

Marsh Grammar School

School Improvement Plan



January 2012—December 2012

Methuen Public Schools
Methuen, Massachusetts

METHUEN PUBLIC SCHOOLS



School Committee

Mayor Stephen N. Zanni, Chairperson
Evan J. Chaisson
Mary Jean Fawcett
Mark Graziano
Barbara Grondine
Lynne Hajjar Kumm
Deborah R. Quinn

Administration

Central Office

Judith A. Scannell, Superintendent of Schools
Jennifer A. Smith, Ed. D., Assistant Superintendent
Gina Bozek, Director of Special Education
Lyn Griffin, Director of Grants and Program Development
Colleen McCarthy, Director of Human Resources
Glenn Fratto, Business Administrator
Timothy Hill, Director of Mathematics and Computer Technology
Ann Piccolomini, Supervisor of Title I
Jane Sigillo, Supervisor of Language Acquisition
Valerie Viscosi, Supervisor of Guidance

Marsh Grammar School Administration

Richard P. Beshara, Supervising Principal
Suzanne Lamoureux, Lower School Associate Principal
JoAnn Lakow, Upper School Associate Principal
Walter Greene, Special Education Administrator

Marsh Grammar School
Richard P. Beshara, Principal

2012 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Introduction2

School Mission Statement 4

District Goals 5

Report on 2011 Performance 6

2012 Student Performance Goals..... 9

2012 Student Learning Objectives 10

2012 Improvement Objectives 11

2012 Action Plans..... 12

2012 Social/Civic Goals..... 22

Professional Development 23

Parent Involvement..... 24

Calendar for School Improvement Plan.....25

Appendix:.....27

Student Achievement Data

- 2011 Adequate Yearly Progress Reports
- 2011 MCAS Performance—Aggregate and Subgroups
- 2011 Student Growth Percentiles

Participants Involved in Preparation of School Improvement Plan

Introduction

In 1998, the Marsh Grammar School opened as a PK–grade 8 building in the west end of the city. The school houses approximately 1350 students. The school is comprised of a lower school (PK–4) and an upper school (5-8). There are two preschool classrooms, one integrated and one intensive, along with 54 regular education classrooms, six at each grade in grades K–8. We also house five district-wide special education classrooms.

Our demographics are as follows:

White Caucasian	79%
Hispanic	16%
Asian	3.2%
African American	1.4%
Other	0.4%
Low Income	21%
Special Education	12.7%
Limited English Proficiency	5.6%

As an aggregate, our scores in both English language arts and mathematics have remained consistent over the past four years. In ELA, we have had a performance rating of *High*. Our mathematics performance rating has been *Moderate*. Our No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Accountability Status is *Restructuring for Subgroups*.

The Marsh Grammar School Improvement Plan has been developed through the Performance Improvement Mapping (PIM) process. This process is a means of analyzing Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) scores and Adequate Yearly Process (AYP) data. Setting goals and objectives and creating specific action plans are essential components of the PIM process. Data analysis began with grade-level teams of teachers working collaboratively to review the 2011 MCAS scores and the 2011 School Improvement Plan to make decisions about whether or not the school had met its goals. Information from the grade-level teams informed the decision-making of the small group of upper and lower school teachers, coaches, and administrators that met to develop the plan. Based on the data provided, and our school's commitment to excellence, the team decided to focus on the following three goals across content areas:

1. Improving students' skill in identifying, analyzing and interpreting elements of nonfiction texts;
2. Improving students' skill in applying comprehension strategies in various genres; and
3. Improving students' skill in communicating effectively in writing, including using information from the text to support written responses.

The implementation of these goals, as well as those specific to English language arts and math, will be monitored throughout the school year as the PIM team meets each spring and fall to assess the school's progress.

This improvement plan is comprehensive, highly structured, and specific. The plan's design focuses on core academic subject areas, the strategies used to teach them, professional development, technology, parent involvement, and measurable goals. It is our intention that the implementation of this plan will bring all groups of students to proficiency in both mathematics and English language arts.

Upon approval from the Superintendent and the Methuen School Committee, this School Improvement Plan will be shared with the staff. Expectations will be set in terms of achieving the school's goals. Teachers will begin to implement it as soon as possible. The SIP will be available on the website for both teachers and parents to access.

Marsh Grammar School Mission Statement

The Marsh Grammar School family embraces the philosophy and goals of the Methuen Public Schools through its vision and mission.

VISION: *A community of learners committed to excellence.*

MISSION: The Marsh Grammar School strives through teamwork, communication, and shared decision-making to prepare each student to excel in the global community while respecting each other's individual potential.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES: Proficiency
Responsibility
Innovation
Differentiation
Excellence

Achievement of this vision and mission involves the entire Marsh Grammar School—students, parents, staff, and administration.

District Goals

In order to improve student achievement at all levels and across the curriculum, the district will pursue the following goals.

