

Mountain View Elementary School
2007-2008

EAST LONGMEADOW PUBLIC SCHOOLS
SITE-BASED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

I. INTRODUCTION

Each Site-Based Plan for East Longmeadow Public Schools has been developed within the framework of the East Longmeadow comprehensive Strategic Plan. The purpose of the Site-Based School Improvement Plan is to allow our school staff to identify needs and recommend solutions based upon our day-to-day professional interactions within the school. Active participation of the staff has been realized throughout shared decision-making, data profiling, program review, and action team planning. This site-based plan will become part of the over-all district comprehensive local education plan.

II. SCHOOL MISSION STATEMENT

The East Longmeadow school district has established Mountain View School as an intermediate elementary center for children in grades three through five. Our goal is to help prepare students to achieve academic excellence and to acquire the skills necessary to become life-long learners as they meet the challenges of the 21st century.

We continue to build on the foundations established at Meadow Brook School. We strive to maintain a safe and nurturing educational environment, promoting positive interaction and collaboration within the school community. We recognize the right of individuals to grow, to develop a sense of responsibility, and to interact creatively with the world, as they journey on to meet the challenges of Birchland Park Middle School.

Our mission statement supports our school motto: "We Respect Ourselves, Others and the Environment".

III. SCHOOL PHILOSOPHY

The staff and parents of Mt. View School are committed to providing quality experiences for academic excellence by cultivating a learning environment that is safe, caring, and nurturing. We provide opportunities for children to become self-directed, life-long learners. We recognize the need for our students to develop into citizens with global awareness. We continually challenge all students to achieve their academic, social, emotional and physical potentials.

IV. SHARED DECISION-MAKING COMMITTEES

- a. Site-Based School Improvement Committee
 - Carolyn Wallace, Principal
 - Sara Scibelli, Faculty Representative
 - Rissa Larsen, Faculty Representative
 - Elizabeth Boucher, Parent
 - Ann Marie Dunn, Parent
 - Linda Raimondi, Community Representative
 - Glenn Little, Community Representative

- b. Site Professional Development Committee
 - Carolyn Wallace, Principal
 - Mary Whelihan, Grade 3
 - Mary Collins, Grade 4
 - Donna Suchcicki, Grade 5
 - Geri Martin, Para-professional

- c. Principal's Advisory Committee
 - Carolyn Wallace, Principal
 - Nancy Adams, Grade 3
 - Patricia Hitchcock, Grade 4
 - Donna Suchcicki, Grade 5
 - Charlene LaChapelle, SPED
 - Marsha Akpan, Para-professional
 - Don Potter, Support personnel

V. Demographic Data for School:

<u>Ethnicity</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
White	<u>305</u>	<u>95.7</u>
Hispanic	<u>1</u>	<u>.3</u>
African Amer.	<u>4</u>	<u>.2</u>
Asian	<u>9</u>	<u>2.8</u>
Am.Indian/Alk	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	319	100
Free & Reduced	<u>15</u>	<u>4.7</u>

VI. STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Results from the Spring 2007 MCAS administration and the GRADE Reading Test are used to measure student achievement. The Spring 2007 MCAS results for Grade 3 Reading; 91% passing (equals the state average), Math, 90% passing rate (6% above state average); Grade 4 ELA; 99% passing (8% above state average), Math, 97% passing (10% above state average); Grade 5 Reading, 97% passing rate (5% above state average), Math, 94% passing rate (12% above state average), Science; 97% passing (9% above state average). These results are used by the department heads and grade level teams to improve the effectiveness of our curriculum maps, to determine areas of focus for professional development opportunities and to guide units of classroom and grade level study. Results from this testing are used to qualify students for the gifted and talented program.

The GRADE Reading Test was used to identify possible candidates for our Reading Support Program. Qualifying students were then given further diagnostic testing using the DRA for final eligibility into the program. Classroom teachers also use these results to guide reading instruction and for the selection of appropriate supplemental reading materials in all content areas.

THE 8 STATE REQUIRED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT CATEGORIES:

VII. SITE-BASED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OFFERED THIS YEAR:

10/05/07	“Getting Started with Investigations”	Mary Beth O’Connor HEC
1/22/08	“Differentiating Instruction Using Renzulli Learning”	Donna Whitman and Kim Turnberg – G/T Staff
4/08/08	“Setting a Foundation for Effective Reading Instruction”	Sandford Roth HEC

VIII. ANNUAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT PLAN:

Areas for school improvement are determined by examining the results of the MCAS tests combined with the results of the previous year’s SMART goals. The School Improvement Committee conducts annual surveys of staff, students and parents to determine areas of non-academic needs. The results of this analysis are used to create the three SMART goals for the school year. For the 2007/2008 school year the staff at Mountain View School focused on researching best practices for differentiating instruction, further implementation of the “Investigations” math program across all three grade levels and maintaining a positive school climate at the staff level in a year of many changes.

