



School Improvement Plan Overview

To ensure that every student has access to high-quality schools, the Whole School Improvement Plan development, submission, and revision process should be aligned with ongoing strategic school improvement efforts at each school site as well as the district’s overall targets of the Superintendent’s Strategic Operating Plan. These efforts include: improving student achievement in LA, math, and science; Increase achievement of high needs students to decrease the gap; create more educationally robust programs that meet student needs and interests; Develop exemplary teachers and school leaders; ensure safe and attractive schools and develop external partnerships

PLAN
Plan 2017-18 Revisit Priorities and Goals in 2018 - 2019
<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Draft due September 15, 2017➤ Share with SGC by October 15, 2017➤ Revision due November 15, 2017 updated with BOY data➤ Ongoing revisions due March 2018 MOY data➤ Updated June 2018 EOY data

2017-2018**School Improvement Plan**

The purpose of the School Plan is to strategically establish goals based on the unique needs of the school and demonstrate how they intersect with the district strategic operating plan. This is also an opportunity to align funding streams, staffing and other resources to ensure measurable outcomes established to monitor progress are being met.

VISION AND THEORY OF ACTION**VISION STATEMENT**

Vision Statement

The Silvermine Way

Silvermine School will be a team of professional educators that collaboratively accepts responsibility for the learning of all students. Our supportive culture will ensure that continuous growth occurs for every child and every staff member at Silvermine School. Further, we will implement, with fidelity, a dual language program that is built around local and state frameworks, that develops cross cultural understanding and that grows bilingual/biliterate students.

Theory of Action – If/then

If all staff, certificated and non-certificated attend professional development and then implement the new information with fidelity, then students will receive a high quality, rigorous education.

If administrators and teachers, monitor student progress on a regular basis through data team and leadership meetings, then instruction can be adjusted to meet the needs of students.

If intervention strategies such as ECRI and effective tier 1 instruction are implemented, then student academic progress should increase during the year so that students gain at least one year's growth.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE DATA ANALYSIS

This section of the document will support your identification of focus areas for your school. You should use 1 page to answer the questions.

OPTIONAL: Prior to answering the questions below, you may find it helpful to examine your school's *historical* data and sub-group data on the district, state and school assessments. Collecting existing documentation you have available will support your analysis.

1. SBAC ASSESSMENT - existing achievement gaps

- Please complete the charts below with **All School data** and then individual grade levels and subgroup data. Who are our highest performing sub-groups?
- Who are our lowest performing subgroups?

Subject Area Grades 3-5 or 6-8		School Overall			District Overall			State Overall		
		2015	2016	2017	2015	2016	2017	2015	2016	2017
ELA	All students	38.3	41.6	41.1	46.5	47.1	48.4	52.4	55.7	54.2
MATH	All students	31.3	38.0	39.4	30.7	34.0	39.3	40.1	44.0	45.6
SCIENCE	All students	38.9	33.8	29	50.6	53		55.5		

Grade Level 3 or 6	All	African American	Hispanic	White	Other	Special Education	ELL	Free/Reduced	High Needs Group
ELA									
2014-2015	38	19	35	70	50	0	20		
2015-2016	47	42	35	88	67	18	9		
2016-2017	42	67	38	50	0	13	29		
Math									
2014-2015	37	25	36	60	50	0	27		
2015-2016	55	47	49	76	100	27	30		
2016-2017	64	56	62	80	100	38	42		

Grade level 4 or 7	All	African American	Hispanic	White	Other	Special Education	ELL	Free/Reduced	High Needs Group
ELA									

2014-2015	42	33	41	56	-	13	34		
2015-2016	32	27	26	58	40	11	5		
2016-2017	48	37	38	93	100	0	0		
Math									
2014-2015	35	33	36	33	-	0	25		
2015-2016	35	27	32	58	70	0	18		
2016-2017	42	32	31	86	100	0	0		