1. *Provide, supervise, and sustain effective interventions to increase the success of all underperforming students, including those in the transient and subgroup populations.*
2. *Continue curriculum development and revision and ensure appropriate classroom implementation of new curricula.*
3. *Provide, supervise, and support effective instruction that communicates high expectations and that meets the needs of all learners.*
4. *Improve classroom standards-based assessment practices and use of assessment data for formative and summative purposes.*
5. *Expand parental communication and involvement in the schools.*
6. *Support our students' learning by organizing effective organizational structures, nurturing a healthy culture, and providing well-maintained facilities.*
7. *Review and refine the district's business and financial practices, including budget preparation, to ensure that they identify and effectively deploy resources to support the student achievement goals.*

Report on 2011 Student Performance

In 2011, the Marsh Grammar School did not meet the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) goals mandated by No Child Left Behind; but it was in good company, since those goals were not met by 82% of Massachusetts schools. With no significant change in English language arts scores and a decrease in mathematics achievement, the school is currently in *Restructuring Year 2* for subgroup performance. Despite the AYP status, there were some positive signs for the Marsh in English language arts. The special education subgroup showed a 2.0-point increase in its Composite Performance Index (CPI), the AYP proficiency measure; and the Hispanic/Latino subgroup improved by 2.2 CPI points. Although the school did not meet its ELA and math proficiency targets, it did achieve two other components of AYP. With nearly 100% participation in MCAS assessment and about 95% student attendance, the Marsh exceeded the required participation and attendance rates of 95% and 92%, respectively.

Going forward, MCAS proficiency rates will most likely be combined with student growth percentiles (SGP) to determine Adequate Yearly Progress. Student growth percentile data issued by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education make it possible to assess students' growth from the end of one school year to the next, by comparing local students to others statewide who started from the same scaled scores. Only students tested for two consecutive years are included in this measure. The median student growth percentile is the percentage of students across Massachusetts whose knowledge and skills grew less than those of the typical local student. SGP scores between 40 and 60 indicate moderate growth. Slightly below the moderate range defined by the state, Marsh's 2011 median student growth percentiles were 38.0 in ELA and 37.0 in math. Most of the subgroup median percentiles were also in the thirties. An exception was the 42.5 SGP posted in English language arts by Marsh's Hispanic/Latino subgroup. Over the coming year the Marsh Grammar School will need to ensure that all of its students, even those currently achieving MCAS proficiency, are growing at rates similar to those of their academic peers across the state.

Overall, Marsh students are achieving MCAS proficiency in English language arts, although the school's math scores reveal slightly more than half of the students scoring in the *Needs Improvement* or *Warning* performance levels. Table 1 displays the 2011 MCAS score percentages for students across all grade-levels at the Marsh.

Table 1: 2011 MCAS Score Distributions—All Grades

	Advanced	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Warning
ELA	7	54	32	7
Math	13	36	35	16

Table 2 shows more specifically the grade-levels in which Marsh found it most difficult to achieve MCAS success in 2011. The table provides the differences in MCAS proficiency (the percentages of students who scored *Advanced* or *Proficient*) between the school and Massachusetts as a whole; and it is ordered from the strongest performance to the weakest, relative to the state. Some grade-levels achieved good results in 2011. For

example, in grades 6 and 8 math, Marsh students achieved higher proficiency rates than were evident in Massachusetts as a whole. Marsh proficiency rates in grades 7 and 8 ELA matched the statewide rates. But there were also some problem areas, displayed at the bottom of the table. In science at both grades 5 and 8, Marsh performance was well below statewide results. In grades 4 and 5 English language arts, there also was a large difference between Marsh students' proficiency and Massachusetts proficiency. Similarly, in math at grades 5 and 7, Marsh MCAS achievement was significantly below the scores achieved across the state. Clearly, grade 5 needs to be a focus for improvement in the coming year, given the results in English language arts, math, and science.

Table 2: 2011 MCAS Proficiency Rates by Grade

	MARSH	STATE	Difference
Grade 6 Math	60	58	2
Grade 8 Math	53	52	1
Grade 7 ELA	73	73	0
Grade 8 ELA	79	79	0
Grade 3 Reading	60	61	-1
Grade 3 Math	59	66	-7
Grade 6 ELA	61	68	-7
Grade 4 Math	38	47	-9
Grade 4 ELA	41	53	-12
Grade 5 Math	47	59	-12
Grade 7 Math	39	51	-12
Grade 5 ELA	53	67	-14
Grade 5 Science	36	50	-14
Grade 8 Science	24	39	-15

Although generally the Marsh Grammar School has a less diverse student population than the rest of the Methuen school district, the disparity is shrinking, as shown in demographic data collected just after the 2011 MCAS administration. Twenty percent of Marsh students came from low-income families, and over 21% belonged to ethnic/racial minority groups. Almost 16% of the school's students were Hispanic/Latinos. Thirteen percent of the school's students did not speak English as their first language. Just over 12% received special education services.

