 34 | 46 | 26 |
| **2011** | 0 | 12 | 12 | 29 | 38 | 33 | 50 | 26 |
| **2012** | 0 | 12 | 4 | 28 | 26 | 34 | 70 | 26 |

## DIBELS Results

The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) are a set of standardized, individually administered measures of early literacy development. They are designed to be short (one minute) fluency measures used to regularly monitor the development of pre-reading and early reading skills. DIBELS is administered three times a year: fall, winter, and spring. In kindergarten, students are tested in Letter Naming Fluency (LNF), Initial Sound Fluency (ISF), Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (PSF), and Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF). In grade one; students are tested in Letter Naming Fluency, Phoneme Segmentation, Nonsense Word Fluency, and Oral Reading Fluency (ORF). In grade two, Nonsense Word and Oral Fluency are administered. Oral Reading Fluency is administered in grades three, four, and five.
The following charts show the percentage of students in each of the reporting categories-At Risk, Some Risk, Low Risk-for school years 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011. The reporting categories for 2011-2012 are At/Above Benchmark, Below Benchmark, and Well Below Benchmark

**William Fallon Elementary School - K**

| Test | Testing Period | 2009 Risk % | | | 2010 Risk % | | | 2011 Risk % | | | 2012 Benchmark % | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | At/Above | Below | Well Below |
| Letter Naming Fluency | Fall | 87 | 13 | 0 | 70 | 20 | 10 | 50 | 17 | 33 | 50 | | 50 |
| | Winter | 41 | 59 | 0 | 38 | 23 | 39 | 75 | 0 | 25 | 50 | 50 | |
| | Spring | 41 | 35 | 24 | 50 | 14 | 36 | 75 | 0 | 25 | | | |

| Test | Testing Period | 2009 Risk % | | | 2010 Risk % | | | 2011 Risk % | | | 2012 Benchmark % | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | At/Above | Below | Well Below |
| Initial Sound Fluency | Fall | 14 | 57 | 29 | 70 | 10 | 20 | 17 | 0 | 83 | 50 | | 50 |
| | Winter | 6 | 70 | 24 | 17 | 50 | 33 | | | | | 50 | 50 |
| | Spring | NA | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Test | Testing Period | 2009 Risk % | | | 2010 Risk % | | | 2011 Risk % | | | 2012 Benchmark % | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | At/Above | Below | Well Below |
| Phoneme Segmentation Fluency | Fall | NA | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Winter | 24 | 24 | 52 | 9 | 9 | 82 | 25 | 12 | 63 | | 50 | 50 |
| | Spring | 28 | 33 | 39 | 21 | 43 | 36 | 0 | 63 | 37 | | | |

| Test | Testing Period | 2009 Risk % | | | 2010 Risk % | | | 2011 Risk % | | | 2012 Benchmark % | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | At/Above | Below | Well Below |
| Nonsense Words Fluency | Fall | NA | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Winter | 29 | 12 | 59 | 18 | 9 | 73 | 25 | 0 | 75 | | | 100 |
| | Spring | 22 | 28 | 50 | 36 | 21 | 43 | 29 | 42 | 29 | | | |

**William Fallon Elementary School – 1**

| Test | Testing Period | 2009 Risk % | | | 2010 Risk % | | | 2011 Risk % | | | 2012 Benchmark % | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | At/Above | Below | Well Below |
| Letter Naming Fluency | Fall | 55 | 0 | 45 | 22 | 39 | 39 | 36 | 37 | 27 | 33 | | 67 |
| | Winter | NA | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Spring | NA | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Test | Testing Period | 2009 Risk % | | | 2010 Risk % | | | 2011 Risk % | | | 2012 Benchmark % | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | At/Above | Below | Well Below |
| Phoneme Segmentation Fluency | Fall | 11 | 45 | 44 | 28 | 28 | 44 | 27 | 37 | 36 | | | 100 |
| | Winter | 10 | 30 | 60 | 40 | 40 | 20 | 58 | 34 | 8 | 17 | 50 | 33 |
| | Spring | 10 | 70 | 20 | 78 | 22 | 0 | 91 | 0 | 9 | | | |

| Test | Testing Period | 2009 Risk % | | | 2010 Risk % | | | 2011 Risk % | | | 2012 Benchmark % | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | At/Above | Below | Well Below |
| Nonsense Word Fluency | Fall | 45 | 22 | 33 | 17 | 22 | 61 | 27 | 9 | 64 | 33 | | 67 |
| | Winter | 9 | 46 | 45 | 13 | 27 | 60 | 25 | 17 | 58 | 50 | | 50 |
| | Spring | 30 | 10 | 60 | 28 | 39 | 33 | 27 | 9 | 64 | | | |