Grade Level 5 or 8	All	African American	Hispanic	White	Other	Special Education	ELL	Free/Reduced	High Needs Group
ELA									
2014-2015	50	57	50	0	100	0	11		
2015-2016	45	50	43	63	NA	10	4		
2016-2017	33	25	28	75	50	0	9		
Math									
2014-2015	18	0	21	0	100	19	0		
2015-2016	22	25	20	38	NA	0	8		
2016-2017	13	8	12	25	25	0	9		
Science									
2015-2016	33.8								
2016-2017	29								

2. Northwest Evaluation Association MAP Assessment - Fill in data chart on sub-group performance

Subject Area Grades 4-5 or 6-8 Math 3-5	School Overall All Students		District Overall All students	
	2015-16	2016-17	2015-16	2016-17
ELA	NA			
Math	NA			

Grade 3 All Students	Fall	Winter	Spring
Math			
2016-2017	186.7	195.9	202.2
2017-2018	187.8		
Grade 4 All Students			
Reading			
2016-2017	195.9	201.2	207.0
2017-2018	196.2		
Language Usage			
2016-2017	198.6	202.0	206.2
2017-2018	195.4		
Math			
2016-2017	198	202	210.7
2017-2018	197.8		
Grade 5 All Students			
Reading			
2016-2017	196.2	203.3	207.7
2017-2018	205.7		
Language Usage			
2016-2017	199.0	203.1	206.2
2017-2018	204.9		
Math			
2016-2017	202.3	208.3	214.0
2017-2018	207.2		

3. mCLASS Dibels - Fill in data chart on sub-group performance

ONLY Elementary Schools

Subject Area Grades K-3		School Overall			District Overall		
		Fall	Winter	Spring	Fall	Winter	Spring
ELA	All students						
	2015-2016	59.6	70.5	77	67.7	75.0	79.4
	Eng. Only	62.9	73.7	79.5	NA	NA	NA
	2016-2017	61.1	70.2	73.5	67.6	72.9	77.5
	2017-2018						
	K All Students						
	2015-2016	46.8	57.3	75.0	61.5	69.2	80.8
	Eng. Only	50.0	69.2	87.7	NA	NA	NA
	2016-2017	53.0	67.1	83.5	58.7	66.5	81.2
	2017-2018	59.0					
	Grade 1 All Students						
	2015-2016	57.1	79.8	85.9	58.1	75.3	75.6
Eng. Only	66.7	81.8	86.6	NA	NA	NA	
2016-2017	53.4	67.1	69.9	59.3	70.0	72.5	
2017-2018	52.0						
Grade 2 All Students							
2015-2016	66.3	69.1	70.7	76.3	79.3	79.4	
2016-2017	77.5	74.4	76.5	78.5	78.3	78.4	
2017-2018	82.0						
Grade 3 All Students							
2015-2016	67.9	75.3	76.1	75.0	76.6	82.1	
2016-2017	60.0	72.0	62.2	73.5	76.5	77.9	
2017-2018	55.0						

Analyze students' academic strengths, struggles and data trends. Use the data above to analyze the strengths and weaknesses in ELA and Math.

Dibels scores show the following:

K and 1 students were weak in the area of phonemic awareness per the BOY data. The EOY from last spring showed that K improved significantly in this area with 88% meeting or exceeding the benchmark from 47% at the beginning of the year.

2017 end of year data for grade one showed that these students need to improve in the area of fluency. As the year progresses fluency becomes more of a focus. This trend will continue through the grades.

In gr. 1, the 2017 BOY showed that knowledge of letter sounds was a strength for the students. The results also showed that gr. 1 students struggled with blending sounds together/reading the whole word. Overall, by the end of first grade last year, 70% had met or exceeded the benchmark from 53% at the beginning of the year.

In gr. 2, the 2017 BOY showed that the strength of the students was in decoding. An area of weakness for gr. 2 was accuracy and fluency in connected text. By the end of second grade in 2017, 79% of the students had met or exceeded the benchmark for fluency from 73% at the beginning of the year.

In gr. 3, fluency appears to be a strength for the students per the BOY, 2017, results. Their weakness/area of need for improvement was accuracy and retell. By the end of the last school year, 67% of the students had met or exceeded the benchmark for fluency from 58% at the beginning of the year.