IX. PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE SCHOOL:

The Mountain View PTO is very active in the school through financial support and volunteer efforts. Financially, the PTO supports field trips, enrichment assemblies, library supplies and individual teacher needs. They lead several community service projects during the year including food collections, book drives and holiday cards for soldiers. Their volunteer efforts can be seen in the creation of our monthly newsletter, publishing of the school newspaper “Mountain View News”, the many after school programs and “Family Fun” nights they sponsor and their help in the classrooms.

X. SAFETY AND DISCIPLINE IN THE SCHOOL:

The District has developed a Crisis Plan, which deals with district contingency plans as well as individual school needs. This plan is reviewed with staff annually. It establishes two crisis response teams (blue and red) to handle emergencies if and when they arise. These teams also work to evaluate and improve the plan each year and after each crisis. The ELPS K-12 Code of Conduct is reviewed and improved each year by the administrative team. The updated Code of Conduct is distributed to each student and reviewed with all students each September.

This year we were again part of a safety grant with the Hampden/Wilbraham Regional School District. This grant provided the Mountain View crisis team with formal training at the district level. This grant also provided plastic flip chart crisis plans for all staff members. These are more durable than our previous folder system and easily changed when needed.

XI. SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT, CULTURE AND DIVERSITY:

There have been many assemblies and events this year that have enhanced and enriched the school environment for the students at Mountain View. The PTO was very instrumental by providing most of the opportunities or supporting them financially or with volunteers. They include:

Academic Programs:

- Jeff Nathan; poet in classrooms
- Classroom Play Performances
- Character Trait Quilt Making
- “Underground Railroad” theatrical performance

Field Trips:

- “Fish Face” – live theatrical performance
- Old Sturbridge Village
- Plimouth Plantation
- “Freedom Train” presentation
- Boston Science Museum
- Springfield Symphony

Enrichment Assemblies:

- Amazing Art performance
- Music Concerts

PTO Family Fun Nights:

- Bingo for Books
- Family Dance
- Talent Show
- Movie Night
- Interskate 91

XII. EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES FOR STUDENTS:

- MCAS Before School Tutoring – ELA
- SLIME
- Leadership Team
- PTO After School Programs
 - Beading
 - Pottery
 - Cartooning
 - K’Nex team building
 - Student Talent Show
 - Holiday projects

XIII. SCHOOL SITE EDUCATIONAL *SMART* GOALS & IMPROVEMENT OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE:

Each year goals are reviewed and updated based on progress toward meeting the goals established the previous year and on current needs identified by the staff. Schools will initiate a minimum of three site goals each year. The *Site-Based School Improvement Plan* is finalized each September, reviewed with the superintendent in January for progress, and evaluated each June with the school committee. Presented below are the *SMART* goals and the data collected during our work on these goals during the 2007/2008 school year.

School: Mountain View

Year:

2007/2008

SMART GOAL: 1

Increase staff knowledge and use of student-based, differentiated instruction strategies at both the school and classroom level.

Strategic Goal Correlate:

#3, #5 #6, #10

Action Step: # 1

Current teaching practices will be examined across the whole school to determine current use of differentiated instruction.

A. Begin Date:

September 2007

Anticipated Completion Date:

January 2008

Actual Completion Date:

June 2008

B. Measurement Method(s)

C. Monitoring Dates/Timelines

1.

Staff will investigate current research on differentiated instruction to determine a common definition and purpose for differentiated instruction for all students in our school.

December 2007 – June 2008

2.

Staff will apply this common definition and purpose for differentiated instruction to their current teaching practices to determine current frequency of these strategies.

May and June 2008

3.

Staff will develop a school wide action plan for a measurable increase in differentiated instruction for the 2008/2009 school year.

