

**Ingalls Elementary School
School Improvement Plan
May/June 2013**

PIM Team Members

Irene Cowdell, Principal
Patricia Hebert, Program Specialist
Michelle Winslow, CIT
Carrie Sawyer, ELL Specialist
Stephanie Clayman, CIT
Patricia Marcus, CIT
Samantha Trunfio, Grade 2
Jill Homan, Grade 3
Britney Falite, Grade 3
Karen Barbuzzi, Grade 4
Ashley Garuti, Grade 4
Tara Friedman, Grade 5
Muriel Whenal, Grade 5

Parent Council Members

Principal

Irene Cowdell

Faculty

Heather Angus
Corinne Geary
Pati Kane
Debra Ladderbush
Carrie Sawyer
Heather Trainor

Parents

Judith Crawford
Nicole Green
Antonio Guitterez
Jesse Jaeger
Dawn Perry

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

School Profile and Demographics

The Ingalls Elementary School is one of Lynn's largest elementary schools and has a student population of approximately 655 students. Demographically the student population is 9.5 % African American, 9.2% Asian, 68.2% Hispanic, 0.5 % Native American, 10.1% White, and 2.6% multi-race non-Hispanic.

The student population is composed of 64.6% of students whose first language is not English, 34.4% who are Limited English Proficient, 92.4% who are low income, and 11.8% who receive services from the Special Education Department. Ingalls is a Title I school that provides Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) classrooms for grades 2-5. Ingalls has the TEAMS Program (Together Educating and Advancing Multi-Handicapped Students). This program services the most medically fragile students in the district. They are in three separate classrooms and span academically from grades Pre-K to Grade 5. Ingalls has two self-contained classes (DD and II) that service students in grades 1 to 5. Ingalls has one integrated Pre-K class and four full-day kindergarten classes. There are six first grades, five second grades (one of which is SEI), five third grades (one of which is SEI), four fourth grades (one of which is SEI), and four fifth grades (one of which is SEI). During SY06-07, Ingalls departmentalized grades 3, 4, and 5 in ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies to better implement standards-based instruction and have continued departmentalizing through School Year 12-13.

Enrollment Data 2012-2013

School	Number	% African American	% Asian	% Hispanic	% Native American	% White	% Multi Race, Non-Hispanic	% FLNE	% LEP	% Low Income	% Special Ed	% High Needs
Ingalls	655	9.5	9.2	68.2	0.5	10.1	2.6	64.6	34.4	92.4	11.8	95.9
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)

Proficiency Gap Narrowing	2011 CPI	2012 CPI Target	2012 CPI	PPI Points	Target Rating	Extra Credit Increase Advanced	Extra Credit Decrease Warning
ELA	76.6	78.6	79.8	75	On Target	25	25
Math	78.1	79.9	76.5	25	No Change	25	0
Science	59	62.4	67.3	100	Above Target	25	25

Student Growth (SPG)	6 Yr Goal	2011 SGP	2012 SGP	PPI Points	Target Rating
ELA	51	58	47	50	Below Target
Math	51	69	58	75	On Target

Accountability and Assistance Level- Level 2
Cumulative PPI (all students)- 73

MCAS Results

The following charts show the percentages for the past ten years of Ingalls' third, fourth and fifth grade students in ELA and Math.

Grade 3 Reading	P+		Proficient		Needs Improvement		Warning	
	School	Lynn	School	Lynn	School	Lynn	School	Lynn
2002	NA		35	49	55	43	10	8
2003	NA		30	46	49	43	21	11
2004	NA		26	51	50	40	24	9
2005	NA		38	49	48	40	14	11
2006	1	10	11	30	59	47	29	13
2007	4	6	32	35	40	28	24	25
2008	4	6	24	33	45	41	27	20
2009	3	5	26	32	38	44	32	19
2010	6	7	34	38	43	43	16	13
2011	4	6	40	41	43	41	13	12
2012	5	6	35	35	38	45	22	14

