# School Improvement Plan, 2019-20

School: Edison

| Team Members | | |
|---|---|---|
| Don Williams | Gretchen Boerwinkle | Samantha Schumacher |
| Mary Greska | Jessica Smith | Jim Pluskota |
| Maggie Pavlacka | Michelle Quinn | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Peer Review 1 Date: To be done at EC-12 | Peer Review 2 Date: To be done at EC-12 |
| Presentation To Staff Date: Late Start (fall) | Presentation to PTA Date: Should be done in the fall |
| Update to Staff Date: | Update to PTA Date: |
| Update to Staff Date: | Update to PTA Date: |

| SIP Team Meeting Dates | January 8, 2020 |
|---|---|
| September 11, 2019 | February 12, 2020 |
| October 9, 2019 | March 11, 2020 |
| November 13, 2019 | April 8, 2020 |
| December 11, 2019 | May 13, 2020 |

# School Improvement Plan, 2019-20

School: Edison

**Goal 1: The Edison Educational Staff will implement Guided Math and Reading Strategies during Math and ELA Blocks. We feel the implementation of small group lessons will increase student achievement in math and reading in grades K-5.**

**Data Analysis to indicate that there is a problem to address for Goal 1.**

Math and Reading Information for 2019-20 SIP Goal

While our overall math achievement was acceptable, upon analyzing the End of Module data from the 2017-18 and 2018-19 school year there are areas for improvement in our math instruction for student learning. We used our Eureka End of the Module Assessments which measure the proficiency of the students achievement on Common Core Math Standards (CCSS).
Our scoring or grading system is
1 = With Support, Basic Level of Understanding
2= Approaching Grade Level Expectations
3= Grade Level Expectations
4= Exceeds Grade Level Expectations

During one of our beginning of the year Late Arrivals, we asked the staff to complete a Math Workshop/Differentiation exit slip. Staff worked in team to sort through a variety of math differentiation books, videos and district expectations for differentiation. After the sessions was completed the staff completed an exit slip to inform the Leadership Team of our math workshop/differentiation implementation practices in each classroom. The data is below. There are a few pieces that standout for upcoming professional development such as 55% of the staff have only partially established small learning and along with that 36% of the classrooms have not implemented small group learning for math. A few reasons to consider for these numbers are the classroom activities occurring at the beginning of the year such as creating student stamina, teaching student roles with independent learning and establishing meaningful tasks based on student assessment. Another outlier is 46% of our staff have partially committed to creating a reflection time after learning. For teachers to understand the level of learning students intake, a teacher should allow student reflection in their schedules.

# School Improvement Plan, 2019-20

## School: Edison

| Question | Yes | No | Partially |
|---|---|---|---|
| Have you implemented math workshop or a structure for differentiated math instruction in your classroom? | 81% | 0% | 18% |
| Have you implemented Guided math (small group learning) in your classroom? | 45% | 0% | 55% |
| Do you have Learning Stations established in your classrooms? | 46% | 36% | 18% |
| Do you have a number sense routine in your classroom? | 27% | 27% | 46% |
| Is your classroom set up for math literacy similar to being set up for reading literacy? | 60% | 10% | 30% |
| Do you provide time for student reflection in your schedule? | 18% | 36% | 46% |

Our first analysis looked at average percent of students reaching a 3 or a proficient on the End of Module Assessments for all grades. We compared each grade and each module's percentage of students who met the standard and those who did not meet the standard for two consecutive years. There were a few outliers such as module 6 in 2018-19 where 100% of our students did not meet the standard. Also in grade 5 on module 2 and 4, we had a significant percentage of students not meeting standards. With the exception of those noted, student achievement increased especially as we look at the percentage of students who did not meet expectations one year to the next. This percentage is noted in green highlights in the following year to year module charts. Additionally, the chart directly below shows a comparison of the percentage of students who met standards in modules from 2017-18 to 2018-2019, meaning that we increased the percentage of students who met standards from one year to the next. We also documented the number of modules that we decreased the percentage of students not meeting standards from one year to the next.