May and June 2008

D. Person/persons responsible for monitoring:

Carolyn Wallace, grade level teams, Department Heads; Kerri Laurenzo, Mary Collins, Donna Suchcicki, Elaine Santaniello, para-professionals

E. Education Results

1. Large portions of time at monthly staff meetings from December 2007 – June 2008 were used to investigate teacher’s current knowledge base and to research new knowledge about differentiated instruction.
- December 2007 – Staff members brainstormed current knowledge of differentiated instruction including key terms, concepts, and strategies and their current use in our classrooms
- Staff members shared information and strategies they had learned about at a recent workshop entitled, “*Practical Strategies for Differentiating Your Classroom Instruction (Grades 2 – 6)*”. Strategies shared included choice boards, unit organizing charts and graphs that combined Bloom’s taxonomy and Gardner’s multiple intelligences to guide differentiation.
- February 2008 – Staff worked in small groups with a “word splash” brainstorming activity and to share four current research articles written from different perspectives about differentiated instruction. The purpose of this work was for the staff to determine key terms, definitions and concepts of differentiated instruction that should be a part of our definition.
- March 2008 – Staff received a complete list of identified key terms, definitions and concepts generated from the February staff meeting. After small group discussion, they participated in a “spend-a-dot” consensus building activity to prioritize the terms and concepts to use in our working definition of differentiated instruction.
- April 2008 – A small group of staff members turned the results from the “spend-a-dot” activity into a draft document shared at this staff meeting. We used small group and whole group discussion to edit this draft document.
- May 2008 – A working definition and our key terms and concepts was created based on the editing work from the April staff meeting.

Working Definition: Differentiated instruction at Mountain View School matches the skills and abilities of the learner to content and products of varied complexities through flexible grouping based on the needs of different learners.

Our Key Terms and Phrases:

- Flexible grouping
- Pre-post assessments matched with on-going assessments
- All encompassing
- Choices to go with learning styles
- Individualized
- Training and time for both staff and students
- Modifications
- Inclusive

2. and 3.

The research and consensus building needs of this action step took longer than originally planned. Therefore, information about the use of differentiated instruction used by teachers and the creation of an action plan for the 2008/2009 school year were addressed through questions on the annual staff online survey. Survey results for applicable questions are:

Question #3 – Did you find our work at staff meetings around differentiated instruction applicable to your classroom? – 67% - a little

Questions #4 – Has our work around differentiated instruction had an impact on your thinking about your daily instructional planning and practice? – 48% - yes

Questions #5 – Are you interested in learning more about how to differentiate your instruction based on on-going assessment and data about the students in your classroom? – 73% - yes

Question #6 - We experienced several structures of differentiated instruction this year through professional development and staff meetings. Which of these structures would you like to investigate in detail and apply to your classroom next year? (Mark the two most interesting to you)

- Individual structures (choice boards, etc.) – 45%
- Specific areas of “Investigations” - 14%
- Renzulli Learning - 41%
- “Reader’s Workshop” – Sandy Roth - 73%
- Other - 1%
- o Suggestion was “Team teaching especially with SPED teachers.”

The data from this survey will be used to create a focused SMART goal and action plan for the 2008-2009 school year.

School: Mountain View

Year: 2007-2008

SMART GOAL: 1

Increase staff knowledge and use of student-based, differentiated instruction strategies at both the school and classroom level.

Strategic Goal Correlate:

#3, #5, #6, #10

Action Step: # 2

Staff will begin to examine the concept of “guided reading strategies” as a way to differentiate reading/writing instruction for students at all ability levels.

A. Begin Date: September 2007 **Anticipated Completion Date:** May 2008 **Actual Completion Date:** June 2008

B. Measurement Method(s)

C. Monitoring Dates/Timelines

1.

The concept of guided reading, as a strategy to differentiate instruction for students at all ability levels will be investigated by the staff.

April 8, 2008 Professional Development Day

2.

Grade level teams will begin to identify materials needed to implement guided reading strategies for their grade level curriculum for students at all ability levels.

April – June 2008

3.

Staff will begin to investigate short and long term funding sources for needed materials.

April – June 2008

4.

Grade level teams will develop an action plan to implement guided reading for students of all reading abilities for one content topic for the 2008/2009 school year.

April – June 2008

D. Person/persons responsible for monitoring:

Carolyn Wallace, grade level teams, Department Heads; Kerri Laurenzo, Mary Collins, Donna Suchcicki, Elaine Santaniello

E. Education Results

1. On April 8, 2008, Sanford Roth, from Hampshire Educational Collaborative, presented "*Setting a Foundation for Effective Reading Instruction*" to the staff of Mountain View and Mapleshade schools. Mr. Roth presented a format for a "Reader's Workshop" that incorporated "guided reading" to support independent work for students as well as small group and individualized work with the teacher. This presentation was well received by the Mountain View staff as indicated by an average of "4" on all questions of the professional development evaluation form passed out at the end of the presentation.