Grade 3 Math	Advanced		Proficient		Needs Improvement		Warning	
	School	Lynn	School	Lynn	School	Lynn	School	Lynn
2002								
2003								
2004								
2005								
2006	0	2	4	32	39	37	57	29
2007	6	12	42	35	22	28	30	25
2008	12	16	39	35	27	28	22	21
2009	9	9	31	35	29	30	31	26
2010	6	13	32	36	33	32	29	19
2011	3	8	48	47	34	31	16	14
2012	7	13	26	33	40	35	28	19

Grade 4 ELA	Advanced		Proficient		Needs Improvement		Warning	
	School	Lynn	School	Lynn	School	Lynn	School	Lynn
2002	0	1	22	33	62	49	16	16
2003	6	3	33	35	46	46	14	17
2004	1	3	24	36	49	47	26	13
2005	4	4	10	32	46	47	41	17
2006	1	4	16	35	57	46	26	15
2007	1	3	18	35	58	44	22	18
2008	1	3	13	26	45	49	40	22
2009	3	4	16	28	53	44	29	23
2010	0	2	15	29	42	50	43	20
2011	1	3	30	30	39	46	30	22
2012	0	4	36	34	44	40	20	22

Grade 4 Math	Advanced		Proficient		Needs Improvement		Warning	
	School	Lynn	School	Lynn	School	Lynn	School	Lynn
2002	3	5	11	19	50	46	36	31
2003	11	5	17	20	49	50	24	25
2004	3	6	14	22	51	54	32	18
2005	2	7	7	19	52	53	38	21
2006	6	8	14	19	51	52	29	20
2007	6	11	21	27	47	43	26	19
2008	9	10	27	24	38	44	26	22
2009	3	7	16	23	53	48	29	22
2010	5	9	18	26	48	48	28	17
2011	10	7	28	23	35	49	27	21
2012	5	6	29	30	50	47	16	17

Grade 5 ELA	Advanced		Proficient		Needs Improvement		Warning	
	School	Lynn	School	Lynn	School	Lynn	School	Lynn
2006	4	8	13	37	55	42	28	14
2007	4	6	39	46	39	35	17	12
2008	5	6	30	40	38	40	27	14
2009	4	6	34	36	35	40	27	18
2010	1	6	29	37	45	38	25	18
2011	3	7	31	44	42	34	23	15
2012	7	9	35	39	27	34	32	18

Grade 5 Math	Advanced		Proficient		Needs Improvement		Warning	
	School	Lynn	School	Lynn	School	Lynn	School	Lynn
2006	6	9	23	23	25	35	46	33
2007	11	10	23	33	43	37	24	19
2008	5	13	25	25	35	37	35	25
2009	12	11	35	27	21	28	32	34
2010	9	12	23	24	30	37	38	27
2011	12	12	33	34	32	33	24	21
2012	16	13	20	28	36	33	28	26


Student Growth Percentile by School and Grade

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 District Growth Stacked Bar Chart, by school, shows how much students grew over the past year relative to their academic peers, with the individual data grouped by school. The District Growth Stacked Bar Chart, by Grade, shows how much students changed relative to their academic peers between grade level MCAS tests. Each chart shows the percentage of growth in the following categories: Very Low, Low, Moderate, High, and Very High.




Spring 2012 MCAS School Growth Distribution English Language Arts

District: Lynn
Subject: English Language Arts



	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	Median SGP	N Students (SGP)	% Proficient or Higher	N Students (Perf. Level)
Ingalls	27	21	35	17	21	47.0	121	39	244




Vertical lines at 20%, 40%, 60%, 80% and 100% represent the Statewide distribution for very low, low, moderate, high and very high growth.

	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	Median SGP	N Students (SGP)	% Proficient or Higher	N Students (Perf. Level)
Grade 04 - Ingalls	18	16	20	5	8	40.0	67	36	80
Grade 05 - Ingalls	9	5	15	12	13	59.5	54	41	75


Growth Distribution by School

All Grades



Vertical lines at 20%, 40%, 60%, 80% and 100% represent the Statewide distribution for very low, low, moderate, high and very high growth.