| Test | Testing Period | 2009 Risk % | | | 2010 Risk % | | | 2011 Risk % | | | 2012 Benchmark % | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | At/Above | Below | Well Below |
| CBM Reading (Oral Reading Fluency) | Fall | NA | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Winter | 25 | 25 | 50 | 7 | 13 | 80 | 17 | 8 | 75 | 50 | | 50 |
| | Spring | 14 | 43 | 43 | 11 | 6 | 83 | 27 | 9 | 64 | | | |

**William Fallon Elementary School -2**

| Test | Testing Period | 2009 Risk % | | | 2010 Risk % | | | 2011 Risk % | | | 2012 Benchmark % | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | At/Above | Below | Well Below |
| CBM Reading | Fall | NA | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (Oral Reading | Winter | 25 | 25 | 50 | 7 | 13 | 80 | 17 | 8 | 75 | 50 | | 50 |
| Fluency) | Spring | 14 | 43 | 43 | 11 | 6 | 83 | 27 | 9 | 64 | | | |

| Test | Testing Period | 2009 Risk % | | | 2010 Risk % | | | 2011 Risk % | | | 2012 Benchmark % | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | At/Above | Below | Well Below |
| Nonsense | Fall | 14 | 14 | 72 | 75 | 0 | 25 | 36 | 18 | 46 | 25 | 38 | 37 |
| Word | Winter | NA | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fluency | Spring | NA | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Test | Testing Period | 2009 Risk % | | | 2010 Risk % | | | 2011 Risk % | | | 2012 Benchmark % | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | At/Above | Below | Well Below |
| CBM Reading | Fall | 17 | 33 | 50 | 50 | 25 | 25 | 18 | 18 | 64 | 37 | 25 | 38 |
| (Oral Reading | Winter | 12 | 12 | 76 | 14 | 29 | 57 | 14 | 14 | 72 | 20 | 30 | 50 |
| Fluency) | Spring | 14 | 0 | 86 | 14 | 29 | 57 | 15 | 23 | 62 | | | |

**William Fallon Elementary School -3**

| Test | Testing Period | 2009 Risk % | | | 2010 Risk % | | | 2011 Risk % | | | 2012 Benchmark % | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | At/Above | Below | Well Below |
| CBM Reading | Fall | 8 | 0 | 92 | 17 | 17 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 12 | 12 | 76 |
| (Oral Reading | Winter | 0 | 7 | 93 | 12 | 25 | 63 | 0 | 20 | 80 | 11 | 33 | 56 |
| Fluency) | Spring | 0 | 9 | 91 | 17 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 17 | 83 | | | |

**William Fallon Elementary School -4**

| Test | Testing Period | 2010 Risk % | | | 2011 Risk % | | | 2012 Benchmark % | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | At/Above | Below | Well Below |
| CBM Reading | Fall | 0 | 0 | 100 | 17 | 0 | 83 | | | 100 |
| (Oral Reading | Winter | 0 | 0 | 100 | 37 | 12 | 51 | 17 | | 83 |
| Fluency) | Spring | 0 | 0 | 100 | 33 | 11 | 56 | | | |

**William Fallon Elementary School -5**

| Test | Testing Period | 2010 Risk % | | | 2011 Risk % | | | 2012 Benchmark % | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | At/Above | Below | Well Below |
| CBM Reading | Fall | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 20 | 80 | 33 | | 67 |
| (Oral Reading | Winter | 11 | 11 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 22 | 11 | 67 |
| Fluency) | Spring | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 25 | 75 | | | |

**William Fallon Elementary School -6**

| Test | Testing Period | 2010 Risk % | | | 2011 Risk % | | | 2012 Benchmark % | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Low | Some | At | Low | Some | At | At/Above | Below | Well Below |
| CBM Reading | Fall | | | | 0 | 22 | 78 | | | |
| (Oral Reading | Winter | | | | 10 | 20 | 70 | | | |
| Fluency) | Spring | | | | 25 | 0 | 75 | | | |

## Student Growth Percentile

For K-12 education in Massachusetts, the phrase "Growth Model", describes a method of measuring individual student progress on MCAS by tracking students from one year to the next. Each student receives a student growth percentile, which measures how much the student changed relative to other students statewide with similar score histories from one year to the next. The chart blow shows individual student growth percentiles in both ELA and mathematics.