2. and 3.

The "Reader's Workshop" as presented by Sanford Roth, used the Fountas and Pinnell "book leveling system". Each grade level is currently creating a list of book titles that are appropriate for their grade level based on genre and content area concepts. Teachers are looking for books at different reading levels that cover the concepts (fiction and nonfiction) of their grade level. These lists will be used to create a school literacy closet filled with sets of books across reading levels and content concepts. These lists will also be used when purchasing sets of books to be sure that any and all money available for this purpose adds value to our literacy closet.

A 2008 Endowment grant was awarded to the Reading Support teacher and was used to buy leveled books according to the above plan. In addition we earned \$485 from families who identified Mountain View school as the recipient of their *Stop and Shop Bonus Bucks*. These funds will also be used to purchase leveled reading books according to the above plan. It will take several years to compile all of the sets of books needed. Gift money and money from the school's budget will be used to purchase these sets of books whenever possible.

A new program called, "Bulbs for Books" began this year as well. Students purchased spring bulbs to plant outside the school to help create a beautiful spring. The money raised by the purchase of the "bulbs" was used to purchase sets of "books" for the literacy closet based on the above plan. Students who purchased bulbs were the ones that got to vote for which books were purchased for their grade level. The hope is that this program will help connect students to the school and to the books they read in class while it adds to our literacy closet. This year 180 bulbs were purchased by students and planted outside the cafeteria windows. The money was used to purchase one set of ten books for each grade level based on student votes:

Grade 3 – Magic Tree House Research Guide – Planets, by Will Osborne and Mary Pope Osborne

Grade 4 – Smart About the Fifty States, by Jon Buller

Grade 5 – African-Americans in the Thirteen Colonies, by Deborah Kent

4. The results of the annual staff survey showed that the staff would like to continue work with the "Reader's Workshop" as presented by Sanford Roth at the April 8 professional development day. 73% of the staff chose this as one of the two most important differentiated instruction structures they would like to learn more about and apply in their classrooms. The specifics of this plan will be determined in the fall.

School: Mountain View

Year:

2007-2008

SMART GOAL: 1

Increase staff knowledge and use of student-based, differentiated instruction strategies at both the school and classroom level.

Strategic Goal Correlate:

#3, #5, #6, #10

Action Step: # 3

Staff will implement the use of the Renzulli Learning network in their classrooms for students of all ability levels.

A. Begin Date:

September 2007

Anticipated Completion Date :

May 2008

Actual Completion Date:

April 2008

B. Measurement Method(s)

C. Monitoring Dates/Timelines

1.

All staff members will create a personal profile on the Renzulli Learning network.

January 22, 2008 Professional Development Day

2.

The gifted and talented teaching staff will provide professional development to increase teachers' ability to effectively integrate the use of this tool into their classroom instruction to differentiate for students of all abilities across content areas.

January 22, 2008 Professional Development Day

3.

Grade level teams will create an action plan to implement one unit using students' Renzulli Learning profiles to differentiate instruction for all students in their classrooms.

January - April 2008

D. Person/persons responsible for monitoring:

Carolyn Wallace, Donna Whitman, Kim Turnberg, grade level teams, Department Heads; Kerri Laurenzo, Mary Collins, Donna Suchcicki, Elaine Santaniello

E. Education Results

1 and 2

The morning sessions of the January 22, 2008 professional development day were dedicated to the Renzulli Learning program. Kim Turnberg and Donna Whitman, gifted and talented staff, presented the basic functions of the program to the entire staff. They also presented the program's "assignment maker" template. The work product for this presentation was for teachers to work through the whole process of creating a lesson of their choice and sending it to their students to do. Once their initial presentation was completed, Donna and Kim circulated around the computer lab helping staff members. They helped staff members create their personal profile if they hadn't done that yet. They also helped teachers use the capabilities of the program to create a lesson. The staff found this presentation and work time very useful and helpful as measured by the average score of "5" on all of the questions of the professional development evaluation form passed out at the end of the program.

3.

The work product of this professional development experience was the creation of a grade level, content appropriate assignment of choice by each member of the teaching staff. The work could be done individually or as a pair or team and was due by April vacation. All staff members completed at least one assignment and some completed several! The assignments ranged in complexity from having a single web site for students to explore to the P.E. activity that listed four web sites guiding students to books to read, exercise charts to keep and rules for different games. The content of these activities covered all areas of our curriculum including music, P.E., and G/T. Teachers found this an exciting and rewarding "tool" easily added to their "toolbox" of differentiated instruction.