Like their counterparts elsewhere in Methuen and Massachusetts, Marsh students in four major subgroups—students with disabilities, limited/formerly limited English proficient (F/LEP) students, low-income students, and Hispanic/Latino students—continue to find MCAS success elusive. 2011 MCAS proficiency rates for Marsh's disabled students were 22% in ELA and only 11% in math. Similarly, among F/LEP students, 20% reached proficiency in ELA and just 13% scored *Proficient* or better in math. Forty-six percent of low-income students achieved MCAS proficiency in ELA, as did 31% in math. In

contrast, among students not below the poverty line, Marsh achieved 67% proficiency in ELA and 55% in math. For Hispanic/Latino students the proficiency rates were 46% in ELA and only 29% in math, compared to white students' proficiency rates of 65% in English language arts and 54% in math.

In the Appendix there are copies of the school's 2011 Adequate Yearly Progress reports, MCAS score distributions for the aggregate and all subgroups at each grade level, and student growth percentiles for the aggregate and all subgroups at each grade level. In conjunction with MCAS objectives and item analyses for each grade, these data have guided the process through which this improvement plan was developed.

2012 Student Performance Goals

Two measures of student performance will be used to determine the school's success in meeting its performance goals for 2012. The first is the percentage of students who have scored either *Advanced* or *Proficient* on MCAS, thus achieving the proficiency goal of No Child Left Behind. The second measure is the student growth percentile or SGP. The SGP tells how a child's progress compares to the progress of other students in the state with similar MCAS score histories. The growth percentile score tells the percentage of these academic peers who achieved less growth from the end of one year to the end of the next, as measured by MCAS scaled scores. The median growth percentile for a group is the SGP of the student who is in the exact middle of the score distribution. Median growth percentiles range from 1 to 99. An SGP of 1 to 39 indicates low growth. An SGP of 40 to 60 indicates moderate growth. An SGP of 61 to 99 indicates high growth.

The 2011 MCAS score distributions and student growth percentiles appear in the Appendix.

For the coming year, at each grade-level and for both the aggregate and each subgroup, the school's performance goals are to...

- a. Achieve an increase in the percentage of students scoring *Advanced* or *Proficient* in English language arts.
- b. Achieve an increase in the percentage of students scoring *Advanced* or *Proficient* in mathematics.
- c. Achieve median student growth percentiles in the moderate range or higher in English language arts.
- d. Achieve median student growth percentiles in the moderate range or higher in mathematics.

2012 Student Learning Objectives

The Student Learning Objectives are based upon 2011 MCAS item analyses and objectives analyses. They identify specific skills and areas of knowledge that need improvement across groups of students in English language arts, mathematics, and all content areas. Unless otherwise noted, the Student Learning Objectives apply to all students in the school.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES FOR ALL CONTENT AREAS

Students will be able to...

1. identify, analyze and interpret elements of nonfiction texts.
2. apply comprehension strategies in various genres.
3. communicate effectively in writing, including using information from the text to support written responses.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES

Students will be able to...

1. identify, analyze, and apply knowledge of the structure and elements of fiction, and use basic facts and main ideas to infer from and interpret text.
2. understand and acquire new vocabulary using various strategies.
3. identify, analyze, and apply knowledge of characteristics of the genres of poetry and drama.

MATHEMATICS STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES

Students will be able to...

1. analyze multi-step problems (decoding directions, identifying relevant information, selecting strategy) and effectively communicate their responses.
2. conceptualize number sense in the areas of locating fractions, number lines, using fractions as decimals, integer exponents, and inverse relations.
3. demonstrate competence in patterns/relations/algebra in the areas of symbols of number patterns, variables in equations, linear relations, and simple algebraic equations.

2012 Improvement Objectives

The Improvement Objectives identify the opportunities that the school and its faculty will provide, in order for its students to achieve the Student Learning Objectives.

Improvement Objectives may identify specific interventions, curriculum emphases, and instructional strategies that are designed to enhance students' learning.

IMPROVEMENT OBJECTIVES FOR ALL CONTENT AREAS

Teachers will provide explicit instruction and opportunities for learning in...

1. identifying, analyzing, and interpreting elements of various types of nonfiction text.
2. reading comprehension strategies.
3. responding to text, in writing, across the curriculum.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS IMPROVEMENT OBJECTIVES

Teachers will provide explicit instruction and opportunities for learning in...

1. making inferences and interpreting text.
2. utilizing various strategies for understanding, acquiring, and using new vocabulary.
3. the characteristics of the genres of poetry and drama.

MATHEMATICS IMPROVEMENT OBJECTIVES

Teachers will provide instruction and exploratory learning opportunities for...

1. analyzing multi-step problems and effectively communicating responses.
2. conceptualizing number sense.
3. demonstrating competence in patterns/relations/algebra.