# School Improvement Plan, 2019-20

## School: Edison

| Grade | Number of Modules that increased %age of students meeting standards from 2017-18 to 2018-2019. | Number of Modules that decreased %age of students who did not meet standards from 2017-18 to 2018-19 |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3 of 4 Modules | 3 of 4 Modules |
| 2 | 6 of 6 Modules | 6 of 6 Modules |
| 3 | 5 of 5 Modules | 5 of 5 Modules |
| 4 | 3 of 4 Modules | 3 of 4 Modules |
| 5 | 2 of 4 Modules | 2 of 4 Modules |

Highlighted in green are the modules that had a significant increase in the %age of students who met standards from one year to the next. These highlights indicate a 50% reduction or more in the %age of students who did not meet standards from one year to the next. Highlighted in yellow are modules that require instructional support.

| | | 2017-18 | | 2018-19 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Module | Did not Meet Standard | Met Standard | Did not Meet Standard | Met Standard |
| Grade 1 | Module 1 | 8.33% | 91.67% | 19% | 81% |
| | Module 2 | 28% | 72% | 14% | 86% |
| | Module 3 | 14% | 86% | 7% | 93% |
| | Module 4 | 10% | 90% | 7% | 93% |

# School Improvement Plan, 2019-20

School: Edison

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Module 6 | | | 100% | 0% |
| | | | | | |
| Grade 2 | Module 1 | 40% | 60% | 10% | 81% |
| | Module 2 | 25.93% | 74.07% | 4% | 92% |
| | Module 3 | 12.73% | 87.27% | 2% | 99% |
| | Module 4 | 67.27% | 32.73% | 8% | 84% |
| | Module 5 | 43.64% | 56.36% | 8% | 84% |
| | Module 6 | 3.64% | 96.36% | 0% | 100% |
| | Module 7 | | | 1% | 99% |
| | | | | | |
| Grade 3 | Module 1 | 44.44% | 55.56% | 3.7% | 96.3% |
| | Module 2 | 38.89% | 61.11% | 9.6% | 90.4% |
| | Module 3 | 44.44% | 55.56% | 11.5% | 88.5% |
| | Module 4 | 19.44% | 80.56% | 7.4% | 92.6% |
| | Module 5 | 14.29% | 85.71% | 11.54% | 88.45% |
| | | | | | |
| Grade 4 | Module 1 | 14.81% | 85.19% | 0% | 100% |

# School Improvement Plan, 2019-20

School: Edison

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Module 2 | | | 0% | 100% |
| | Module 3 | 9.26% | 90.74% | 0% | 100% |
| | Module 4 | | | 4.3% | 95.7% |
| | Module 5 | 19.61% | 80.39% | 9.5% | 90.5% |
| | Module 6 | | 100.00% | 2.27% | 97.73% |
| | Module 7 | 14.29% | 85.71% | | |
| | | | | | |
| Grade 5 | Module 1 | 10% | 90% | 11.6% | 88.4% |
| | Module 2 | 15.79% | 84.21% | 17.02% | 82.98% |
| | Module 3 | 47.37% | 52.63% | 24% | 76% |
| | Module 4 | 38.10% | 61.90% | 37.83% | 62.17% |
| | | | | | |
| Kindergarten | Module 1 | 11.11% | 88.89% | 4.87% | 95.13% |
| | Module 2 | 31.43% | 68.57% | 10.25% | 89.75% |
| | Module 3 | 37.14% | 62.86% | 0% | 100% |
| | Module 4 | | | 27.5% | 72.5% |
| | Module 5 | | | 4.87% | 95.13% |

# School Improvement Plan, 2019-20

## School: Edison

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Module 6 | | | 33.33% | 66.68% |

The charts below reflect a triangulation of the data in math. We used spring 2019 IAR, fall 2019 NWEA and spring 2019 Eureka Math. If our student achievement is consistent and accurate then we should see similar numbers for each grade. Triangulating the data in math for 3rd grade indicates a difference between IAR and NWEA achievement. Likewise, 5th grade has the same data pattern. However, our 4th grade appears to be consistent with achievement in all three assessment areas.

Triangulation of Math Data Regular Education Students

| Triangulation of Math Data - IAR, NWEA and Eureka Math | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | IAR Spring 2019 % age Meets and Exceeds | NWEA Fall 2019 | SBR Spring 2019 % age Meeting Expectations with a proficiency of 3 |
| 3rd | 57% | Edison Avg. RIT - 193<br>Edison % above Avg. or better - 76%<br>Dist RIT - 193<br>Natl RIT - 190 | 78% |
| 4th | 70% | Edison Avg. RIT - 205<br>Edison % above Avg. or better - 71%<br>Dist RIT - 205<br>Natl RIT - 201 | 97% |
| 5th | 53% | Edison Avg. RIT - 218<br>Edison % above Avg. or better - 85%<br>Dist RIT - 213<br>Natl RIT 211 | 88% |

# School Improvement Plan, 2019-20

## School: Edison

*Fall 2019 NWEA Scores were used in this graph because 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students do not take NWEA MAP in the Spring