School: Mountain View

Year:

SMART GOAL: 2

Strategic Goal Correlate:

Action Step: # 1

A. Begin Date: **Anticipated Completion Date:** **Actual Completion Date:**

B. Measurement Method(s)

C. Monitoring Dates/Timelines

1.

2.

3.

D. Person/persons responsible for monitoring:

E.Education Results

1.

Part of the September staff meeting was used to brainstorm areas of the day that were impacted by the schedule change initiated this year to accommodate increased ELA and math instructional contact time. We worked in small groups to answer the question, “What are the impacts of the changes to this year’s schedule.” We categorized our answers as follows:

- Breaks
 - Library has lost time for book chats before school
 - Breaks are difficult for paras – when to go so they are not coming out of instructional time
 - How do paras take their full ½ hour for lunch
 - With no breaks, you are “on” all the time; need to be more organized, prepared (good and bad)
 - No snack = no movement
 - Transition times are difficult
 - Guidance has lost time to access students during non-instructional time
 - 12:25 – 2:25 – long afternoon with no breaks for kids
- Handling time chunks (large and small)
 - Double blocks of math difficult to maintain attention at the end of the day (all grades)
 - 15 min. blocks are problematic to schedule usefully (grade 3)
 - 60 minute math periods feel great in all 3 grade levels
 - Longer blocks call for segmented teaching (good thing)
- Outside instructional time
 - Guidance has lost access to students during non-instructional time
 - library has lost time for book chats before school
- Other impacts
 - More stress on the staff this year
 - Having grade 3 and 5 students split for lunch/recess may impact grade level meetings since all teachers are not free at once
 - 10 minute math every morning vs. 10 min. practice/review of any subject
 - Having no one to staff computer lab or site tech position is creating problems in the computer lab

2.

Part of the September staff meeting was used to brainstorm possible solutions to the negative impacts of the schedule change identified by the staff. Several solutions were found at this time. Staff meetings were used throughout the year to continue working on solutions to the negative issues and to identify when they were resolved to the satisfaction of the majority of the staff.

3. Over the course of the year, many possible solutions were found for the identified problems discussed at the September staff meeting. Some of these ideas were implemented and some were not. These included:
- Adjusting the snack time of individual classrooms based on their schedule – e.g. grade 3 in the morning because specials are in the afternoon, grade 4 mid-morning because their specials are first period. (adopted)
 - Use snack time as a working snack for independent work such as SSR so that the teacher can relax during this time and take a break from being “on”. (adopted)
 - Institute a school wide DEAR (drop everything and read) time so that students can see the guidance counselor at this time. (not adopted)
 - Have the guidance counselor institute an hour long “drop in” format during lunch instead of invitation only lunch groups. (not adopted)
 - Have the library book chats during lunch/recess. (adopted at the end of the year)
 - Staff members share successful ways that they have adapted to the longer math periods. (adopted)
 - Evaluate and possibly change lunch schedule to shorten the afternoon. (adopted)
 - Change the format of some required activities such as the format of conference notes and the afternoon parent meeting in the fall. (adopted)
 - Use staff meetings and professional development days to work on SMART goals rather than having committees and additional meetings. (adopted)
 - Reinstate the weekly staff soup club. (adopted)
 - Have monthly staff activities not related to school. (limited adoption)
 - “Gift of Time” certificates from the Principal for a break. (adopted)

Several questions on the annual online staff survey addressed these identified areas of negative impact. Results to related questions include:

Question #7 – Have you adjusted to the elimination of an official school-wide snack time? – 73% yes

Question #8 - Have you adjusted to having longer academic blocks and being “on” more? – 79% yes

Question #9 – Did Renzulli Learning help you use your computer time and alleviate some of this stress for you? – 36% yes. 41% a little

Question 10 – Did changing the September after school parent curriculum meeting and parent conference form help lower stress for you? - 63% yes

Question 11 – Did having all three grades at recess continue to create stress for you? – 59% no

Question 12 - What is your stress level now, at the end of the year, compared to earlier in the year? – 5% less, 54% same, 6% more

Question 13 – What creates the most stress for you at school? There were many responses to this question including:

- Too many things on my plate and too many “new” things
- Pressure to get in all curriculum before MCAS and produce better scores each year with different kids and needs.
- Lack of prep time
- Paperwork
- Too many changes being implemented at the same time.
- Getting through the rigorous curriculum while trying to meet the needs of all learners.