Marsh Action Plan—All Content Areas

Student Group: All Students

Improvement Objectives 1-3: Teachers will provide explicit instruction and opportunities for learning in identifying, analyzing, and interpreting elements of various types of nonfiction text; reading comprehension strategies; and written response to text across the curriculum.				
Strategy	Activities	Who Responsible	Resources Needed	Specific Timeline
Balanced Literacy	Modeling Focus lessons Use of mentor text Conferring Students reading at independent reading levels Detailed feedback Flexible/small group instruction	Classroom/ELL teachers Coaches (ELA/ELL) Administrators Media specialists Title I Supervisor	Time (classroom, cross-curricular with media, computer lab) Expanded/improved book room High interest/low-level readers Guided reading sets Learning A-to-Z license (renew/continued) Technology (software & hardware), including Lexia, SkillsTutor, SmartBoards, etc. Journals/writing books	Entire School Year

Improvement Objectives 1-3: Teachers will provide explicit instruction and opportunities for learning in identifying, analyzing, and interpreting elements of various types of nonfiction text; reading comprehension strategies; and written response to text across the curriculum.				
Strategy	Activities	Who Responsible	Resources Needed	Specific Timeline
Grade-level and content-specific open-response questions	<p>Develop/determine open-response questions for students at each grade-level.</p> <p>Develop common rubrics for assessment based on DESE workshop guidance.</p> <p>Compare assessments in grade-level meetings and with students; use to inform instruction.</p>	Teaching staff Coaches	<p>Writing prompts</p> <p>Journals (optional)</p> <p>Grade-level meeting time</p>	Monthly
Professional development in comprehension strategy instruction.	<p>Investigate available courses/programs related to comprehension strategies for various grade-levels.</p> <p>Recruit in-district “experts” to develop professional development course(s).</p> <p>Recommend appropriate and cost-effective options to administration for consideration and funding.</p> <p>Offer programs to staff and encourage participation.</p>	Administration, with coach and teacher input	Funding Time	Professional development days: January–December 2012

Improvement Objectives 1-3: Teachers will provide explicit instruction and opportunities for learning in identifying, analyzing, and interpreting elements of various types of nonfiction text; reading comprehension strategies; and written response to text across the curriculum.				
Strategy	Activities	Who Responsible	Resources Needed	Specific Timeline
Writing Across the Curriculum	Use 6+1 as assessment tool in classrooms Informal professional development on Writer's Workshop in grade-level meetings and during professional development days.	Classroom teachers ELA coach Administration	6+1 Traits materials and resources Grade-level/professional development day time	Grade-level meetings Professional development days Ongoing assessment during the school year
Investigate other writing programs and resources, such as "Keys to Literacy"	Review for effectiveness and suggestions to assist teachers with classroom writing instruction. Coordinate review with ELA coach/ administration for consistency with Balanced Literacy program. Study groups Webinars Site visits	Classroom teachers ELA coach Administration	Time (coordination with coach/administration, investigation of available resources/programs, grade-level meetings, etc.) Writing resources/ materials on programs for review	January–May 2012

Improvement Objectives 1-3: Teachers will provide explicit instruction and opportunities for learning in identifying, analyzing, and interpreting elements of various types of nonfiction text; reading comprehension strategies; and written response to text across the curriculum.				
Strategy	Activities	Who Responsible	Resources Needed	Specific Timeline
Teachers participate in Massachusetts DESE-recommended Category 1 and Category 2 sheltered English immersion training	<p>Category 1: Second Language Learning and Teaching 10–15 hours of professional development</p> <p>Category 2: Sheltering Content Instruction 30–40 hours of professional development</p>	Teachers who have not yet taken Category 1 or 2 Marsh ESL teacher/trainer of Category 1 & 2	LAD coursework brochure listing course offerings	June–November 2012
Differentiate instruction using SEI techniques and practices	<p>Address the 3 principles of SEI.</p> <p>Plan and restate content and language objectives.</p> <p>Use graphic organizers and ELL rubrics.</p> <p>Teach the text backwards.</p> <p>Develop academic vocabulary.</p>	Classroom/SEI teachers ESL teachers ELL coach	<p>Sheltered instruction look-fors</p> <p>Category training materials</p> <p>Grade-level meetings to discuss ELLs</p>	January–December 2012

Marsh Action Plan—English Language Arts

Student Group: All Students

Improvement Objective 1: Teachers will provide explicit instruction and opportunities for learning in making inferences and interpreting text.				
Strategy	Activities	Who Responsible	Resources Needed	Specific Timeline
Provide Tier I interventions in the classrooms.	Identify students in need of interventions from formative assessments, classroom activities, assignments and tasks, and observation.	Classroom teachers	No special resources needed	Entire school year
	Provide individualized interventions to students as appropriate to their needs.	Classroom teachers ELA coach	Differentiated materials as appropriate to student needs SST	Entire school year
Provide specific Tier II interventions to struggling students (Tier I insufficient)	Assessment (DRA, report card, teacher observation/reports, etc.) and grouping of students	Classroom teachers ELA coach	DRA materials, information/data gathering	September/October 2012
	Advertise/interview/hire/train tutors	ELA coach Administration	Funding for 6 tutors Training/teaching materials	October 2012
	Tutoring; adjustment of groupings/students as appropriate Post-assessment from tutoring and classroom	Tutors ELA coach Classroom teachers	Teaching materials; Formative/summative assessments	October 2012 – May 2013

Improvement Objective 1: Teachers will provide explicit instruction and opportunities for learning in making inferences and interpreting text.

