

2014 – 2016

School Improvement Plan

Baldwin School



85 Oxford Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

Principal: Nicholas Leonardos
Assistant Principal: John Roderick

CPS
Cambridge Public Schools

baldwin.cpsd.us



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page Number
Vision	1
Theory of Action	1
Summary of Strategic Objectives and Initiatives.....	1
Data Analysis	
Trend Data/ Areas of Strength	2-3
Trend Data/ Areas for Improvement	3-4
Action Plan #1	
Mathematics: Develop students’ mathematical “habits of mind”	5-6
Action Plan #2	
English Language Arts:	
Improve students’ deeper reading comprehension by providing.....	7-8
frequent opportunities for thinking, talking, and writing about	
reading (including in the content areas).To increase the	
performance of High Needs students in ELA, in grades 4 - 8.	
Action Plan #3	
Develop and increase students’ sense of agency in all.....	9-10
content areas.	
Additional Considerations	11

Baldwin School Improvement Plan 2014-16

Vision				
To provide students with the skills, knowledge and academic and social characteristics necessary for lifelong learning. To ensure that all children see themselves as learners, possessing a high degree of capability and a high likelihood for future academic and social success. To raise achievement as measured through a variety of assessments.				
Theory of Action				
If we as teachers use careful language to promote growth mindsets in our students, and if we provide our students with research based instruction, and if we provide students with opportunities to own and control their learning, then our students will achieve strong results during their time at Baldwin and be strong learners for the rest of their lives.				
Strategic Objectives				
Improve students' deeper reading comprehension	Develop students' mathematical "habits of mind" and procedural skill.	Focus on refining Science instruction.	Develop and increase students' sense of agency.	Continue our efforts to refine Response to Intervention.
Strategic Initiatives				
Provide frequent opportunities for thinking, talking, and writing about reading (including in the content areas)	Explicitly teach problem solving behaviors (close reading, drawing models to represent the situation, organizing work)	Teachers will cover topics in Science related to the new standards.	Deepen the Professional Learning Culture at Baldwin, focusing on teacher language and student agency.	Collect data and hold data meetings in ELA and Math.
Utilize "close reading" practices to improve students' understanding of complex texts	On going opportunities to practice computational skills during non-computation units. Use Symphony and Reflex Math.	Teachers will map out their science units for the year.	Students will complete an annual Academic Choice project, based on RC principles. Teachers will collaboratively plan these units.	Identify students for support in Tier 2 and 3 in ELA and Math.
Develop teachers' repertoire of "beyond the text" and "about the text" questioning	Use of reference sheets, graphic organizers and problem solving protocols to help students develop procedural skills and multiple problem solving strategies.	Teachers will learn about how to incorporate the Science/Common Core standards into their teaching.	Students will engage in Goal Setting and lead their own Parent Conference, with teacher support.	Hire additional interventionists for ELA and Math with SIP funding.
Use SEI reading, writing and vocabulary strategies to support ELL and FLEP students	Vocabulary for each unit known and defined by students.	Ensure adequate time is provided for Science instruction.	During CPT and afterschool, teachers will engage in a PLC to support Math and ELA SIP goals.	Conduct social/emotional screeners, and follow up services.
Engage families by hosting ELA information sessions where families will learn how to support reading comprehension at home	Grade Level RtI meetings to look at student work and make instructional decisions based on the problem solving and computational needs of the students.			
	Engage families in effort by hosting math information sessions where families will learn how to support computational fluency and problem solving.			
2015 Outcomes				
<p>ELA- We will see an improvement on the district benchmark in "beyond" and "about" the text comprehension. We will continue to see a steady improvement in open response writing as measured by percentage of possible points on Grade 4 MCAS open response (41% in 2012, 52% in 2013, 58% in 2014), indicating deeper comprehension.</p> <p>Math- Improve grades 4-5 student achievement in short answer/open response questions in ELA and Math. The average Math open response score for grades 4-5 for the last three years is 61%.</p> <p>Student Agency- Students will exhibit an increased ability to show academic perseverance, especially in longer problems/assignments in Math and ELA. Teachers will support this by using more growth mindset teaching strategies and language.</p>				

Strengths: Please rank these in order, with #1 being the most important area of strength.