The conclusion that can be reached from the multiple choice questions is that the majority of negative issues that were initially identified in the beginning of the year have been addressed for the majority of staff members. This conclusion is furthered by the answers to the open ended question. Only one of the stressors identified in the question had anything to do with the original list generated at the September staff meeting.

School: Mountain View

Year:

2007/2008

SMART GOAL: 2

Staff will collaborate to maintain a positive school culture as we adjust to changes made to the daily schedule for 2007/2008.

Strategic Goal Correlate:

#1, #2, #5, #8

Action Step: # 2

Areas of positive and negative impact will be identified for changes made to the schedule for specialists caused by the addition of a fourth grade classroom.

A. Begin Date:

September 2007

Anticipated Completion Date:

May 2008

Actual Completion Date:

May 2008

B. Measurement Method(s)

C. Monitoring Dates/Timelines

1.

Grade four teachers will identify areas of negative and positive impact of dividing classrooms for instruction with specialist (art, music, physical education).

October 2007

2.

Art, music and physical education teachers will identify areas of negative and positive impact to their curriculum of the current way of dividing five classrooms into four specialists' classes for instruction.

October 2007

3.

The principal, specialists and instructional staff will work to formulate an action plan to lessen the negative impact of the grade four classroom split on the curriculum of specialists.

October 2007 – May 2008

D. Person/persons responsible for monitoring

Carolyn Wallace, Veronica Richter, Therese Moriarty, Richard Juskalian, Wayne Wilson

E. Education Results

1.

The principal met with the grade 4 team in October to discuss the impact of dividing one classroom in half to go with two different classrooms for art, music and physical education. This created classrooms with over thirty students... At that time, the fourth grade teachers felt that the impact to the fourth graders was all positive. The students didn't complain. They seemed to like going with another class to their specialists classes. This allowed them to see more of their friends during the day.

2.

The art, music and physical education teachers from Mountain View and Mapleshade met with the principals of both schools in October. At that time, the specialists felt that the impact to their programs created by splitting one fourth grade class and adding them to two other fourth grade classes was all negative. The negative impact included:

- **Safety** – large number of students in a small space, moving chairs from class to class, use of tennis rackets in a large group, use of hands-on activities, safe supervision, etc.
- **Curriculum** – Hands-on activities need to be modified for larger groups, less student contact time with the teacher and materials in larger groups, lessons such as mask making and painting have to be eliminated for larger mixed classes creating inequities within the grade level, classes need to be divided for some activities affecting skill level, etc.
- **Materials** – typically materials are ordered for a maximum of 25 leaving the larger mixed classes without enough materials (PE – paddles, golf sticks, rackets; art – paint sets, crayons, drawing racks; music – instruments, copies of music) consequently either the activity or the amount of students participating at a time has to change.

The negative impact to these programs would be extended into the fifth grade during the 2008/2009 school year based on the proposed addition of a fifth grade teacher at both schools in the fall of 2008.

3.

The identified negative impact to the art, music and physical education classes made it necessary to change the master schedule of the school. The schedule needed to be changed in order to create enough additional periods to accommodate the additional fourth grade class this year and the possible addition of a fifth grade class next year. The initial idea was to develop a “6 day rotating schedule”. This would increase the number of periods in the specialists schedule by extending the schedule over more days. However, this change would decrease the overall number of periods each class would have with each specialist over the course of the year. For a variety of reasons this idea was abandoned. The final resolution was an “adjusted 5-day schedule”.

The “5-day adjusted” schedule was created by adjusting the lunch/recess period to 12:00 – 12:55. By doing this, an additional 45 minute period could be fit into the existing schedule. The original schedule had thirty periods per week for specialists. The adjusted schedule has thirty-five periods per week for specialists. This adjusted schedule provided all fourth grade classes this year have their own period for specialist’s classes. All negative issues raised by the specialists were resolved by this schedule change:

- **Safety** – smaller classes means adequate space and supervision for all classes
- **Curriculum** – smaller classes means that there is space for all types of activities necessary for the teaching and learning of art, music and physical education.
- **Materials** – smaller classes means that the specialists have enough materials for each student in a class when they come for instruction.
- **Fifth grade** – this adjusted schedule created enough class periods per week to accommodate the addition of a fifth grade that may be added in the next school year.

An added benefit of this schedule change is that time is used more efficiently at both schools.