Strategy	Activities	Who Responsible	Resources Needed	Specific Timeline
Balanced Literacy	Modeling Focus lessons Use of mentor text Conferring Students reading at independent reading levels Detailed feedback Flexible/small group instruction	Classroom/ELL teachers Coaches (ELA/ELL) Administrators Media specialists	Time (classroom, cross-curricular with media, computer lab) Expanded/improved book room High interest/low-level readers Guided reading sets Learning A-to-Z license (renew/continued) Technology (software & hardware), including Lexia, SkillsTutor, SmartBoards, etc. Journals/writing books	Entire School Year

Improvement Objective 2: Teachers will provide explicit instruction and opportunities for learning in utilizing various strategies for understanding, acquiring, and using new vocabulary.				
Strategy	Activities	Who Responsible	Resources Needed	Specific Timeline
Balanced Literacy – Word Work & Vocabulary Development	Assessment of word analysis skills	Classroom/ELL teachers	“Words Their Way” (or similar resource)	September 2012
	Targeted instruction based on student needs	Classroom/ELL/ resource room teachers	“Words Their Way” (or similar resource); Reading A-to-Z, SkillsTutor, or other programs that best address individual student needs	September 2012– June 2013
	Explicit instruction in using context to determine word meaning and other word analysis strategies	Classroom/ELL/ resource room teachers	Instructional materials focusing on word analysis skills	September 2012– June 2013
	Investigate specific vocabulary programs (e.g., Marzano) for applicability to students’ needs.	ELA coach Administration	Time	January- March 2012

Improvement Objective 3: Teachers will provide students with explicit instruction and opportunities for learning in the characteristics of the genres of poetry and drama.				
Strategy	Activities	Who Responsible	Resources Needed	Specific Timeline
Incorporate poetry into ELA instruction throughout the year (not just as a unit of study).	Poem-a-Week Teaching figurative language and sensory words Instruction and student activities on types of poetry Poet studies	Classroom teacher ELA coach	Poetry materials and resources in classrooms Expanded selection of poetry by type and grade-level in book room Teacher reference materials	September 2012– June 2013
Provide explicit instruction in the structure and interpretation of dramatic literature.	Shared reading of dramatic literature Differentiated instruction Reader’s Theatre (grade-level appropriate) Understanding and practicing dialogue Coordination with fine arts teacher/ play coordinator on cross-curricular instruction. In-school performances (professionals or amateurs)	Classroom teachers Fine arts teachers ELA coach Administration	Funding (for performances) Plays/dramatic materials and resources available for different grade-levels and abilities. Teacher reference materials	January 2012– December 2012

Marsh Action Plan—Mathematics

Student Group: All Students

Improvement Objectives 1-3: Teachers will provide instruction and exploratory learning opportunities in analyzing multi-step problems; conceptualizing number sense in the areas of locating fractions, number lines, using fractions as decimals, integer exponents, inverse relations; and demonstrating competence in patterns/relations/algebra in the areas of symbols of number patterns, variables in equations, linear relations, simple algebraic equations.				
Strategy	Activities	Who Responsible	Resources Needed	Specific Timeline
Teachers will provide Tier I interventions	Utilize formative assessment to identify struggling students	Classroom teachers	Interim assessments and other formative assessments	Early September
	Collaborate by grade-level to schedule students for math intervention	Classroom teachers	Intervention block; teaching materials	September- June
The school will offer Tier II intervention for struggling learners.	Identify pre-assessment	Math coach, teachers	Math achievement predictor assessment	Early September
	Administer assessments and group students	Teachers, math coach	Scoring key	Late September
	Hire math tutors	Administrators Math coach	Funding for 6 tutors, teaching areas	By October 10 th
	Train tutors	Math coach, tutors	Time, teaching materials	By October 20 th
	Schedule students for intervention tutorials	Administration, math coach	Whole-school schedule with intervention blocks	By October 25 th
	Administer post-assessments	Tutors, math coach	Post-assessment	By April 13 th

Improvement Objectives 1-3: Teachers will provide instruction and exploratory learning opportunities in analyzing multi-step problems; conceptualizing number sense in the areas of locating fractions, number lines, using fractions as decimals, integer exponents, inverse relations; and, demonstrating competence in patterns/relations/algebra in the areas of symbols of number patterns, variables in equations, linear relations, simple algebraic equations.				
Strategy	Activities	Who Responsible	Resources Needed	Specific Timeline
The school will provide professional learning opportunities to enhance mathematical content knowledge.	Determine appropriate coursework	Administration	Funding	Spring 2012
	Identify professional development provider	Administration	Funding	Summer 2012
	Offer course work to staff and encourage participation	Administrators and Coaches	Professional development plans	September 2012
The school will schedule common grade-level meetings with a focus on developing Professional Learning Communities.	Collaborate during grade-level meetings to address PLC feedback	Administrators Teachers Coaches	Note-taking “Look Fors” Grade-level planning time	October-June
	Review and discuss indicators of standards-based report cards	Teachers Coaches	Common Core Report Cards	October-June
	Generate lessons and assessments that align with scope and sequence and standards-based report cards	Teachers Coaches	Common Core Report Cards	October-June