Triangulation of Data for Special Education Population

| Triangulation of Math Data for Special Education Students - IAR, NWEA and Eureka Math | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | IAR Spring 2019 % age Meets and Exceeds | NWEA Fall 2019 Meeting with a Local Grade Level RITScore | Eureka Math Spring 2019 average percent of students earning a 3 or 4 on SBRs |
| 3rd | YES - 67%<br>No - 33% | Edison Avg. RIT - 193<br>Edison Avg. Spec Ed. RIT - 176<br>Edison Spec ed % above Nat RIT -100%<br>Dist RIT - 193<br>Natl RIT - 190 | 65% |
| 4th | | Edison Avg. RIT -<br>Edison Avg. Spec Ed RIT - 206<br>Edison Spec ed % above Nat. RIT - 22%<br>Dist RIT - 205<br>Natl RIT - 201 | 68% |
| 5th | YES - 0%<br>No - 100% | Edison Avg. RIT - 218<br>Edison Avg Spec Ed. RIT - 195<br>Edison Spec ed % above Nat. RIT - 1%<br>Dist RIT - 213<br>Natl RIT 211 | 43% |

Reading

# School Improvement Plan, 2019-20

## School: Edison

Triangulation of our ELA Data for Regular Education Students

| Triangulation of ELA Data - IAR, NWEA and F&P | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | IAR Spring 2019 % age Meets and Exceeds | NWEA Fall 2019 Meeting with a Local Grade Level RIT Score | %age of Students Meeting or Exceeding Fall 2019 Grade Level Expectations with F&P |
| 3rd | 61% | Edison Avg. RIT - 195<br>Edison % above Avg. or better - 78%<br>Dist RIT - 195<br>Natl RIT - 187 | 91% |
| 4th | 75% | Edison Avg. RIT - 205<br>Edison % above Avg. or better - 85%<br>Dist RIT - 205<br>Natl RIT - 197 | 94% |
| 5th | 57% | Edison Avg. RIT - 215<br>Edison % above Avg. or better - 87%<br>Dist RIT - 215<br>Natl RIT - 205 | 83% |

| 2018-19 Special Education Students F&P Growth Expectations |
|---|
| Exceeds - 13 Students |
| Meets - 10 Students |

# School Improvement Plan, 2019-20

School: Edison

| Approaches - 2 Students |
| --- |
| Below - 16 Students |

Triangulation of ELA Data for Special Education Students

| Triangulation of ELA Data for Special Education Students - IAR, NWEA and F&P | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | IAR Spring 2019 % age Meets and Exceeds for Special Education Students | NWEA Fall 2019 Meeting with a Local Grade Level RIT Score | %age of Students Meeting or Exceeding Fall 2019 Grade Level Expectations with F&P |
| 3rd | YES - 33%<br>No - 67% | Edison Avg. RIT - 205<br>Edison Avg. Spec Ed. RIT - 183<br>Edison % above Nat RIT -14%<br>Dist RIT - 195<br>Natl RIT - 187 | YES - 45%<br>NO - 55% |
| 4th | | Edison Avg. RIT - 215<br>Edison Avg. Spec Ed. RIT - 187<br>Edison % above Nat RIT -1%<br>Dist RIT - 205<br>Natl RIT - 197 | YES - 100%<br>NO - 0% |
| 5th | YES - 0%<br>NO - 100% | Edison Avg. RIT -<br>Edison Avg. Spec Ed. RIT - 203<br>Edison % above Nat RIT - 66%<br>Dist RIT - 215<br>Natl RIT - 205 | YES - 59%<br>NO - 41% |

# School Improvement Plan, 2019-20

School: Edison

**Developing the problem of practice (guiding questions):**

What's going on with our students' learning? Although our student achievement is adequate in most areas, our data suggests that our on level and above level students continue to outperform our lower achieving students, we are not closing the gap between our low achievers and our on level students.

What needs to change in our students' learning so that students will be able to adapt their knowledge to new learning, synthesize concepts into a variety of areas, and evaluate academic discussions and arguments with peers.
Through the work of small group instruction and a workshop model in both ELA and math, students will have the opportunity to apply information in a collaborative environment to solve real life predictable and unpredictable situations. Through this model student learning will be at the center of instruction and students will have available time to practice skills in a variety of different ways.

What needs to change in teacher practice to better support student learning? Teachers will learn the components of an effective workshop model and small group guided practice to encourage a growth mindset to work through a variety of problems with perseverance. Communication, collaboration, and creativity (and other 6Cs) will be promoted and rewarded in student work through the workshop model where student choice is imbedded.

How will this change lead to improved student learning outcomes? Application problems will relate to real-life situations to provide relevance for the students. Students will understand how lessons are connected to their lives outside of the classroom. This will lead to a more relevant understanding of the curriculum as well as greater retention to be applied in future learning.