This new “5-day adjusted” schedule was implemented on February 4, 2008. The change has been very successful at both schools. A joint committee was formed to monitor the impact of the schedule change. The role of this committee was to identify any areas of negative impact and suggest changes for the 2008/2009 school year. This committee held two meetings. The first meeting occurred before the schedule change occurred to discuss any anticipated problems. The final meeting was held in May 2008. The conclusion of the committee at this meeting was that there were a few minor problems created by this schedule change but that everyone liked the change and it was working well. The most important issues were:

- Classes with first period specialists have a rushed start to the day. This is a bigger issue at Mountain View. The resolution is to work with the transportation office to be sure all buses are at the school to drop off students by 8:10.
- Contractually, staff needs to be at school fifteen minutes before the start of the students’ day. This creates a change for Mapleshade. According to the contract, the current time for Mapleshade teachers is from 8:05 – 2:45. This needs to change to match Mountain View – 8:00 – 2:40. The administration waived the time change for this school year. This contract issue needs to be resolved for Mapleshade staff for the 2008-2009 school year.
- Dismissal at Mapleshade can be chaotic because not all 3rd grade classrooms can bring their possessions to their specialists’ classes for dismissal based on the location of their classroom. It is hoped that the room changes that will occur over the summer at Mapleshade will alleviate at least some of this problem.

The action plan for next year is to make this “5-day adjusted” schedule the permanent schedule for both schools.

School: Mountain View

Year:

2007/2008

SMART GOAL: 3

To continue the implementation process of the "Investigation" math program in all three grade levels.

Strategic Goal Correlate:

#1, #2, #5, #10

Action Step: # 1

The fraction unit of the "Investigations" math program will be implemented at all three grade levels according to the curriculum map at each grade level.

A. Begin Date:

September 2007

Anticipated Completion Date:

May 2008

Actual Completion Date:

May 2008

B.

Measurement Method(s)

1.

Materials will be purchased for the fraction unit at each grade level.

2.

Professional development will be provided to support effective implementation of the fraction unit at each grade level.

3.

Grade levels will collaborate on the implementation of the fraction unit across all three grade levels to ensure that the State's standards for this topic are addressed completely.

C. Monitoring Dates/Timelines

September 2007

October 5, 2007 Professional Development Day

October 2007 – May 2008

D. Person/persons responsible for monitoring:

Carolyn Wallace, grade level teams, Elaine Santaniello

E. Education Results

1.

Grade 3 and 4 materials for the fraction unit were purchased 9/13/07 with Mountain View funds. Grade 5 materials for the second fraction/decimal unit were purchased 9/07 with District funds.

2.

The October 5, 2007 Professional Development Day was dedicated to the implementation of these “Investigations” units. Mary Beth O’Connor, a math consultant from HEC, worked with the Mountain View staff in the morning. She began by reviewing the information and activities that she did with us last year. She then introduced a format she designed for us called “Where to Start”. The purpose of this format was to give the staff guiding questions and activities that moved them through the teacher’s manual for the specific grade level fractions unit they would be implementing. Once the staff understood the structure, they began working with it to explore their grade level materials. The final activity of the morning was for the grade level teams to come together and share their work up to that point. This discussion included the progression of skills and concepts across the three grades. Grade level teams spent the rest of the day working through the “Where to Start” questions and activities to prepare for the unit’s implementation later in the year. The January staff meeting was dedicated to completing the preparation work begun on this Professional Development Day.

3.

Staff meetings in December, January and May were used to share information about each grade level’s implementation of the “Investigations” materials. We discussed current implementation, conclusions, and thoughts for future implementation. Each grade level implemented their unit at different times of the year based on the math curriculum map for their grade level. Each grade level also met with Mrs. Wallace mid-way through their implantation of the unit to voice any problems, find solutions, discuss progress, etc. The results of these discussions were shared and discussed at the May staff meeting. The following data was gathered across the grade levels and shared:

 - Students were actively engaged in the “investigations”. The hands-on methodology was effective with our students.
 - The content matched the 5th grade curriculum expectations more closely than it did the expectations at grade 3 and 4.
 - The program was very paper intensive at the grade 3 and 4 levels.
 - Supplemental materials are needed at all three grade levels to cover the established curriculum completely...
 - It is very time consuming to prepare for these “hands-on” activities and it is hoped that all nine units will not be implemented at once next year.
 - It took longer to go through each lesson than the program suggested – which might be because the foundation was not laid in earlier grades.

School: Mountain View

Year: 2007/2008

SMART GOAL: 3

To continue the implementation process of the "Investigation" math program in all three grade levels.

Strategic Goal Correlate:

#1, #2, #5, #10

Action Step: # 2

Mountain View teachers will collaborate with Mapleshade teachers as the "Investigations" math program is implemented in both schools.