Civic and Social Goals

CIVIC/SOCIAL GOAL 1: Students at the Marsh Grammar School will learn in a safe school environment.				
Activities	Responsible Participants	Time-Line for Implementation	Means of Assessing Goal's Achievement	Benchmarks
Practice lock-downs and fire drills	Administration	Ongoing	Consultations with public safety officials	Time and success of drills
Anti-Bullying Curriculum	Classroom Teachers	Throughout year	Feedback from students	Weekly lesson plans
Anti-Bullying Committee	Administration/Teachers Parents/Student	September 2011– June 2012	Monthly meetings	Feedback from committee
CIVIC/SOCIAL GOAL 2: Students at the Marsh Grammar will have opportunities to participate in school-wide and community-based activities.				
Activities	Responsible Participants	Time-Line for Implementation	Means of Assessing Goal's Achievement	Benchmarks
Relay for Life	Administration/Teachers Staff/Parents/Students	Annual	Participation	Meet or exceed previous year's goal
Jump Rope for Heart	Administration/Teachers Staff/Parents/Students	Annual	Participation	Meet or exceed previous year's goal
Food Collection/Coat Drive	Administration/Teachers Staff/Parents/Students	Annual	Participation	Meet or exceed previous year's goal
Student Tutors	Teachers/Coaches/Students	Annual	Participation	Increased participation
<i>Appleseed/Applesauce</i>	Administration/Teachers Coaches/Staff/Students	3–4 times a year	Participation	Increased submission of student work
Peer Leaders	Teachers/Students	Annual	Participation	Increased student involvement
Student Council	Administration/Teachers/ Students	Annual	Participation	Increased student involvement
PTO Activities (Fall Festival, holiday store, Jigsaw Jamboree, pasta dinner, etc.)	Administration/Teachers Staff/Parents	Annual	Participation	Increased participation

Professional Development

A great deal of our professional development this past year and for the upcoming year will focus on our new standards-based report cards. Last year grades one and two implemented the new report card. This year, grades three and four are implementing the new report card, to be followed by grades five and six for the school year 2012–2013.

It is important for teachers, parents, and students to know that the standards are written to be the expected accomplishment of all students at the end of the year. The new report cards report on students' progress toward mastery of those standards. Grades are based on the level of achievement students have attained at the end of the teaching cycle for each standard. Work habits and effort are reported separately.

Other areas that the staff will be engaged in during professional development opportunities at the building level are

- Balanced literacy
- Writing across the curriculum
- Intervention strategies
- Differentiated instruction.

At the district level Marsh teachers will have ample opportunities to participate in district-offered courses such as *Building Teaching Skills*, *Reader's Workshop*, and *Writer's Workshop*, as well as *Category Courses* for teaching English language learners (ELL).

Staff meetings and grade-level meetings will be a primary way of discussing student achievement and “look-fors,” which is a way to observe a classroom for evidence of student learning.

Parent Involvement

The Marsh Parent Community is very involved at the school. Without their help, assistance, and financial support, many programs would go unfunded. Parents are involved in many activities. They orchestrate and support events/activities such as

- Classroom helpers
- Copying
- Fall Festival
- Gingerbread houses
- Holiday store
- Jigsaw Jamboree
- Pasta/Pizza Night
- Ice cream social
- School play
- Fun days.

Formal organizations in which parents are involved and have the opportunity to be included are

- PTO
- School Council
- Anti-Bullying School-Wide Committee.

The involvement of parents at our school helps ensure a safe school climate.

Calendar for School Improvement Plan

December 2011	2012 School Improvement Plan due
January 2012	Presentation of School Improvement Plans to School Committee
Spring 2012	PIM team reviews implementation of action plans; adjusts improvement plan as needed
October 2012	PIM team reviews outcomes data, including 2012 MCAS results; determines revisions to improvement plan for following year
December 2012	2013 School Improvement Plan due

APPENDIX

2011 Student Achievement Data

Marsh Grammar School - NCLB Accountability

Accountability & Assistance Level: Level 2

	NCLB Accountability Status	Improvement Rating
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS	Restructuring Year 2 - Subgroups	No Change
MATHEMATICS	Restructuring Year 2 - Subgroups	Declined

To make adequate yearly progress in 2011, a student group must meet (A) a student participation requirement, either (B) the State's 2011 performance target for that subject or (C) the group's own 2011 improvement target, and (D) an additional attendance requirement.