	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	Median SGP	N Students (SGP)	% Proficient or Higher	N Students (Perf. Level)
Ingalls	10	25	29	26	31	58.0	121	34	244



Vertical lines at 20%, 40%, 60%, 80% and 100% represent the Statewide distribution for very low, low, moderate, high and very high growth.

	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	Median SGP	N Students (SGP)	% Proficient or Higher	N Students (Perf. Level)
Grade 04 - Ingalls	7	13	20	9	18	57.0	67	34	80
Grade 05 - Ingalls	3	12	9	17	13	62.0	54	36	75

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.

Ingalls - Kindergarten

Test	Testing Period	2008 Risk %			2009 Risk %			2010 Risk %			2011 Risk %			2012 Benchmark %		
		Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	At/Above	Below	Well Below
Letter Naming Fluency	Fall	37	20	43	33	19	48	51	20	29	41	27	32	43	21	36
	Winter	58	16	27	61	12	27	86	9	5	71	18	11	79	14	7
	Spring	80	13	7	71	16	13	93	5	2	86	9	5	95	3	2

Test	Testing Period	2008 Risk %			2009 Risk %			2010 Risk %			2011 Risk %			2012 Benchmark %		
		Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	At/Above	Below	Well Below
Initial Sound Fluency	Fall	25	34	42	43	28	29	47	20	33	30	23	47	14	7	7
	Winter	46	39	16	29	52	19	59	28	13				79	8	13
	Spring															

Test	Testing Period	2008 Risk %			2009 Risk %			2010 Risk %			2011 Risk %			2012 Benchmark %		
		Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	At/Above	Below	Well Below
Phoneme Segmentation Fluency	Fall	40	37	23	22	44	34	72	21	7	56	17	27	67	19	14
	Winter	77	20	3	68	30	2	93	6	1	86	7	7	89	6	5
	Spring															

Test	Testing Period	2008 Risk %			2009 Risk %			2010 Risk %			2011 Risk %			2012 Benchmark %		
		Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	At/Above	Below	Well Below
Nonsense Words Fluency	Fall	66	20	14	59	28	13	88	11	1	70	19	11	84	8	8
	Winter	89	8	3	74	19	7	92	6	2	84	9	7	88	10	2
	Spring															

Ingalls 1st Grade

Test	Testing Period	2008 Risk %			2009 Risk %			2010 Risk %			2011 Risk %			2012 Benchmark %		
		Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	At/Above	Below	Well Below
Letter Naming Fluency	Fall	60	19	21	67	18	15	54	23	23	72	18	10	72	19	9
	Winter															
	Spring															

Test	Testing Period	2008 Risk %			2009 Risk %			2010 Risk %			2011 Risk %			2012 Benchmark %		
		Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	At/Above	Below	Well Below
Phoneme Segmentation Fluency	Fall	56	28	17	53	36	11	52	37	11	60	26	14	68	18	14
	Winter	92	5	2	86	11	3	86	13	1	85	11	4	95	1	4
	Spring	96	4	0	91	8	1	97	2	1	97	2	1			

Test	Testing Period	2008 Risk %			2009 Risk %			2010 Risk %			2011 Risk %			2012 Benchmark %		
		Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	At/Above	Below	Well Below
Nonsense Word Fluency	Fall	60	22	18	63	24	13	57	22	21	64	18	18	77	10	13
	Winter	56	37	8	65	25	10	50	38	12	73	10	17	87	7	6
	Spring	81	17	2	79	17	4	78	14	8	77	5	18	84	10	6

Test	Testing Period	2008 Risk %			2009 Risk %			2010 Risk %			2011 Risk %			2012 Benchmark %		
		Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	At/Above	Below	Well Below
CBM Reading (Oral Reading Fluency)	Fall															
	Winter	49	37	14	59	29	12	42	47	11	54	32	14	64	31	4
	Spring	58	26	17	62	24	14	55	26	19	66	20	14	68	23	9

Ingalls 2nd Grade

Test	Testing Period	2008 Risk %			2009 Risk %			2010 Risk %			2011 Risk %			2012 Benchmark %		
		Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	At/Above	Below	Well Below
Nonsense Word Fluency	Fall	51	26	24	68	18	14	78	18	4	73	16	11	82	10	8
	Winter															
	Spring															

