

SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN

**Worcester Public Schools
2016 - 2017**



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

Gates Lane

School

Ann Swenson

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
Ann Swenson	Principal	Sept: 14 th , 28 th
Maureen McDermott	Assistant Principal	Oct: 12 th , 26 th
Mary Hedvig	Intermediate Focused Instructional Coach	Nov: 9 th , 30 th
Christine Rovezzi	Primary Focused Instructional Coach	Dec: 14 th
Lindsay Doughty	PreK SAIL Teacher	Jan: 4 th , 18 th
Joyce Phillips	Kindergarten Teacher	Feb: 1 st , 15 th
Valerie O'Connor	Grade 1 Teacher	Mar: 8 th , 22 nd
Vincenza Rakic	Grade 2 Teacher	Apr: 5 th , 26 th
Tammy Prentiss	Grade 3 Teacher	May: 10 th , 24 th
Colleen McCallum	Grade 4 Teacher	June: 7 th
Kara Tirimacco	Grade 5 Teacher	
Kathleen Chaban	ESL Teacher	

II. Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Accountability Data

2016 Accountability Data - Gates Lane

Organization Information			
District:	Worcester (03480000)	School type:	Elementary School
School:	Gates Lane (03480110)	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	2016 Level held harmless	
This school's overall performance relative to other schools in same school type (School percentiles: 1-99)		
All students:		15
	Lowest performing	Highest performing

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		68	Did Not Meet Target
High needs		76	Met Target
Econ. Disadvantaged		-	-
ELL and Former ELL		77	Met Target
Students w/disabilities		72	Did Not Meet Target
Amer. Ind. or Alaska Nat.		-	-
Asian		76	Met Target
Afr. Amer./Black		63	Did Not Meet Target
Hispanic/Latino		52	Did Not Meet Target
Multi-race, Non-Hisp./Lat.		-	-
Nat. Haw. or Pacif. Isl.		-	-
White		55	Did Not Meet Target

III. Comprehensive Needs Analysis

Areas of Strength													
Strength			Evidence										
<p>ELA:</p> <p>Overall data for all students for 2016 shows that Gates Lane increased our ELA and Science CPI in comparison to 2015 data. Gates Lane also significantly increased our ELA SGP from 2015.</p>			Change in CPI and SGP: All Students										
				2015	2016	Change							
			ELA CPI	72.5	78.0	+5.5							
			Science CPI	70.3	71.7	+1.4							
	ELA SGP	35.0	56.0	+21.0									
<p>In a comparison of 2015 and 2016 PARCC data by grade level, we found that Grade 3 and Grade 6 significantly increased the percent of students scoring in Level 4, and also significantly increased their Average Transitional CPI, and SGP Median (Grade 6 only).</p> <p>Grade 3 also significantly reduced the percent of students scoring in Level 1 from 27% in 2015 to 0% in 2016.</p>			Grade 3 ELA: Compared to 2015 Results										
				Level 4	Avg. Trans. CPI								
			2015	18%	69.4								
			2016	43%	85.4								
			Change	+25	+16								
			Grade 6 ELA: Compared to 2015 Results										
				Level 4	Avg. Trans. CPI	SGP Median							
			2015	35%	80.8	45.0							
			2016	54%	87.2	69.0							
			Change	+19	+6.4	+24							
<p>In a comparison of 2016 PARCC ELA data to the District, we found the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The percent of our students scoring in Level 4 is above the District in Grades 3 and 6 The percent of our students scoring in Level 1 is lower than the District for Grades 3-6 Gates Lane's Average Transitional CPI is higher than the District in Grades 3-6 Gates Lane's SGP Median is higher than the District in Grades 4 and 6 			Grade 3										
				Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6					
			District	Gates Lane	District	Gates Lane	District	Gates Lane	District	Gates Lane			
			Level 4	33%	43% (+10)	28%	22% (-6)	39%	32% (-7)	41%	54% (+13)		
			Level 1	27%	0% (-27)	15%	10% (-5)	9%	5% (-4)	8%	4% (-4)		
			Avg. Trans. CPI	73.3	85.4 (+12.1)	61.1	65.5 (+4.4)	78.7	79.3 (+.6)	80.9	87.2 (+6.3)		
			SGP Median	N/A	N/A	38	48 (+10)	59	49 (-10)	66.0	69.0 (+3)		