Student Group	(A) Participation		(B) Performance		(C) Improvement		(D) Attendance		
	Did at least 95% of students participate in MCAS?		Did student group meet or exceed state performance target?		Did student group meet or exceed its own improvement target?		Did student group meet 92% attendance (G1-8)?		
ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS	Met Target	Actual	Met Target (95.1)	Actual	Met Target	Change from 2010	Met Target	Actual	AYP 2011
Aggregate	Yes	100	No	84.5	No	-0.7	Yes	94.9	No
Lim. English Prof.	Yes	98	No	62.5	No	-5.3	Yes	95.1	No
Special Education	Yes	100	No	63.3	No	2.0	Yes	94.3	No
Low Income	Yes	99	No	76.9	No	-0.4	Yes	93.5	No
Afr. Amer./Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian or Pacif. Isl.	-	-	-	86.5	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	Yes	99	No	78.0	No	2.2	Yes	94.1	No
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	Yes	100	No	85.7	No	-0.9	Yes	95.0	No
MATHEMATICS	Met Target	Actual	Met Target (92.2)	Actual	Met Target	Change from 2010	Met Target	Actual	AYP 2011
Aggregate	Yes	100	No	76.3	No	-2.7	Yes	94.9	No
Lim. English Prof.	Yes	100	No	53.9	No	-6.1	Yes	95.1	No
Special Education	Yes	100	No	51.6	No	-1.7	Yes	94.3	No
Low Income	Yes	100	No	66.3	No	-1.5	Yes	93.5	No
Afr. Amer./Black	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian or Pacif. Isl.	-	-	-	81.7	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	Yes	100	No	64.9	No	-3.0	Yes	94.1	No
Native American	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	Yes	100	No	78.3	No	-2.7	Yes	95.0	No

Adequate Yearly Progress History														NCLB Accountability Status
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011		
ELA	Aggregate	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Restructuring Year 2 - Subgroups	
	All Subgroups	-	-	-	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No		
MATH	Aggregate	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Restructuring Year 2 - Subgroups	
	All Subgroups	-	-	-	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No		

**Marsh Grammar School
2011 AYP Data**

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS															
Student Group	2011				2011 Data							2011			AYP 2011
	Participation (A)				Performance (B)			Improvement (C)				Attendance (D)			
	Enrolled	Assessed	%	Met Target (95%)	N	CPI	Met Target (95.1)	2010 CPI (Baseline)	Gain Target	On Target Range	Met Target	%	Change	Met Target	
Aggregate	865	862	100	Yes	846	84.5	No	85.2	3.7	86.4-91.4	No	94.9	-0.5	Yes	No
Lim. English Prof.	49	48	98	Yes	44	62.5	No	67.8	8.1	71.4-80.4	No	95.1	0.4	Yes	No
Special Education	109	109	100	Yes	107	63.3	No	61.3	9.7	68.5-73.5	No	94.3	0.7	Yes	No
Low Income	201	198	99	Yes	193	76.9	No	77.3	5.7	80.5-85.5	No	93.5	-0.3	Yes	No
Afr. Amer./Black	10	10	-	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian or Pacif. Isl.	28	28	-	-	26	86.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	135	133	99	Yes	124	78.0	No	75.8	6.1	79.4-84.4	No	94.1	0.1	Yes	No
Native American	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	686	685	100	Yes	680	85.7	No	86.6	3.4	87.5-92.5	No	95.0	-0.6	Yes	No

MATHEMATICS															
Student Group	2011				2011 Data							2011			AYP 2011
	Participation (A)				Performance (B)			Improvement (C)				Attendance (D)			
	Enrolled	Assessed	%	Met Target (95%)	N	CPI	Met Target (92.2)	2010 CPI (Baseline)	Gain Target	On Target Range	Met Target	%	Change	Met Target	
Aggregate	867	866	100	Yes	848	76.3	No	79.0	5.3	81.8-86.8	No	94.9	-0.5	Yes	No
Lim. English Prof.	49	49	100	Yes	45	53.9	No	60.0	10.0	65.5-74.5	No	95.1	0.4	Yes	No
Special Education	110	110	100	Yes	107	51.6	No	53.3	11.7	62.5-67.5	No	94.3	0.7	Yes	No
Low Income	202	201	100	Yes	195	66.3	No	67.8	8.1	73.4-78.4	No	93.5	-0.3	Yes	No
Afr. Amer./Black	10	10	-	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian or Pacif. Isl.	28	28	-	-	26	81.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	135	135	100	Yes	126	64.9	No	67.9	8.0	73.4-78.4	No	94.1	0.1	Yes	No
Native American	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
White	688	687	100	Yes	680	78.3	No	81.0	4.8	83.3-88.3	No	95.0	-0.6	Yes	No

2011 MCAS Score Distributions All Assessed Students—Percentage in Each Proficiency Level

	ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS Needs				# Students
	Warning	Improvement	Proficient	Advanced	
ALL STUDENTS					
Grade 3	6	35	55	5	141
Grade 4	15	44	37	4	131
Grade 5	7	40	48	5	132
Grade 6	8	31	56	5	146
Grade 7	4	23	66	7	158
Grade 8	1	20	62	17	138

DISABLED STUDENTS					
Grade 3	23	45	27	5	22
Grade 4	63	32	0	5	19
Grade 5	31	56	13	0	16
Grade 6	30	35	35	0	20
Grade 7	32	53	16	0	19
Grade 8	18	55	27	0	11

LIMITED AND FORMERLY LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT STUDENTS					
Grade 3	33	50	17	0	12
Grade 4	30	70	0	0	10
Grade 5	***	***	***	***	7
Grade 6	***	***	***	***	7
Grade 7	***	***	***	***	6
Grade 8	***	***	***	***	2

LOW-INCOME STUDENTS					
Grade 3	15	50	35	0	34
Grade 4	32	56	12	0	25
Grade 5	20	43	37	0	35
Grade 6	16	32	52	0	31
Grade 7	7	31	57	5	42
Grade 8	0	31	62	8	26