**Theory of Action:**

If the principal…

- Provide math PLC time with team
- Provide choice-driven PD for staff involving math workshop/ guided math with time to reflect on the PD with our team to plan, discuss, and practice implementing right away.
- Share resources with staff to implement instruction for solving real-word/messy problems ( ie Jo Boaler, Mindset Mathematics)
-

# School Improvement Plan, 2019-20

School: Edison

Then teachers will be able to….

- Utilize formative assessments to guide instruction that fosters growth**,** use the data from pre and post tests to make instructional decisions to support student growth
- Use formative assessments to determine what levels of support each student needs for math workshop/guided math, additional teacher other than classroom teacher providing guided math support for students
- Seek out additional resources that allow kids to push themselves into the 4th section of the rubric for the grade level standards. Utilize instructional coach for guidance on obtaining appropriate resources.

So that students will be able to…

- Show growth from pre to post tests
- Actively engaged in mini lessons and independent/collaborative work as a part of math workshop/ guided math
- Solve real-word/ messy problems and communicate theory behind their solution with teachers and peers

How will we know if it's working? (monitoring of implementation, student learning outcomes) What data will we use to support our claim? (assessment data, observational data, self-assessment data, etc)

**SMART Goal for Goal 1**

**By the end of the 2019-2020 school year, all teachers will implement small group instruction in the ELA and math workshop models to show 80% of students meeting or exceeding math standards on the EMA and have all students increase F&P levels by at least 2 levels over the course of the school year.**

**First Trimester Action Plan with Specific Measures of Progress (August through mid-November):**

| Action Step | Person Responsible | Target Date | Evidence |
|---|---|---|---|
| Setting Core Expectations | Administration | Every Late Arrival | Agendas and District Expectation Slides in presentation |
| Aggregating Special Education Data | Administration | MMA, EMA | Achievement of 3s on EMA |
| Participation in bi-weekly PLCs | Administration | Aug. 2019 May 2020 | Agendas, notes and admin calendar |

# School Improvement Plan, 2019-20

School: Edison

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Benchmark and Interim Benchmark Mtgs | Admin and Edison Team | Bnchmk - 12 Weeks<br>Int. Bnchmk - 6 Weeks | Notes, agendas, student progress monitoring |
| Classroom Walkthroughs | Admin | Weekly | Schedules and notes from walkthroughs |
| Beginning of the year Edison Differentiation Survey | Teachers and Team Members | Twice a year | Staff will fill out a math differentiation pre survey in August and in May 2020 they will complete a post survey to compare information and growth |
| Teams will use Guided Math Implementation Checklist | Teachers and Team Members | May 2019 | Guided Math Implementation Checklist will be completed reviewed to ensure Guided Math instruction is being implemented |
| Team sill use Guided Math Self-Assessment Implementation Rubric | Teachers and Team Members | May 2019 | Guided Math Self Assessment Implementation Rubric will be completed reviewed to ensure Guided Math instruction is being implemented |
| Use Critical Issues for Team Consideration monitoring chart - *Learning By  Doing* | Jim Pluskota | 10/19 and 5/20 | Chart<br>Fall implementation survey<br>Spring implementation survey |
| Analysis of Student Work Protocols to change Instruction to meet student needs after each Module is completed | Teachers & Team Members | Weekly beginning 8/20/19 | Student work protocols filled out and completed |
| Teams will establish agendas and take | Teachers & Team | Weekly | Team Notes and agendas |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| notes from team meetings | Members | beginning 8/14/19 | |
| Teams will establish norms for PLC meetings | Teachers & Team Members | 8/14/18 | Team Notes<br>Grade level teams wrote norms on 8/14/2019. These norms are posted on each grade levels note page. |
| Use Learning By Doing Book, Dufour | Principal and PLC Team | Monthly | PLC Team notes and agendas |
| Focus on 6Cs and Rigor Relevance Rubrics | Principal and PLC Team | Monthly | PLC Team notes and agendas and Grade Level PLC notes and agendas |
| **Second Trimester Action Plan with Specific Measures of Progress (mid-November through February)** | | | |
| Analysis of Student Work Protocols to change Instruction to meet student needs | Teachers & Team Members | Weekly | Student work protocols filled out and completed |
| Use Learning By Doing Book, Dufour | Principal and PLC Team | Monthly | PLC Team notes and agendas |
| Focus on 6Cs and Rigor Relevance Rubrics | Principal and PLC Team | Monthly | PLC Team notes and agendas and Grade Level PLC notes and agendas |
| End of the year Edison Differentiation Survey | Teachers and Team Members | Twice a year | Staff filled out a differentiation pre survey in August and at the end of the year we'll complete a post survey to compare information and growth |
| Analysis of Student Work Protocols to | Teachers & Team | Weekly | Student work protocols filled out and |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| change Instruction to meet student needs | Members | | completed |
| Use Learning By Doing Book, Dufour | Principal and PLC Team | Monthly | PLC Team notes and agendas |
| Focus on 6Cs and Rigor Relevance Rubrics | Principal and PLC Team | Monthly | PLC Team notes and agendas and Grade Level PLC notes and agendas |
| **Third Trimester Action Plan with Specific Measures of Progress (March through May)** | | | |
| Analysis of Student Work Protocols to change Instruction to meet student needs | Teachers & Team Members | Weekly | Student work protocols filled out and completed |
| Use Learning By Doing Book, Dufour | Principal and PLC Team | Monthly | PLC Team notes and agendas |
| Focus on 6Cs and Rigor Relevance Rubrics | Principal and PLC Team | Monthly | PLC Team notes and agendas and Grade Level PLC notes and agendas |
| End of the year Edison Differentiation Survey | Teachers and Team Members | Twice a year | Staff filled out a differentiation pre survey in August and at the end of the year we'll complete a post survey to compare information and growth |
| Analysis of Student Work Protocols to change Instruction to meet student needs | Teachers & Team Members | Weekly | Student work protocols filled out and completed |
| Use Learning By Doing Book, Dufour | Principal and PLC Team | Monthly | PLC Team notes and agendas |