A. Begin Date: September 2007 **Anticipated Completion Date:** May 2008 **Actual Completion Date:** May 2008

B. Measurement Method(s)

C. Monitoring Dates/Timelines

1. Similar professional development will be provided for the staff at both schools to create a common understanding and language about the "Investigations" math program.

October 2007

2. Grade five teachers from Mountain View will provide support from their experiences last year to the grade five teachers at Mapleshade as they implement the first fraction unit (unit 4).

December 2007 – March 2008

3. Grade 3 and 4 teachers from Mountain View will collaborate with Mapleshade teachers as they implement the fractions unit to help prepare them for later implementation at Mapleshade.

January 2008 – May 2007

D. Person/persons responsible for monitoring:

Carolyn Wallace, grade level teams, Elaine Santaniello

C. Education Results

1. Mary Beth O'Connor, a math consultant from HEC, worked with the staff at Mapleshade Elementary School during the afternoon of the October 5, 2007 Professional Development Day. Her goal was to "demystify" the program by providing the staff with an overview of the program, its components, games, etc. She included grade 5 fraction games and 10 minute math lessons in her presentation to support the implementation of the unit in grade 5 later in the year. This was the same presentation that she gave to the Mountain View staff at the March 2007 professional development day the previous year. This presentation exposed both schools to the same information, vocabulary, use of games, etc. for their joint work with this new math program.

2. and 3.

District grade level curriculum meetings were used by the grade 5 staff to discuss the implementation of the first fraction unit of the "Investigation" program. These discussions included the effectiveness of the program. Teachers from both schools felt that the students were successful and understood the new concepts presented. Mapleshade staff had problems with supplies. They did not have the time to create the games so they used their books as game boards, etc. The Mapleshade staff found that supplementing the Investigations material with their regular textbook worked well for them, too.

Grade 5 teachers from Mapleshade were invited to come observe the Mountain View staff as they implemented this unit for the second time. The Mountain View staff offered to go to Mapleshade to help with implementation, if needed. Neither of these opportunities occurred.

The grade 3 and 4 teachers from Mountain View also shared their implementation experiences with the Mapleshade staff during their monthly grade level curriculum meetings. These discussions were general in nature since the Mapleshade teachers were not implanting the unit this year.

School: Mountain View

Year:

SMART GOAL: 3

Strategic Goal Correlate:

Action Step: # 3

A. Begin Date:

Anticipated Completion Date:

Actual Completion Date:

B. Measurement Method(s)

C. Monitoring Dates/Timelines

1.

2.

3.

D. Person/persons responsible for monitoring:

E. Education Results

1. and 2.

The annual staff online survey included questions about the implementation of the Investigations fraction unit. Answers to the survey questions were not separated by grade level. Therefore, the reported results are for all respondents combined.

Question # 17 – Did you like using the Investigations methods and materials to teach fractions and/or decimals? – 36% yes, 36% a little, 6 % no

Question #18 – Did you feel it was necessary to incorporate our text and/or other materials in order to cover all of the fraction/decimal concepts and skills required for your grade level – 75% yes, 25 % a little, 0% no

Question #19 – Did you feel that your students ended the unit with a better understanding of fraction/decimal concepts and skills than in other years? 20% yes, 45% a little, 35% no

Question #20 – Implementing a new curriculum is always time consuming. Do you think the extra preparation time paid off with increased learning for your students? – 19% yes, 48% a little, 33% no

Question #23 – Now that you have implemented at least one unit of the program, how many new units do you think would be manageable in a school year? 90% - 2

Question #24 – Professional development will definitely be a part of the implementation. What kind of PD do you think would be most effective for you? – 35% - monthly coaching, 25% “train-the-trainer” model, 21% monthly presenter

The conclusions here are mixed. The majority of responses are positive. However, the program is seen as time consuming. Based on these results, it is clear that strong professional development and implementation in a timely manner is necessary for the successful implementation of the rest of this program at Mountain View.

3.

The staff of Mountain View and Mapleshade discussed further implementation of the Investigations program during their monthly curriculum meetings. There are many unknown variables to further implementation of the program including a new principal at Mapleshade, limited knowledge of the program and differing levels of experience between the two schools. The conclusions they were able to reach were:

- The order of implementation of specific units needs to be the same at both schools to create consistency for students and support for staff.
- Implementation will be more effective if only a few units were implemented during one school year.
- High levels of professional development will be needed to implement this program successfully and to its full potential.

Further discussions will need to take place between the teachers in both buildings early in the 2008/2009 school year to ensure consistent implementation during the 2008/2009 school year.