HISPANIC/LATINO STUDENTS					
Grade 3	17	56	28	0	18
Grade 4	32	47	21	0	19
Grade 5	9	47	44	0	32
Grade 6	15	35	50	0	20
Grade 7	5	35	60	0	20
Grade 8	0	20	73	7	15

	MATHEMATICS Needs				# Students
	Warning	Improvement	Proficient	Advanced	
Grade 3	9	33	50	9	141
Grade 4	15	47	27	11	131
Grade 5	23	29	29	18	133
Grade 6	14	26	42	18	146
Grade 7	23	38	31	8	159
Grade 8	13	35	36	17	138

Grade 3	27	41	27	5	22
Grade 4	63	32	0	5	19
Grade 5	81	0	19	0	16
Grade 6	65	35	0	0	20
Grade 7	79	21	0	0	19
Grade 8	64	27	9	0	11

Grade 3	25	50	25	0	12
Grade 4	50	50	0	0	10
Grade 5	***	***	***	***	8
Grade 6	***	***	***	***	7
Grade 7	***	***	***	***	8
Grade 8	***	***	***	***	2

Grade 3	12	47	41	0	34
Grade 4	40	56	4	0	25
Grade 5	42	33	19	6	36
Grade 6	19	42	32	6	31
Grade 7	35	35	28	2	43
Grade 8	23	35	31	12	26

Grade 3	22	50	28	0	18
Grade 4	42	53	5	0	19
Grade 5	33	33	24	9	33
Grade 6	20	35	35	10	20
Grade 7	38	43	14	5	21
Grade 8	20	40	33	7	15

2011 Student Growth Percentiles—Aggregate and Subgroups

English Language Arts	Median Student Growth Percentiles					
	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	All Grades
Marsh Aggregate	34.5	35.5	36.5	46.5	34.0	38.0
State Aggregate	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
Marsh SPED	***	***	***	***	***	32.0
State SPED	36.0	43.0	44.0	42.0	45.0	42.0
Marsh F/LEP	***	***	***	***	***	39.0
State F/LEP	47.0	47.0	49.0	54.0	55.0	50.0
Marsh Low Income	16.5	26.0	50.0	42.0	38.0	37.0
State Low Income	42.0	45.0	45.0	47.0	49.0	46.0
Marsh Not Low Income	40.0	38.0	36.0	51.0	33.0	38.0
State Not Low Income	54.0	52.0	53.0	52.0	51.0	52.0
Marsh Hispanic/Latino	***	39.0	***	***	***	42.5
State Hispanic/Latino	43.0	45.0	45.0	48.0	50.0	46.0
Marsh White	32.5	33.5	36.0	49.0	32.0	36.0
State White	51.0	51.0	51.0	50.0	50.0	51.0

Mathematics	Median Student Growth Percentiles					
	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	All Grades
Marsh Aggregate	36.0	21.0	44.0	44.0	38.5	37.0
State Aggregate	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
Marsh SPED	***	***	***	***	***	34.0
State SPED	39.0	42.0	41.0	43.0	46.0	43.0
Marsh F/LEP	***	***	***	***	***	33.0
State F/LEP	50.0	50.0	50.0	55.0	58.0	52.0
Marsh Low Income	18.5	19.0	52.0	46.0	52.0	36.0
State Low Income	45.0	43.0	46.0	46.0	48.0	46.0
Marsh Not Low Income	38.0	21.0	43.0	41.0	35.0	37.0
State Not Low Income	52.0	53.0	52.0	52.0	51.0	52.0
Marsh Hispanic/Latino	***	20.0	***	***	***	32.0
State Hispanic/Latino	46.0	43.0	45.0	48.0	50.0	46.0
Marsh White	38.5	21.0	43.0	41.5	39.0	37.0
State White	50.0	51.0	51.0	50.0	50.0	50.0

Each child who participated in the MCAS ELA or Mathematics tests in grades 4–8 in 2011 and who also took the last MCAS test in that subject receives a Student Growth Percentile (SGP) score. The SGP tells how a child’s progress compares to the progress of other students in the state with similar MCAS score histories. Growth percentile scores range from 1 to 99. An SGP of 40, for example, means the student’s progress is higher than the growth of 40 percent and lower than the growth of 60 percent of the students in the state with similar prior test scores.

High Growth	61st to 99th percentile
Moderate Growth	40th to 60th percentile
Low Growth	1st to 39th percentile

Participants Involved in Preparation of School Improvement Plan

Richard P. Beshara, Supervising Principal
JoAnn Lakow, Upper School Associate Principal
Suzanne Lamoureux, Lower School Associate Principal
Walter Greene, Special Education Administrator
Elizabeth Conroy, ELL Coach
Rosemary Driend, Math Coach
Tracey Harris, ELA Coach
Edward Lussier, Instructional Technology Specialist
Eileen Burke, Grade 8 Teacher
Christine Habib, Grade 4 Teacher
Kellie Walsh, Special Education Teacher
Tanya Witkum, Grade 3 Teacher