An analysis of 2016 MCAS ELA Alternative Assessment data reflects a significant increase in percent of students scoring in the PRG category in Grade 4 and a slight improvement in Grade 6, as well as Grade 3 maintaining 100%, as compared to the same data for 2015:

ELA MCAS Alternative Assessments: PRG Category

Grade	2015 % Scoring PRG	2016 % Scoring PRG	Change in Percentage Points
3	100%	100%	---
4	71%	95%	+24
5	93%	77%	-16
6	91%	93%	+2

MATH:

In an comparison of 2016 PARCC Math data to the same data from 2015, we found:

- Grade 3 significantly increased the percent of students scoring in Level 4 and Level 5, and significantly decreased the percent of students scoring in Level 1 and Level 2.
- Grade 3 also significantly increased their Avg. Trans. CPI.
- Grade 4 increased the percent scoring in Level 4, as well as their Avg. Trans. CPI and SGP median.

Grade 3 Math: Compared to 2015 Results

	Level 5	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Avg. Trans. CPI
2015	0%	25%	31%	35%	9%	72.7
2016	9%	31%	29%	27%	4%	82.4
Change	+9	+6	-2	-12	-5	+9.7

Grade 4 Math: Compared to 2015 Results

	Level 4	Avg. Trans. CPI	SGP Median
2015	21%	66.4	41.5
2016	27%	71.5	48.0
Change	+6	+5.1	+6.5

In an comparison of 2016 PARCC Math data to the same data for the District, we found:

- Grade 3 scored better than the District in Level 4 and Level 5, and significantly better than the district in Level 1.
- Grade 3 has a higher Avg. Trans. CPI than the District.
- Grade 4 has a higher Avg. Trans. CPI and SGP Median than the District.

Grade 3 Math: Compared to District

	Level 5	Level 4	Level 1	Avg. Trans. CPI
District (2016)	5%	29%	18%	71.7
Gates Lane (2016)	9%	31%	4%	82.4
Difference	+4	+2	-14	+10.7

Grade 4 Math: Compared to District

	Avg. Trans. CPI	SGP Median
District (2016)	59.5	36.0
Gates Lane (2016)	71.5	48.0
Difference	+12	+12

An analysis of 2016 MCAS Math Alternative Assessment data shows that the percent of students scoring in the PRG category in Math across all tested grade levels has been maintained at 100%:

Math MCAS Alternative Assessments: PRG Category

Grade	2015 % Scoring PRG	2016 % Scoring PRG	Change in Percentage Points
3	100%	100%	---
4	100%	100%	---
5	100%	100%	---
6	100%	100%	---

SCIENCE:

Our 2016 MCAS data shows that we decreased the number of students in the Warning category by 30%, which exceeds our goal of decreasing the number of students in Warning by 10%.

In a 2016 MCAS test item analysis of percent correct, we found that Gates Lane students scored above the District on 64% of the test items (27 out of 42), which is an increase compared to 2015 data, when our students scored above the district on 52% (22 out of 42) of test items.

In the same analysis, our students scored above the State on 24% of test items (10 out of 42), compared to 19% in 2015.

An analysis of 2016 MCAS Alternative Assessment data shows that the percent of students scoring in the PRG category in Science has been maintained at 100%.

In an analysis of 2016 MCAS results by achievement level, 8% of Gates Lane students scored in the Advanced category, which was slightly above the District (7%).

In an analysis of 2016 MCAS results by subgroup compared to the same data for 2015, we found that Gates Lane has fewer student in the Warning category (28%) compared to last year (31%).

In the same analysis, Gates Lane improved the percent proficient or higher in the following subgroups compared to our 2015 results and as compared to the District:

2016 Grade 5 MCAS Science % Proficient or Higher

	Gates Lane 2015	Gates Lane 2016	District 2016
Economically Disadvantaged	22%	23%	21%
Students with Disabilities	3%	8%	5%
English Language Learners (ELL)	10%	12%	11%
Asian	35%	55%	38%
African American /Black	---	29%	22%
High Needs		25%	22%

In an analysis of results by standards and question types, Gates Lane scored better than the District on the following strands/topics:

Grade 5 MCAS Science: % Possible Points by Strand/Topic		
Strand/Topic	Gates Lane 2016	District 2016
Earth & Space Science (S)	60%	54%
Earth's History (T)	44%	31%
Soil (T)	77%	58%
Life Science (S)	64%	62%
Energy & Living Things (T)	75%	58%
Technology & Engineering (S)	48%	45%

Gates Lane increased our Science and Technology 2016 CPI compared to our 2015 CPI, and our 2016 CPI is also higher than the state:

Science and Technology CPI		
Gates Lane 2015	Gates Lane 2016	District 2016
70.3	72.7	64.7

Areas of Concern

Concern

Evidence

ELA:

Overall data for all students for 2016 shows that the Math CPI for Gates Lane decreased as compared to 2015. Our SGP for all students also decreased from 2015.

Change in CPI and SGP: All Students			
	2015	2016	Change
Math CPI	67.6	65.1	-2.5
Math SGP	33.0	32.5	-.5

An analysis of 2016 Grade 4 ELA PARCC Data compared to 2015 data and to the District shows the following:

- Percent of students scoring in Level 5 decreased from 2015
- Percents of students scoring in Levels 4 and 5 are below the District
- Percent of students scoring in Levels 1 and 2 have increased from 2015
- Percent of students scoring in Level 2 is above the District

Grade 4 ELA: Compared to 2015 & District					
	Level 5	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
GLS 2015	7%	19%	38%	26%	9%
GLS 2016	1%	22%	39%	28%	10%
District 2016	4%	28%	28%	24%	15%

MATH:

An analysis of 2016 Grade 5 ELA PARCC Data compared to 2015 data and to the District shows the following:

- Percent of students scoring in Level 5 is slightly below the District
- Percent of students scoring in Level 4 decreased from 2015, and is significantly below the District
- Percent of students scoring in Level 2 is above the District

Grade 5 ELA: Compared to 2015 Results

	Level 5	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
GLS 2015	1%	34%	32%	23%	10%
GLS 2016	2%	32%	40%	21%	5%
District 2016	3%	39%	35%	16%	9%

An analysis of 2016 Grade 4 Math PARCC Data compared to 2015 data and to the District shows the following:

- Gates Lane had no students scoring in Level 5, which shows a decrease from 2015 and is below the District
- Percent of students scoring in Level 1 slightly increased from 2015

Grade 4 Math: Compared to 2015 & District

	Level 5	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
GLS 2015	1%	21%	31%	37%	10%
GLS 2016	0%	27%	37%	26%	11%
District 2016	1%	25%	25%	27%	22%

An analysis of 2016 Grade 5 Math PARCC Data compared to 2015 data and to the District shows the following:

- Percent of students scoring in Level 5 is below the District
- Percent of students scoring in Level 4 decreased from 2015 and is significantly below the District
- Percent of students scoring in Level 1 increased significantly from 2015
- Percent of students scoring in Levels 1 and 2 are significantly above the District
- Avg. Trans. CPI and SGP Median decreased significantly from 2015 and are significantly below the District

Grade 5 Math: Compared to 2015 & District

	Level 5	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Avg. Trans. CPI	SGP Median
GLS 2015	1%	13%	25%	43%	18%	59.6	21.5
GLS 2016	2%	11%	21%	37%	29%	54.0	13.0
District 2016	4%	23%	24%	30%	18%	61.5	41.0

An analysis of 2016 Grade 6 Math PARCC Data compared to 2015 data and to the District shows the following:

- Gates Lane had no students scoring in Level 5, which is decreased from 2015 and below the District
- Percent of students scoring in Level 4 decreased significantly from 2015 and is significantly below the District
- Percent of students scoring in Level 2 significantly increased from 2015 and is significantly above the District
- Percent of students scoring in Level 1 slightly increased from 2015
- Avg. Trans. CPI significantly decreased compared to 2015 and SGP Median decreased as well. Both measures are significantly below the District.

Grade 6 Math: Compared to 2015 & District

	Level 5	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Avg. Trans. CPI	SGP Median
GLS 2015	4%	20%	41%	24%	11%	72.3	36.0
GLS 2016	0%	13%	27%	47%	13%	59.0	34.0
District 2016	4%	26%	29%	28%	14%	64.3	57.0

SCIENCE:

Although we improved our overall CPI in Science (72.7 in 2016 compared to 70.3 in 2015), the CPI for some sub groups decreased compared to 2015.