	Trend data that demonstrates an area of strength (please include a chart or table)	What are your observations and your hypothesis of the cause of this area of strength?	What strategic objectives or initiatives could have led to this area of strength? How?																												
#1	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>School Year</th> <th>Suspension Days</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2009-10</td> <td>155</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010-11</td> <td>72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011-12</td> <td>45</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2012-13</td> <td>33</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2013-14</td> <td>7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	School Year	Suspension Days	2009-10	155	2010-11	72	2011-12	45	2012-13	33	2013-14	7	Willingness of teachers to change the policies around referrals and social conferencing. Focus on keeping students in school.	Greater building wide clarity on RC practice and increase in social conferencing, logical consequences and behavior planning.																
School Year	Suspension Days																														
2009-10	155																														
2010-11	72																														
2011-12	45																														
2012-13	33																														
2013-14	7																														
#2	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>CPI</th> <th>ELA</th> <th>Math</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2014</td> <td>90.5</td> <td>89.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2013</td> <td>87</td> <td>87</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2012</td> <td>87.1</td> <td>78.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011</td> <td>87.9</td> <td>80.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td>86.7</td> <td>80.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	CPI	ELA	Math	2014	90.5	89.9	2013	87	87	2012	87.1	78.5	2011	87.9	80.7	2010	86.7	80.3	Effect of coaching model being more strongly implemented through CPT. Hiring of interventionists last two years in Math and ELA.	RTI framework Coaching model Interventionists hired through SIP budget. Use of data to focus on growth. Common Lesson Planning.										
CPI	ELA	Math																													
2014	90.5	89.9																													
2013	87	87																													
2012	87.1	78.5																													
2011	87.9	80.7																													
2010	86.7	80.3																													
#3	<p>ELA – Open Response – MCAS Grade 4 (2014)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Item #</th> <th>Baldwin Average</th> <th>State Average</th> <th>Difference</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>2.52</td> <td>2.08</td> <td>+ .44</td> </tr> <tr> <td>17</td> <td>2.64</td> <td>2.09</td> <td>+ .55</td> </tr> <tr> <td>24</td> <td>2.10</td> <td>1.94</td> <td>+ .16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>35</td> <td>2.00</td> <td>1.61</td> <td>+ .39</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>2.32</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>58% / poss. points</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Item #	Baldwin Average	State Average	Difference	6	2.52	2.08	+ .44	17	2.64	2.09	+ .55	24	2.10	1.94	+ .16	35	2.00	1.61	+ .39		2.32				58% / poss. points			58% in 2014 is up from 52% in 2013 and 41% in 2012. It is an area of strength, but also continues to be an area to work on. Our focus has been and continues to be on preparing our students to write deeper and more completely in answering multi-step problems, and the perseverance and growth mindset that goes along with it.	Work in CPT, continued work through Lesson Study.
Item #	Baldwin Average	State Average	Difference																												
6	2.52	2.08	+ .44																												
17	2.64	2.09	+ .55																												
24	2.10	1.94	+ .16																												
35	2.00	1.61	+ .39																												
	2.32																														
	58% / poss. points																														
#4	<p>Overall 80% of students at the Baldwin School were computational proficient by January 2014.</p> <p>Grade 2 improved from 66% in Sept. 2013 to 86% in Jan. 2014.</p> <p>Grade 3 improved from 76% in Sept. 2013 to 88% in Jan. 2014.</p> <p>Grade 4 improved from 61% in Sept. 2013 to 75% in Jan. 2014.</p> <p>Grade 5 improved from 57% in Sept. 2013 to 74% in Jan. 2014.</p>	Focus on regular checking. Focus on Symphony Math usage before and during school.	Increasing focus and consistency of approach in the grade levels. Use of Symphony Math during and before school.																												

1. Why do you think these are the most important data points for areas of strength? – This data shows a perseverance in our teaching and shows growth which bodes well for our continued growth, and our willingness as a staff to nurture a growth mindset in ourselves and apply our individual talents toward building a stronger common culture in our school that will be translated to students.

Guidelines for choosing trend data for areas for improvement:

- Three of your five pieces of data should:
 - Be in the content areas of math, ELA, and science (one each)
 - Use the measures of SGP, CPI, or % proficient/advanced at the whole school or single grade-level
 - Be disaggregated by subgroups that show the greatest gaps
- The other two of your five pieces of data can focus on any areas you feel are in need of improvement