Dibels composite results show the following for ELL students: At benchmark- K - 21%, Gr. 1 - 46%, Gr. 2 - 70%, Gr. 3 - 33%

Dibels composite results show the following for Special Education students: At benchmark - K-33%, Gr. 1 -0%, Gr. 2 - 33%, Gr. 3 - 0%

In the dual language program, in grades 2-3, BOY for 2017 indicate a weakness in oral reading fluency. 61% of gr. 2 students were at benchmark with 58% of gr. 3 students at benchmark. Overall, in K-3 of last school year, students tested in IDEL increased from 56% meeting the benchmark to 64%.

In SBAC, across all grade levels the reading and the writing and research/inquiry claims appear to be areas of weakness. In math the communicating reasoning claim was a strength. Problem solving and modeling and data analysis are weaker areas for the students. These continue to be areas of strength and weakness for the students.

NWEA finding for BOY

Gr. 3 Math - District RIT mean 187.9 vs. School RIT mean - 187.8 - Strength - Operations and Algebraic Thinking and Measurement and Data Weakness - Number and Operations

Gr. 4 Math - District RIT mean 200.3 vs. School RIT mean - 197.8 - Strength - Operations and Algebraic Thinking and Measurement and Data Weakness - Number and Operations

Gr. 4 Reading - District RIT mean 198.2 vs. School RIT mean - 196.2 - Strength - Vocabulary Acquisition and Use Weakness - Informational Text - Language, Craft, Structure

Gr. 5 Math - District RIT mean 209.7 vs. School RIT mean - 207.2 - Strength - Operations and Algebraic Thinking Weakness - Number and Operations

Gr. 5 Reading - District RIT mean 205.5 vs. School RIT mean - 205.7 - Strength - Informational Text: Language, Craft, Structure Weakness: Vocabulary Acquisition and Use

Where are the largest achievement gaps after looking at all the data in the charts above?

In school year 2015-16, there was a significant achievement gap between white and Hispanic/African American subgroups across all three grades in ELA and in math. In the 2016-17 school year, there was a gap decrease in gr. 3 ELA between African American and white students. In all other grades there was no change in the gap between African American/Hispanic students and white students. Grade 3 special education students had a decline in ELA but grew in math. ELL students grew in both areas. In grades 4 and 5 special education students showed a decline in both ELA and math, in grade 5 ELL students showed a slight increase in ELA and math.

Last year, in DIBELS we took note of the significant gap of BOY scores in gr. 2 vs. the other grades. This may have indicated that the students in the other grades did not suffer a major summer lag or it may have support learning that occurred in summer school for this particular group. At the EOY grades 1 and 3 showed slight increase from the BOY. Factors that should be considered are the following: In gr. 3 there were problems with administering the DAZE assessment on-line. In gr. 1, students had a substitute teacher for the majority of the year.

In NWEA, grades 3-5 showed growth from fall to spring administrations. Our spring scores, however, were below the norms for the grades in both reading and math. The expectation was for the majority of the students to at least reach 50 percentile. This was the first year Silvermine administered this assessment. Having gone through it one full year, the staff feels better prepared to utilize the information from the various reports including a report that shows a direct correlation to success on SBAC.

PERSISTENCE AND BEHAVIOR (ATTENDANCE, SUSPENSIONS, EXPULSIONS)

	Average Daily Student Attendance	Average Daily Teacher Attendance	Percent of Students Chronically Absent
2015-2016	95.6		6.7
2016-2017	95.0		6.6

(Chronically absent is 10% of total number of schools days at the time of data collection)

List 3 Strategies that you will implement to improve attendance for chronically absent students:

1. We follow attendance procedures and refer students with high absenteeism to the social worker who will send warning/excessive absence letters to parents.
2. Students with perfect attendance, will receive special recognition/reward at the end of the school year in a spirit rally.

How will you measure the effectiveness of the attendance strategies?

- The number of students who are chronically absent in the 17-18 school year will be compared to last year’s rate to see if it has lessened.

SUSPENSIONS & EXPULSIONS

EOY 2016		EOY 2017	
Number of Suspensions	20	Number of Suspensions	27
Number of Expulsions		Number of Expulsions	