Test	Testing Period	2008 Risk %			2009 Risk %			2010 Risk %			2011 Risk %			2012 Benchmark %		
		Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	At/Above	Below	Well Below
CBM Reading (Oral Reading Fluency)	Fall	39	27	34	45	29	26	54	28	18	50	29	21	68	18	14
	Winter	45	17	39	65	10	25	60	21	19	59	13	28	73	15	12
	Spring	42	21	37	54	16	30	55	20	25	58	15	27	65	18	17

Ingalls 3rd Grade

Test	Testing Period	2008 Risk %			2009 Risk %			2010 Risk %			2011 Risk %			2012 Benchmark %		
		Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	At/Above	Below	Well Below
CBM Reading (Oral Reading Fluency)	Fall	49	27	24	32	30	38	49	27	24	49	34	17	58	21	21
	Winter	49	21	30	37	25	38	52	21	27	57	30	13	57	26	17
	Spring	39	24	37	33	29	38	49	19	32	63	27	10	56	28	16

Ingalls 4th Grade

Test	Testing Period	2010 Risk %			2011 Risk %			2012 Benchmark %		
		Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	At/Above	Below	Well Below
CBM Reading (Oral Reading Fluency)	Fall	39	27	34	48	15	37	61	27	12
	Winter	38	25	37	53	22	25	64	22	14
	Spring	33	27	40	53	12	35	47	39	14

Ingalls 5th Grade

Test	Testing Period	2010 Risk %			2011 Risk %			2012 Benchmark %		
		Low	Some	At	Low	Some	At	At/Above	Below	Well Below
CBM Reading (Oral Reading Fluency)	Fall	44	20	36	39	21	40	48	20	32
	Winter	40	19	41	46	19	35	51	19	30
	Spring	38	26	36	44	21	35	48	21	31

Implementation Summary of 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan

The following chart contains the goals from Ingalls’ SY 2012/2013 School Improvement Plan, the strategies that were put in place, the implementation activities to support the strategies, and the results thus far.

Measurable Goals	Strategies	Implementation Status/Results
<p>1.To make AYP in ELA.</p>	<p>Teachers in grades K-5 will participate in collaborative common planning time to enhance writing instruction.</p> <p>Faculty meetings will be the venue to share best practices in writing.</p> <p>Teachers in grades K-5 will participate in PD after school (in-house PD in writing.)</p> <p>Teachers in grades 3-5 will continue to participate in curriculum team meetings to develop deliberate lesson plans in writing.</p> <p>Teachers in grades K-5 will increase the amount of time dedicated to small group instruction within their grade level literacy block.</p> <p>Teacher in grades 3 – 5 will make a deliberate attempt to link ELA with content-based social studies and science instruction to create a comprehensive three hour literacy block.</p> <p>Teachers in grades K–5 will have the opportunity to participate in in-house PD to develop early literacy skills to use during small group instruction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Departmentalized instruction continued in SY12-13. • Use of faculty meetings for teacher presentations of best instructional practices. • Grade level teams facilitated in-house PD for writing. • Ingalls framed ELA instruction using the “Great Eight Template.”(e.g. Focus Skill, Focus Strategy, Vocabulary, Writing, Theme, Genre, Grammar/Phonics, Assessment). • School-wide gradual release of responsibility instructional model continued to be implemented. • Lesson planning, student work samples, and classroom assessment binders provided evidence of implementation. • Common planning (2.5 hours - grade level teams -one time per month) was facilitated during SY12-13 and focused on deliberate lesson planning. • Three CIT’s and two ESL Teachers provided support for classroom teachers with the implementation of strategies listed. • Professional development was provided in Six Traits Writing, to support on-going implementation. • KnowAtom implementation to support teachers in ELA/Science instruction in grades 3 – 5. <p>*Curriculum Team Meetings – No Funding Available SY12 - 13</p>