	Trend data that demonstrates an area for improvement (please include a chart or table)	What is your observations and hypothesis of the cause of this area for improvement?	What strategic objectives or initiatives could address this area for improvement? How?																								
#1	<p>Special Needs CPI</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>ELA</th> <th>Math</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2014</td> <td>70.3</td> <td>71.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2013</td> <td>67.4</td> <td>69.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2012</td> <td>71.2</td> <td>51.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011</td> <td>76.7</td> <td>60.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td>73.0</td> <td>54.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		ELA	Math	2014	70.3	71.9	2013	67.4	69.3	2012	71.2	51.1	2011	76.7	60.0	2010	73.0	54.1	Continue to find a need to coordinate efforts between GenEd and OSE staff.	Greater focus in CPT on coordinated approach, coordinated expectations for students on IEPs through Lesson Study. Pay close attention to schedule development.						
	ELA	Math																									
2014	70.3	71.9																									
2013	67.4	69.3																									
2012	71.2	51.1																									
2011	76.7	60.0																									
2010	73.0	54.1																									
#2	<p>Science CPI</p> <table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>2014</td> <td>84.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2013</td> <td>73.3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Target -85.6 Improved below target</p>	2014	84.2	2013	73.3	Science instruction across grades may be uneven and lacks coordination. Time for science is a challenge.	Devote planning time to mapping out the year in science topics from K-5, with a special focus on review of concepts in Grade 5.																				
2014	84.2																										
2013	73.3																										
#3	<p>Spring 2014 Reading Benchmarks % of students scoring 3=excellent comprehension</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Within the Text</th> <th>Beyond the Text</th> <th>About the Text</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Grade 1</td> <td>83%</td> <td>42%</td> <td>9%*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade 2</td> <td>95%</td> <td>82%</td> <td>60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade 3</td> <td>75%</td> <td>25%</td> <td>6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade 4</td> <td>77%</td> <td>30%</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade 5</td> <td>79%</td> <td>34%</td> <td>39%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Within the Text	Beyond the Text	About the Text	Grade 1	83%	42%	9%*	Grade 2	95%	82%	60%	Grade 3	75%	25%	6%	Grade 4	77%	30%	50%	Grade 5	79%	34%	39%	This data correlates to Open Response results on MCAS, and shows the continued need to beef up our students' ability and willingness to write in deeper and more meaningful ways on a regular basis.	Increase student capacity to persevere and stick with longer writing assignments. This is connected to Math "habits of mind" and is also a focus of our Lesson Study work, which is devoted to increasing student agency.
	Within the Text	Beyond the Text	About the Text																								
Grade 1	83%	42%	9%*																								
Grade 2	95%	82%	60%																								
Grade 3	75%	25%	6%																								
Grade 4	77%	30%	50%																								
Grade 5	79%	34%	39%																								

#4	Two Year Mathematics Data						Students tend to seek help from a teacher on longer, multi-step math problems, and tend to be satisfied with partial effort and answers.	Increase the number of students who can use what they know about numbers to attack new and novel tasks from all mathematical content domains. Students who show the ability to persist, try different strategies, and consistently review their work for precision and organization when solving problems.	
	Grade Level	Fall District Assessments		Winter District Assessments		Spring District Assessment			
		2012-13	2013-14	2012-13	2013-14	2012-13			2013-14
		class median percent correct	class median percent correct	class median percent correct	class median percent correct	class median percent correct			class median percent correct
	Grade 2	67	78	100	70	79			83
Grade 3	82	n/a	81	n/a	93	n/a			
Grade 4	73	73	63	68	69	75			

2. Why do you think these are the most important data points for areas of improvement?

Our special needs population shows the most glaring need for support as relates to MCAS performance. Science also shows a concern. Math and ELA data show some growth for Low Income, High Needs and All Students, but not so for Special Needs and not so much in Science.

3. To what extent do the strategic objectives and initiatives listed above align to the strategic objectives and initiatives in the one page SIP overview you completed in June, 2014?

The Special Needs data is a part of the overall emphasis on student agency. These students are the ones that struggle the most with agency, they suffer from lack of confidence in their learning. How teachers use language to build that agency and sense of confidence is one piece of our rationale for the work we are undertaking in reading the Peter Johnston book and the focus on teacher language, and the focus of our Lesson Study work.

Action Plan for Strategic Objective/Initiative #1:

Year-long description, rationale, and goal	
Priority Strategic Objective/Initiative:	Mathematics: Develop students’ mathematical “habits of mind”
Data that supports this initiative as a priority for your school:	<p>Increase the number of students who independently persevere, thoroughly work to make sense of a problem, effectively use models or pictorial representations, and attend to precision.</p> <p>MCAS results reflect the less than proficient nature of open response type tasks in district assessments and classroom work. Students typically score lower on these items than they do on short answer or multiple-choice questions.</p> <p>Teachers also report that students at all grade levels are more reluctant in math to “have a go” when presented with new and novel problems. Furthermore, teachers suggest that students have more difficulty providing clear written explanations of their math thinking than they do when asked to write about reading, a science experiment, or other content areas.</p>
Student outcome at end of school year:	Open Response Scores on MCAS, district assessments, and <i>Math In Focus</i> “Transfer Questions” will match or exceed the overall proficiency level of each student. This overall proficiency level will be determined by comparing Symphony Benchmarks, district assessments, and end of chapter tests.
Early Evidence of Change	
What are you trying to achieve in this initiative by Dec. 31?	<p>All students will independently...</p> <p>Work to thoroughly make sense of a story problem and persevere when solving by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engaging in close and active reading • Using models and/or pictorial representations in their work <p>Teachers will...</p> <p>Develop students problem solving habits of mind by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicitly teaching problems solving through “think-alouds” • Instructing students in how to use a problem solving protocol/graphic organizers • Creating student friendly rubrics to provide problem solving feedback to students <p>By Dec 31...</p> <p>All Students at grade levels K-5 will have regular, about every seven days at minimum, opportunities to independently solve new and novel problems and construct a written or pictorial justification/explanation of their answer. The <i>Math In Focus</i> materials provide such problems about every seven days.</p> <p>Teachers will instruct students on how to use problem-solving protocols/graphic organizers, based on George Polya’s four-step process—understand, plan, solve, check.</p> <p>Teachers will lead at least two problem-solving lessons, using the <i>Math In Focus</i> “Real World Problems” as opportunities to teach children how to use a</p>

	<p>problem solving protocol and/or engage in close reading. Student friendly rubrics will be created in grade levels 2-5 as a means to give students clear feedback on their problem solving efforts.</p>		
<p>How will you know if a change is an improvement by Dec. 31?</p>	<p>Change will be measured by analyzing district assessments, district “transfer questions” and teacher designed performance tasks. Progress towards our expected change will be demonstrated if student work on the above task shows an increase in the number of students who employ a more thorough approach to problem solving. Teacher developed rubrics will help us make decisions about both who is making progress and how that progress has been made.</p>		
<p>What changes can you make that will result in improvement?</p> <p>Describe your plan to implement this initiative over the whole school year (you will revisit this plan in Jan., 2015).</p> <p>Consider students with disabilities, ELLs, and students with high needs.</p>	<p>Implementation benchmark (process benchmark or early evidence of change benchmark)</p>	<p>Person/team primarily responsible</p>	<p>Date/frequency completed</p>
	<p>Problem Solving Lessons</p>	<p>Grade Level Teams (classroom teachers, special educators, and math coach).</p>	<p>Minimum once a month</p>
	<p>Problem Solving Protocols</p>	<p>Grade Level clusters and math leadership team</p>	<p>November 30</p>
	<p>Problem Solving Feedback Rubrics</p>	<p>Grade Level clusters and math leadership team</p>	<p>November 30</p>
	<p>RtI data meetings to help consider the needs of students “borderline” and “at risk.” Interventions planned and provided.</p>	<p>Grade Level Teams and Math Interventionist</p>	<p>Week of December 14</p>

Action Plan for Strategic Objective/Initiative #2:

Year-long description, rationale, and goal			
Priority Strategic Objective/Initiative:	Improve students’ deeper reading comprehension by providing frequent opportunities for thinking, talking, and writing about reading (including in the content areas).		
Data that supports this initiative as a priority for your school:	There has been a pattern over the past 3 years on the district spring reading benchmarks of students scoring lower on “beyond the text” and “about the text comprehension” compared to “within the text” comprehension questions.		
Student outcome at end of school year:	We will see more frequent opportunities for students in all grades to write about their reading, which is a high leverage strategy for improving deeper comprehension. We will see an improvement on the district benchmark in “beyond” and “about” the text comprehension. We will continue to see a steady improvement in open response writing as measured by percentage of possible points on Grade 4 MCAS open response (41% in 2012, 52% in 2013, 58% in 2014), indicating deeper comprehension.		
Early Evidence of Change			
What are you trying to achieve in this initiative by Dec. 31?	Teachers will develop lesson plans & routines, and engage in a lesson study process, to increase opportunities for thinking, talking and writing about reading, emphasizing “beyond the text” and “about the text” thinking. Teachers will meet weekly with coaches and principal during common planning time to begin the work.		
How will you know if a change is an improvement by Dec. 31?	Teachers will observe and debrief a research lesson on “writing about reading” after engaging in a 3-5 week lesson study process. Teachers will establish writing about reading routines for their classroom.		
What changes can you make that will result in improvement?	Implementation benchmark (process benchmark or early evidence of change benchmark)	Person/team primarily responsible	Date/frequency completed
Describe your plan to implement this initiative over the whole school year (you will revisit this plan in Jan., 2015). Consider students with disabilities, ELLs, and students with high	All teachers will have evidence of writing about reading in their classrooms (examples: journals, on-line letters to teacher, reader’s notebook, shared writing) in which teachers will encourage “beyond the text” and “about the text” thinking through specific feedback to student work.	ILT/Principal Coach Teachers	All year