**Levels of growth:**

1%- 20% Very Low Growth
21%-40% Low Growth
41%-60% Moderate Growth
61%-80% High Growth
81%-100% Very High Growth

| 2012 Grade 4 | ELA SGP | Math SGP |
|---|---|---|
| Student 1 | 74 | 69 |
| Student 2 | 41 | 25 |
| Student 3 | 12 | 65 |
| Student 4 | na | 62 |
| Student 5 | 28 | 87 |
| | | |
| Mean SGP | 38.75 | 61.6 |

| 2012 Grade 5 | ELA SGP | Math SGP |
|---|---|---|
| Student 1 | 54 | 15 |
| Student 2 | 32 | 4 |
| Student 3 | 6 | na |
| Student 4 | 31 | 35 |
| Student 5 | 8 | 12 |
| Student 6 | 58 | 1 |
| Student 7 | 51 | 9 |
| | | |
| Mean SGP | 34.28 | 12.66 |

| 2012 Grade 6 | ELA SGP | Math SGP |
|---|---|---|
| Student 1 | 50 | 94 |
| Student 2 | 92 | 62 |
| Student 3 | 43 | 71 |
| Student 4 | 16 | 74 |
| Student 5 | 54 | 87 |
| Student 6 | 65 | 58 |
| Student 7 | 84 | 10 |
| Student 8 | 6 | 16 |
| | | |
| Mean SGP | 51.25 | 59 |

# Implementation Summary of 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan

The following charts provide the results for the strategies that were put in place for the goals set for William Fallon Elementary School (formerly Washington Elementary School) School Improvement Plan SY 2012 - 2013.

| Measurable Goals | Strategies | Implementation Status/Results |
|---|---|---|
| **Goal: To meet AYP in ELA** | Using explicit systematic Direct Instruction reading programs, a variety of text across all content area at the students' independence level, students will improve their fluency. | Teachers will use Direct Instruction reading programs (Corrective Reading, Reading Mastery), along with ample opportunities to read connected text at students independent level daily. Biweekly DIBELS progress monitoring was completed by teachers, demonstrating growth on the instructional level. |
| | Teachers will systematically instruct, model, and demonstrate comprehension strategies necessary to understand text across all content areas and respond to a variety of questions, (short answer, multiple choice, and open response). | Teachers will systematically instruct the Six Basic Reading Comprehension Strategies across all content areas. |

| Measurable Goals | Strategies | Implementation Status/Results |
|---|---|---|
| **Goal: To meet AYP in Math** | Using MA. Frameworks Common Core number sense standards, teachers will systematically model, practice, and coach students in number sense concepts. | The students were placed in groups according to their abilities. Teachers instructed students in the area of number sense using a variety of materials: Every Day Counts Calendar board, Houghton Mifflin Math, Groundworks, Problem Solvers and teacher made materials; Mad Minute Math was also used. Word walls need to be implemented with fidelity. Students had difficulty accessing grade level district testing due to grouping by ability and not grade level, and not following district mapping for each grade. The teachers designed units according to the Common Core Standards but were not implemented in the same time frame as mapped out by the district. |
| | Using MA. Frameworks Common Core standards, teachers will systematically model, practice, and coach students in solving word problems across all strands. | Teachers provided systematic direct instruction to develop strategies enabling students to solve multiple step word problems (understanding of the question, vocabulary, order of operation and selecting the appropriate strategy). Students worked on calendar board and daily word problems using Houghton Mifflin, Groundworks, Daily Mathematics Challenges and Problem Solvers. The teachers of grades 3 – 6 used previous MCAS questions and prompts. The unit for word problems was implemented as a separate unit. Word problems need to be incorporated within each topic so that the students have the necessary mathematical knowledge/skills necessary to appropriately solve the problems. |

| Measurable Goals | Strategies | Implementation Status/Results |
|---|---|---|
| **Goal: Improvement in all content areas** | Using MA. Frameworks Common Core standards, teachers will systematically model, practice, and coach students across all content areas to improve student vocabulary acquisition and appropriate application. | Teachers utilized and maintained word walls in ELA and Math and incorporated higher level tier II & III vocabulary into a variety of writes. Teachers planned for the integration, repetition, and meaningful use of learned vocabulary. Various strategies were used to implement content vocabulary. |
| | Teachers will provide instruction to help students understand, apply, and internalize coping strategies necessary to increase their pro-social on task behavior. | Teachers implemented the William Fallon Elementary School's behavior management system (PBIS, procedures and protocols, daily point sheets, weekly levels and differential reinforcements. Students participated in cooperative games, social skills groups (Second Step), character education themes, and monthly community service. Individual and group counseling sessions were provided by the clinical directors. Raw Arts and Roman Music supplemented the therapeutic milieu. A significant improvement was noted in the SWIS data, documenting the overall decrease in time out referrals, suspensions and restraints. |