Measurable Goals	Strategies	Implementation Status/Results
<p>2. To make AYP in MATH.</p>	<p>Teachers will continue to participate in common planning time and monthly curriculum team meetings to develop deliberate lesson plans and assessments.</p> <p>Teachers in Grades K – 5 will identify student weaknesses using daily formative assessments to drive instruction.</p> <p>Teachers will implement the use of picture word walls for math vocabulary.</p> <p>Teachers will use the Standards for mathematical practice to drive instruction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Departmentalized instruction continued in SY12-13. • School-wide gradual release of responsibility instructional model continued to be implemented. • Use of faculty meetings for teacher presentations of best instructional practices. • Lesson planning, student work samples, and classroom assessment binders provided evidence of implementation. • Common planning (2.5 hours - grade level teams -one time per month) was facilitated during SY12-13 and focused on deliberate lesson planning. • Grades 3-5 continued implementing the RTI model. • SEI students in grades 4-5 were integrated into the departmentalized math classrooms on a daily basis. • Afterschool math program for students in grades 3-5. • Use of district created math assessments in grades 3-5. <p>*Curriculum Team Meetings – No Funding Available SY12 - 13</p>

SY 2013-2014 Ingalls School Improvement Plan

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 Report Card/PPI Indicator for Narrowing Proficiency Gap shows that Ingalls received a target rating of “On Target” for ELA and “No Change” for Math. The PPI Indicator for Student Growth shows that Ingalls received a rating of “Below Target” for ELA and “On Target” for Math. Ingalls has received a Level 2 for the Accountability and Assistance Level.

Data driven analysis reveals two weaknesses in ELA: Students’ ability to write for different audiences and purposes and students’ ability to read widely and deeply from among a broad range of high quality, increasingly challenging literary and informational texts. Data indicates a weakness in students’ ability to solve multi-step problems. Analysis reveals a weakness with basic math computation skills.

Student Learning Objectives

The action plan that follows outlines the student learning objectives that the faculty will concentrate on for the following year.

- Students will be able to write opinion pieces, explanatory/informative texts, narratives, stories, poems, and scripts according to grade level expectations as cited by the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Framework for English Language Arts and Literacy Incorporating the Common Core State Standards.
- Students will be able to:
 - Use foundational skills to apply grade level phonics and access text.
 - Determine or clarify the meaning of grade-appropriate words encountered through listening, reading, and media use.
 - Read widely and deeply from among a broad range of high quality, increasingly challenging literary and informational texts.
- Students will be able to identify, use and apply problem solving strategies relating to all grade level standards.

Ingalls 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' ability to write for different audiences and purposes.
Student Learning Objective	Students will be able to write opinion pieces, explanatory/informative texts, narratives, stories, poems, and scripts according to grade level expectations as cited by the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Framework for English Language Arts and Literacy Incorporating the Common Core State Standards.

Strategy/Action (What, Who, How)	Timeline (When)	Resources Needed	Method of Collecting Evidence
Teachers in grades K – 5 will participate in collaborative Common Planning Time to enhance writing instruction aligned with the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Framework for English Language Arts and Literacy Incorporating the Common Core State Standards.	Monthly	Common Planning Time, Principal, Program Specialist, CITs/Coaches, ESL Specialists, Interventionists, Subs, Trait Crates and Six Trait book bundles, Zaner-Bloser materials, Zaner-Bloser training	Lesson plans and student work samples
Teachers in grades K-5 will participate in in-house PD for writing.	On-Going	Principal, Instructors, materials, Zaner-Boser PD Personnel	Lesson plans, student work samples, and attendance

Ingalls 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’ ability to read widely and deeply from among a broad range of high quality, increasingly challenging literary and informational texts.
Student Learning Objective	<p>Students will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use foundational skills to apply grade level phonics and access text. • Determine or clarify the meaning of grade-appropriate words encountered through listening, reading, and media use. • Read widely and deeply from among a broad range of high quality, increasingly challenging literary and informational texts.