needs.	After school PD (10 hour course on Baldwin SIP Goals), including: 1. Looking at student writing about reading work with a focus on high needs students and 2. Using Interactive Read Alouds to help students think more deeply about text.	Coaches ILT/Principal	Oct.27-June 1, during B & D weeks, approximately 1 time per month
	Plan coaching/model lessons for open response writing in grades 3 and 4.	Coach Grade 3 & 4 Teachers	Jan. – March 2015

OPTIONAL: Action Plan for Strategic Objective/Initiative #3:

Year-long description, rationale, and goal			
Priority Strategic Objective/Initiative:	Develop and increase students' sense of agency in all content areas.		
Data that supports this initiative as a priority for your school:	Our students, from data collection in Math and ELA on standardized assessments, and from day to day class work, exhibit a lack of agency, and an overall reliance on direct teacher intervention to work through multi-step, or lengthy math and ELA assignments/activities. Open response on MCAS shows improvement over the past three years, but also shows a need to continue to improve, especially for HN students.		
Student outcome at end of school year:	Students will exhibit an increased ability to stick with hard problems in math, and stick with longer writing assignments.		
Early Evidence of Change			
What are you trying to achieve in this initiative by Dec. 31?	Teachers will focus on using growth mindset language with their students on a more regular and purposeful basis. We will also complete at least one Lesson Study cycle by December 31, focusing on planning explicitly for HN students.		
How will you know if a change is an improvement by Dec. 31?	We gave teachers a pre-assessment at the start of the Book Club, we will give another one in December/January. We also have a consultant coming on February 9 th to provide feedback on teacher language. I will note language changes through my own and peer observations.		
What changes can you make that will result in improvement? Describe your plan to implement this initiative over the whole school year (you will revisit this plan in Jan., 2015). Consider students with disabilities, ELLs, and students with high needs.	Implementation benchmark (process benchmark or early evidence of change benchmark)	Person/team primarily responsible	Date/frequency completed
	Teachers will read <u>Opening Minds</u> by Peter Johnston and engage in lesson planning with a focus on teacher language. Consultant from NECC will provide observation and feedback to teachers around teacher language.	ILT	September – February
	Teachers will engage in Unit and Lesson Study cycles, within their grade. During CPT and afterschool, teachers will engage in a PLC to support Math and ELA SIP goals.	All teachers/staff	All year

	Teacher surveys will reflect greater awareness of own language tendencies and change of practice.	ILT	February
	Students will exhibit greater ability to complete longer writing and math problems/assignments with greater precision and elaboration.	All teachers/staff	Ongoing: December, May data collection, MCAS results, district assessments

Additional Considerations:

1. What additional initiatives from your SIP is your school undertaking this school year (besides those described in the Action Plan above)?
 - a. Report Card work
 - b. Student Led Parent Conferences and Goal Setting.

2. Do you believe the list above is achievable this year? If not, please consider making changes to your improvement plan (Section 2). Yes.

3. What *professional development* will support all the initiatives your school is undertaking this year? Please identify the professional development included as an initiative on your improvement plan or other professional development that is not included in your improvement plan.
 - a. Building Student Agency (15 hour course)
 - b. Weekly Common Planning Time with Lesson Study focus at all grade levels.
 - c. SIP goals PD (10 hours) supporting Lesson Study structure.

4. How are you *aligning your resources* to support all the initiatives your school is undertaking this year?
 - a. 25 afterschool hours
 - b. \$20k for interventionists to support RTI processes.
 - c. Additional time in weekly CPT to support Lesson Study.
 - d. PD led by RBT to support our Lesson Study.

5. Who was involved in the creation of each part of your SIP? In what ways were they involved?
 - a. Coaches and ILT, mainly in the creation and implementation of PD to support the goals.
 - b. Site Council is kept informed and specializes in how to engage parents in the school goals.
 - c. Our staff has been working through the ideas of the SIP on a daily and weekly basis, through our grade level common planning meetings, and our 25 hours of afterschool time.
 - d. The SIP was shared at our first meetings in August, and we continue to go back to the goals throughout our work all year.