Grade 5 Science: CPI Compared to 2015 & District

Sub-Group	2015 CPI	2016 CPI	Change
Non-Disabled	75.8	70.6	-5.2
ELL	61.7	57.8	-3.9
Hispanic	67.2	55.7	-11.5
Non-High Needs	80.6	70.8	-9.8

An analysis of 2016 Grade 5 Science MCAS data shows that The percent of Gates Lane students scoring in the Proficient category has decreased compared to 2015, and is below the District. In addition, while the percent of students scoring in the Warning category has decreased compared to 2015, it is above the District.

Grade 5 Science: Proficiency Categories Compared to 2015 & District

	Advanced	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Warning
GLS 2015	8%	23%	38%	31%
GLS 2016	8%	16%	48%	28%
District 2016	7%	22%	45%	26%

In the same analysis, data shows that Gates Lane decreased percent of possible points earned for open response question types compared to 2015, and scored below the District percent in this question type as well.

Grade 5 MCAS Science: Percent Possible Points on Open Response

GLS 2015	46%
GLS 2016	40%
District 2016	41%

IV. Action Plan

Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration (#1) <i>Establishing a community of practice through leadership, shared responsibility for all students, and professional collaboration</i> (Focus on improving core instruction and tiered interventions systems using a variety of data)	
Prioritized Best Practices or Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Utilize data from standardized testing, as well as teacher-created assessments and anecdotal evidence, to create tiered Reading groups in Grades 1-6 to ensure that high quality Reading instruction is being offered. ➤ Utilize data from standardized testing, as well as teacher-created assessments and anecdotal evidence to create tiered Math groups in Grades 3-6 to ensure that high quality Math instruction is being offered. ➤ Utilize Science-based literature during the ELA block to ensure a balanced literacy approach.
Instructional Leadership Team Implementation	Analyze results of summative data submitted by teachers from all core subjects and all grade levels, in order to foster a culture of shared ownership and to further ensure high quality instruction throughout the school
School Performance Indicators and Data Sources	
ADULT IMPLEMENTATION INDICATOR	STUDENT RESULTS INDICATOR
Data Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Lesson plans ➤ Classroom observations ➤ Student learning goals and educator plans 	Data Source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Bi-monthly ELA, Science, and/or Social Studies evidence based response and narrative writing data ➤ Bi-monthly Math open response data ➤ Foundations unit tracking data ➤ BAS data ➤ MAP data

Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction (#2)

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)

<p>Prioritized Best Practices or Strategies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Frequent visits to classrooms by the Principal and Assistant Principal, followed by constructive feedback to teachers, framed by a common understanding of and expectations for high quality instruction throughout the school. ➤ Use of Student-Focused Coaching Protocol by Focused Instructional Coaches (FICs) to increase student achievement by providing targeted supports to classroom teachers, based on data to define student needs. ➤ Provide clear instructional priorities to all staff through professional literacy communities, and professional development designed to build a Keys to Literacy comprehension routine in Intermediate classrooms, and regular use of guided reading strategies in Primary classrooms.
<p>Instructional Leadership Team Implementation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Analyze results of summative data submitted by teachers from all core subjects and all grade levels, in order to foster a culture of shared ownership and to further ensure high quality instruction throughout the school

School Performance Indicators and Data Sources

ADULT IMPLEMENTATION INDICATOR	STUDENT RESULTS INDICATOR
<p>Data Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Student-Focused Coaching log ➤ PLC minutes ➤ Professional Development plans and agendas ➤ Evaluation documentation 	<p>Data Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Higher level of student discourse in the classroom ➤ Bi-monthly ELA, Science, and/or Social Studies evidence based response and narrative writing data ➤ Bi-monthly Math open response data ➤ Foundations unit tracking data ➤ BAS data ➤ MAP data

Providing Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students (#3)

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)

Prioritized Best Practices or Strategies

Instructional Leadership Team Implementation

- Use of a variety of assessments to regularly refine and modify flexible groupings in order to provide specific academic supports and skill-specific interventions as needed.
- Ensure that all students have a solid foundation in the prerequisite skills necessary to successfully master grade level skills and close achievement gaps
- Continually refine and further develop academic scheduling and thoughtful placement of personnel resources within the building, in order to provide needed student-specific instruction.
- Regularly review classroom schedules
- Analyze data from standardized assessments