Strategy/Action (What, Who, How)	Timeline (When)	Resources Needed	Method of Collecting Evidence
<p>Ingalls teachers in grades K-5 will continue with the allotted time dedicated to small group instruction within their grade level literacy block.</p> <p>Ingalls teachers in grades 3-5 will make a deliberate attempt to link ELA with content-based social studies and science instruction to create a comprehensive three-hour literacy block.</p>	Daily	<p>Texts aligned with the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Framework for English Language Arts and Literacy Incorporating the Common Core State Standards, Common Planning Time, Principal, Program Specialist, CITs/Coaches, ESL Specialists, Interventionists, Teachers, and Subs</p>	<p>Walk-throughs, lesson plans, student work samples, assessment binders, and personnel schedules</p>
<p>Teachers in grades K – 5, through deliberate lesson planning and instruction, will promote student engagement by incorporating Total Participation Techniques.</p>	Daily	<p>Principal, Program Specialist, CITs/Coaches, ESL Specialists, Interventionists, Teachers</p>	<p>Lesson plans and student work samples, walk throughs, formative and summative assessments</p>
<p>Teachers in Grades K – 5 will incorporate questions that promote Higher Order Thinking (Bloom’s Taxonomy) in daily lessons to deepen student comprehension.</p>	Daily	<p>Principal, Program Specialist, CITs/Coaches, ESL Specialists, Interventionists, Teachers</p>	<p>Lesson plans and student work samples, walk throughs, formative and summative assessments</p>

Ingalls 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' ability to solve multi-step problems; basic math computation skills.
Student Learning Objective	Students will be able to identify, use, and apply problem solving strategies relating to all grade level standards.

Strategy/Action (What, Who, How)	Timeline (When)	Resources Needed	Method of Collecting Evidence
Teachers will continue to participate in Common Planning Time and monthly curriculum meetings to develop deliberate lesson plans and assessments.	Monthly	Principal, Program Specialist, Common Planning Time, Subs, materials, funding	Lesson plans, teacher assessment binders, and walk-throughs
Teachers in grades K-5 will identify student weaknesses using daily formative assessments to drive instruction.	Daily	Formative assessments	Lesson plans, examples of student work, and walk-throughs
Teachers will implement the use of picture word walls for math vocabulary.	On-going	Appropriate grade level vocabulary	Lesson plans and walk-throughs
Teachers will use the Standards for mathematical practice to drive instruction.	Daily	2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Framework for English Language Arts and Literacy Incorporating the Common Core State Standards	Lesson plans, examples of student work, formative and summative assessments
Teachers in grades K – 5, through deliberate lesson planning and instruction, will promote student engagement by incorporating Total Participation Techniques.	Daily	Principal, Program Specialist, CITs/Coaches, ESL Specialists, Interventionists, Teachers	Lesson plans and student work samples, walk throughs, formative and summative assessments
Teachers in Grades K – 5 will incorporate questions that promote Higher Order Thinking (Bloom's Taxonomy) in daily lessons to deepen student comprehension.	Daily	Principal, Program Specialist, CITs/Coaches, ESL Specialists, Interventionists, Teachers	Lesson plans and student work samples, walk throughs, formative and summative assessments

Parent Involvement

Ingalls School implemented the following parent involvement activities:

- Parent Council
- School Improvement Council
- Kindergarten Orientation
- Three Open Houses- Parent /Teacher conferences, Family Literacy Night and Ice Cream Social
- School Programs: Veterans' Day, Winter Fantasy, Memorial Day, Blue and Gold Day, Moving-On Ceremonies, After School Sports Activities
- Monthly PTO Meetings/Guest Speakers
- Monthly Newsletters and Calendar from Principal/Program Specialist
- Translated notices
- Connect ED
- School Fundraisers
- Lynn Community Health
- Dental Services – Forsythe
- The Food Project/ Farmer's Market on site that accepts WIC and Food Stamps
- City Sprouts
- LEHS/LCHS ROTC Program-Bilingual Students interpret at Open Houses and PTO Meetings
- Fall TEAMS Breakfast
- DIBELS/MAZE Report Cards
- Progress Reports/Report Cards
- MLK Beautification Day
- Science Fair
- Parent Communication Survey
- Summer Safety Night