# William Fallon Elementary School Pre K - 6 SY 2013-2014 School Improvement Plan

## Goal

Our goal has been revised because Massachusetts received a waiver of certain aspects of the federal No Child Left Behind Act. AYP results are no longer the only measure of school success currently used by the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE). ). Instead of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) reporting, Massachusetts will report district and school progress toward narrowing proficiency gaps using a new 100-point Progress and Performance Index (PPI).
Therefore, the goal for this School Year 2013-2014 is:

- **To achieve a minimum of 75 points in the Progress and Performance Index (PPI) as measured by the following indicators where applicable: (1-3) Narrowing proficiency gaps in ELA, Mathematics and Science, (4-5) Growth in ELA and Mathematics, (6) Annual dropout rates, and (7) Cohort graduation rates.**

## Data Analysis – Strengths and Weaknesses

The 2012 PPI report for ELA and Mathematics shows NO DATA.

William Fallon Elementary School uses a variety of formal, informal and authentic assessments to measure students' progress and strengths and weaknesses (Key Math, Woodcock-Johnson, DIBELS Next benchmark and progress monitoring Maze, Wilson, Corrective Reading Program, Reading Recovery, Fundations, OWL). Results from these assessments show that our students have made individual growth from year to year (Student Growth Percentiles, DIBELS progress monitoring, student portfolios). Growth is commensurate with cognitive and emotional profiles. The William Fallon Elementary School Data Team works directly with the May Institute to analyze SWIS data and implement differential reinforcement for Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavior. Our team recognizes the following areas of weaknesses that need to be addressed:

**Weaknesses in All Content Areas:**

- Students have difficulty using and applying grade level content area vocabulary
- Students have difficulty managing their behavior, pro-social and on-task behavior

**Weaknesses in ELA:**

- Students continue to struggle with the reading comprehension strategies
- Students continue to struggle with word analysis (phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency)

**Weaknesses in Math:**

- Students struggle with  basic number sense skills and computation
- Students struggle with solving multi step word problems

## Student Learning Objectives

The action plan that follows outlines the seven student learning objectives and the strategies related to those objectives that the entire staff will concentrate on for the following year. Those objectives are:

- Students will acquire and apply vocabulary in all content areas.
- Students will acquire and practice reading comprehension strategies
- Students will acquire and practice decoding skill to improve fluency
- Students will increase abilities in number sense and computation skills
- Students will increase abilities to solve multi-step word problems
- Students will increase pro-social, on-tasks behavior

# William Fallon Elementary School SY 2013-2014 School Improvement Plan

| | |
|---|---|
| Goal | To achieve a minimum of 75 points in the Progress and Performance Index (PPI) as measured by the following indicators where applicable: (1-3) Narrowing proficiency gaps in ELA, mathematics and science, (4-5) Growth in ELA and mathematics, (6) Annual dropout rates, and (7) Cohort graduation rates. |
| Identified Student Weakness | Reading difficulties impact the students' ability to understand text and utilize reading comprehension strategies across the content areas. |
| Student Learning Objective | Through systematic instruction of the reading comprehension strategies, students will be able to select appropriate strategies and apply them across all content areas. |

| **Strategy/Action (What, Who, How)** | **Timeline (When)** | **Resources Needed** | **Method of Collecting Evidence** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers will provide Direct Instruction to teach each of the six district reading comprehension strategies. Using a gradual release of responsibility, students will select and apply the appropriate comprehension strategy when reading across the content areas. | Daily<br>Sept. 2013 – June 2014 | Books of various genre at developmentally appropriate levels, released MCAS questions, smart board technology, SRA Corrective Reading, SRA Reading Mastery, Wilson Reading Program, Florida Center for Reading Research, Fundations, OWL, 7 Keys to Comprehension How to Help Your Kids Read It and Get It! By Susan Zimmermann and Chryse Hutchins, Imagine Learning | Student work samples across all content areas, teacher observation, formal/informal assessments, student oral responses, open response prompts, professional development plans, Collins writes |