School Performance Indicators and Data Sources

ADULT IMPLEMENTATION INDICATOR

STUDENT RESULTS INDICATOR

- Data Source:**
- Lesson plans
 - Classroom schedules

- Data Source:**
- Bi-monthly ELA, Science, and/or Social Studies evidence based response and narrative writing data
 - Bi-monthly Math open response data
 - Foundations unit tracking data
 - BAS data
 - MAP data

A Safe, Respectful, and Collegial Climate for Teachers and Students (#4)

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

- Weekly professional literacy community meetings by grade level and by discipline for collegial planning and implementation of common strategies based on data and research, and to provide opportunities for professional collaboration.
- Continue the practice of holding bi-monthly Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) meetings comprised of administration, FICs, and staff members representing all grade levels who collaborate to make professional judgments on initiatives that best support our students.
- Continue to foster a safe, orderly, and respectful climate for teaching and learning throughout the school through the use of school-wide behavioral expectations and social-emotional supports

Instructional Leadership Team Implementation

- Review of PLC minutes
- Monitor school-wide discipline data

School Performance Indicators and Data Sources

ADULT IMPLEMENTATION INDICATOR

STUDENT RESULTS INDICATOR

- Data Source:**
- ILT meeting minutes
 - ILT Sign-in sheet
 - PLC meeting minutes

- Data Source:**
- Participation in weekly and monthly reward activities
 - Participation in quarterly *Great Gators* celebrations
 - Participation in *Greatest Gators* end of year celebration
 - Student of the Month
 - Bi-annual good sportsmanship rewards

V. Worcester Public Schools Professional Learning Plan (PLP)

District Name	School Name	Principal Name	Plan Begin/End Dates
Worcester Public Schools	Gates Lane School of International Studies	Ann Swenson	September 2016 – June 2017

1: Professional Learning Goals:

No.	Goal	Identified Group	Rationale/Sources of Evidence
1	Increase expertise in literacy techniques for use across the curriculum	School-wide	Although we are making progress in ELA, we have not reached our 2016 target CPI.
2	Increase student achievement in Math across all grades	School-wide	Data analyzed from State mandated assessments show that there is a significant gap in achievement of students in Grades 3-6 (PARCC) and Grades 2-6 (MAP).
3	Use of Science-based literature during the ELA block to ensure a balanced literacy approach	School-wide	Although we are making progress in Science, we have not reached our 2016 target CPI.

2: Professional Learning Activities

PL Goal No.	Initial Activities	Follow-up Activities (as appropriate)
1	Ten hours of Keys to Literacy follow-up training (Intermediate) and Next Steps in Guided Reading (Primary)	Classroom observations of components of Keys to Literacy and guided reading practices being utilized in grade level classrooms
		Follow a professional coaching protocol to provide lesson modeling and coverage for peer observations and follow-up reflection meetings
		Follow up on Keys to Literacy and Guided Reading training during PLC meetings
2	Design professional development to address school-wide achievement gaps in Mathematics	Build a list of Math resources that provides specific purposes for each resource, and that provides resources for all grade levels

		Follow a professional coaching protocol to do classroom observations specific to Math, and provide lesson modeling and coverage for peer observations and follow-up reflection meetings
		ILT will regularly review Math Open response data, as well as January MAP data, in order to monitor improvements.
3	Use Science-based non-fiction texts during ELA blocks	Follow a professional coaching protocol to provide lesson modeling and coverage for peer observations and follow-up reflection meetings
		ILT will regularly review Science EBR data in order to monitor improvements

3: Essential Resources

PL Goal No.	Resources	Other Implementation Considerations
1	Staff to cover classrooms during PLC meetings	
2	Formal and informal assessment data	
3	Access to student work samples for scoring and analysis	
4	Training in building a Keys to Literacy Comprehension routine in Intermediate grades	
5	Training in providing guided reading for students in Primary grades	
6	ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies Liaisons	
7	Office of Professional Development	
8	School-wide commitment to and cooperation in meeting the academic needs of our students	

4: Progress Summary

PL Goal No.	Notes on Plan Implementation	Notes on Goal Attainment
1		