# William Fallon Elementary School SY 2013 - 2014 School Improvement Plan

| | |
|---|---|
| Goal | To achieve a minimum of 75 points in the Progress and Performance Index (PPI) as measured by the following indicators where applicable: (1-3) Narrowing proficiency gaps in ELA, mathematics and science, (4-5) Growth in ELA and mathematics, (6) Annual dropout rates, and (7) Cohort graduation rates. |
| Identified Student Weakness | Due to high mobility rate, students often enter with varying literature experiences, including lack of exposure to rich literature in the formative years. |
| Student Learning Objective | Students will use and apply tier two and tier three vocabulary in all content areas. |

| **Strategy/Action (What, Who, How)** | **Timeline (When)** | **Resources Needed** | **Method of Collecting Evidence** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Through Direct Instruction with gradual release of responsibility students will demonstrate an understanding of tier two and three vocabulary, as demonstrated by their ability to solve problems and write for a variety of purposes across all content areas. | Daily<br><br>Sept. 2013 – June 2014 | Books of various genre at developmentally appropriate levels, word walls, Bring Words to Life by Isabel Beck, Words, Words, Words Teaching Vocabulary in Grades 4 -12, reference materials, graphic organizers, SRA Corrective Reading, SRA Reading Mastery, Wilson Reading Program, Florida Center for Reading Research, OWL, Fundations, Informational text, Read Naturally reading program, Great Leaps | Teacher observation, student work samples in all content areas, formal/informal assessments, discussions, graphic organizers, writing across all content areas |

# William Fallon Elementary School SY 2013 - 2014 School Improvement Plan

| | |
|---|---|
| Goal | To achieve a minimum of 75 points in the Progress and Performance Index (PPI) as measured by the following indicators where applicable: (1-3) Narrowing proficiency gaps in ELA, mathematics and science, (4-5) Growth in ELA and mathematics, (6) Annual dropout rates, and (7) Cohort graduation rates. |
| Identified Student Weakness | Student weaknesses in letter/sound relationships, vowel combinations and phonemic segmentation impact the students' ability to decode words therefore affecting fluency. |
| Student Learning Objective | Students will acquire, practice, and apply strategies for word analysis and develop the automaticity to improve fluency. |

| **Strategy/Action (What, Who, How)** | **Timeline (When)** | **Resources Needed** | **Method of Collecting Evidence** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers will provide direct instruction with gradual release of responsibility until students can demonstrate an understanding of word analysis, improve sight word vocabulary, and fluently read connected text at their instructional level. | Daily<br><br>Sept. 2013 - June 2014 | Books of various genre at independent and developmentally appropriate levels, decodable books, books on tape, sight word lists, readers theater books, SRA Corrective Reading, SRA Reading Mastery, Wilson Reading Program, Florida Center for Reading Research, DIBELS Next, Imagine Learning, Dolch and Frye Word Lists, Read Naturally | DIBELS Next scores, teachers' informal observations, progress monitoring, reading inventories, Imagine Learning, Dolch and Frye Word Lists, controlled vocabulary text, and direct instruction reading programs. |

# Washington Elementary SY 2013 - 2014 School Improvement Plan

| | |
|---|---|
| Goal | To achieve a minimum of 75 points in the Progress and Performance Index (PPI) as measured by the following indicators where applicable: (1-3) Narrowing proficiency gaps in ELA, mathematics and science, (4-5) Growth in ELA and mathematics, (6) Annual dropout rates, and (7) Cohort graduation rates. |
| Identified Student Weakness | Students' weaknesses in number sense and computational fluency. |
| Student Learning Objective | Students will increase their number sense and computational fluency. |

| **Strategy/Action (What, Who, How)** | **Timeline (When)** | **Resources Needed** | **Method of Collecting Evidence** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers will provide direct instruction of MA frameworks Common Core Standards in number sense with gradual release of responsibility until students can demonstrate computational fluency while solving a variety of math problems. | Daily<br><br>Sept 2013 -June 2014 | Read, Write and Draw workbooks, Problem Solvers, Groundworks, On Core Math program, LPS mapping guide, Prior MCAS open response questions, pre/post tests | Student samples across all math standards – Daily Problem Solvers, Read It, Draw It, Solve It, sample MCAS questions, word wall, math vocabulary rings, district benchmark assessments |

# Washington Elementary SY 2013 - 2014 School Improvement Plan

| | |
|---|---|
| Goal | To achieve a minimum of 75 points in the Progress and Performance Index (PPI) as measured by the following indicators where applicable: (1-3) Narrowing proficiency gaps in ELA, mathematics and science, (4-5) Growth in ELA and mathematics, (6) Annual dropout rates, and (7) Cohort graduation rates. |
| Identified Student Weakness | Students' weakness in fluency, reading comprehension and mathematical vocabulary lead to difficulties in to solving multi step word problems. |
| Student Learning Objective | Students will solve multi-step word problems through all mathematical domains to increase their fluency and ability to solve real world mathematical problems by identifying the appropriate strategies needed to solve problems within each Common Core standard. |

| **Strategy/Action (What, Who, How)** | **Timeline (When)** | **Resources Needed** | **Method of Collecting Evidence** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers will provide direct instruction with gradual release of responsibility (scaffolding) until students can solve multi-step word problems. | Sept 2013-June 2014 | Read, Write and Draw workbooks, Problem Solvers, Groundworks, Houghton Mifflin Math program, LPS pacing guide, Prior MCAS open response questions, common planning time | Student samples all domains – Daily Problem Solvers, Read It, Draw It, Solve It, sample MCAS questions, |

# Washington Elementary SY 2013 - 2014 School Improvement Plan

| | |
|---|---|
| Goal | To achieve a minimum of 75 points in the Progress and Performance Index (PPI) as measured by the following indicators where applicable: (1-3) Narrowing proficiency gaps in ELA, mathematics and science, (4-5) Growth in ELA and mathematics, (6) Annual dropout rates, and (7) Cohort graduation rates. |
| Identified Student Weakness | Lack of pro-social strategies due to emotional, mental health and behavioral issues. |
| Student Learning Objective | Students will develop pro-social skills and coping strategies to solve everyday problems/conflicts. |

| **Strategy/Action (What, Who, How)** | **Timeline (When)** | **Resources Needed** | **Method of Collecting Evidence** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teachers will provide direct instruction with gradual release of responsibility until students can demonstrate an understanding of coping strategies needed to solve everyday problems/conflicts using skills from the Second Step Program, character education, social skills groups, pragmatic groups, clinical therapeutic counseling, individual and group sessions, William Fallon Elementary School's behavior management system (point sheets, levels, behavior charts and/or contracts), and PBIS. | Daily<br><br>Sept. 2013 - June 2014 | William Fallon Elementary School's, behavior management system, PBIS, Second Step, and clinical therapeutic individual and group counseling. Character Education programming, community service projects, Roman Music and Raw Arts | Work samples that demonstrate implementation of Second Step Program, Social skills groups, Pragmatic groups, behavior management system, community service efforts, annual school wide theme, point sheets, levels, SWIS data collection |

## Parent Involvement

The William Fallon Elementary School requires ongoing communication between parents and staff to ensure that a student's needs are met. Parents are informed of their child's day through Classroom Daily Reports.

In addition to daily reports, The William Fallon Elementary School reaches out to parents through PTO/School Council with three caretakers as representatives of the families. The school council meets three times per year to discuss the needs of the school presently and for the future. The school council is updated regarding Performance Improvement Mapping, MCAS, and the Progress and Performance Index (PPI).

At the beginning of every school year, parents complete a survey asking what topics of interest they would like to learn and explore. In response, the clinical team has developed a parents' coffee hour where the professional staff at the school or within the community will lead groups in areas of concern, such as ADHD, Bi-Polar Disorder, medication, anger management, MCAS, behavior management, homework, reading, gang awareness, and accessing community services. The school has established a parent section in the library for parents to further educate themselves about concerning issues. Books, magazines, and tapes were purchased addressing many of the concerns parents of special education children face at home, in the community, and at school. There is also a space with computer access for parents to do research.

A calendar of special events and the William Fallon Elementary School handbook is sent home in early fall. The calendar informs and invites parents to participate in the special events. Special events include Math Week, Book Week/ Author Share, Science Fair, Multicultural Fair, Art Show, and Words and Windows. The school has an open house in September and two scheduled parent teacher conferences to address academic and social progress of students. For those parents who are unable to attend parent teacher conferences on the scheduled nights, other arrangements can be made. If parents have concerns needing immediate attention, meetings can be scheduled accordingly. Periodically letters are sent home or Net Connect is used as needed to update parents with important information. The William Fallon Elementary School provides numerous opportunities for parent involvement. Throughout the year parents are invited to volunteer in the classroom and encouraged to attend all events hosted by the school. They are also encouraged to share their cultural heritages and traditional values to support diversity throughout the school.

Parents know their children best; therefore it's vital for staff and families to communicate on a regular basis to ensure the successful school year so students will develop both emotionally and academically.