# School Improvement Plan, 2019-20

School: Edison

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Focus on 6Cs and Rigor Relevance Rubrics | Principal and PLC Team | Monthly | PLC Team notes and agendas and Grade Level PLC notes and agendas |

**<u>Goal 2:</u> Our goal is to ensure that all teachers are implementing Responsive Teaching Strategies and Structures in Writing.**

**Data Analysis to indicate that there is a problem to address for Goal 2.**

Writing

The table below is based on our 2019 IAR writing scores. The table shows two areas, one is Written Expression and the other is Writing Conventions. Looking at the Met or Exceeded achievement of our students, we were able to outpace the state average in both categories and we were able to outpace the district percentages of met and exceeded in all but 5th grade. Based on our on demand writing and response to text in classroom formative assessments we are observing students knowledge of writing lacking the generalization from lessons to writing samples in several content areas. We are also observing a difference in writing skills based on the tool being used. For example, we are noticing that students, specifically the 4th and 5th graders, will meet expected standards when they are provided a chromebook to complete their writing assignment, however, when asked to complete their writing assignments using pencil and paper students do not fare as well. Our task is to balance our writing achievement regardless of how the students are asked to perform a writing task. Although our IAR meets and exceeds scores are above 50%, with the exception of 5th grade, using our pencil and paper example, we are noticing conventions such as “completing sentences with capitalization and proper punctuation” being a primary area of concern.

| Grade | Written Expression | | | Writing Conventions | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Did not Meet | Approached | Met or Exceeded | Did not Meet | Approached | Met or Exceeded |
| 3 | 22% | 20% | 57% | 15% | 19% | 67% |
| 4 | 9% | 20% | 70% | 7% | 32% | 61% |

# School Improvement Plan, 2019-20

School: Edison

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 22% | 31% | 47% | 14% | 43% | 43% |

**Theory of Action:**

What's going on with our students' learning?

Based on our on demand writing and response to text in classroom formative assessments we are observing students knowledge of writing lacking the generalization from lessons to writing samples in several content areas. We are also observing a difference in writing skills based on the tool being used. For example, we are noticing that students, specifically the 4th and 5th graders, will meet expected standards when they are provided a chromebook to complete their writing assignment, however, when asked to complete their writing assignments using pencil and paper students do not fare as well.

What needs to change in our students' learning?

We are noticing that students, specifically the 4th and 5th graders, will meet expected standards when they are provided a chromebook to complete their writing assignment, however, when asked to complete their writing assignments using pencil and paper students do not fare as well. Our task is to balance our writing achievement regardless of how the students are asked to perform a writing task.

So that students will be able to…

Students will be able to generalize and develop their writing skills to meet the expectations and standards regardless of the mode they are being asked to perform.

What needs to change in teacher practice to better support student learning? How will this change lead to improved student learning outcomes?

Professional Development in teaching writing skills, small group learning, more concise conferring strategies and use cross curricular scheduling to ensure writing are being generalized and being learned

How will we know if it's working? (monitoring of implementation, student learning outcomes) What data will we use to support our claim? (assessment data, observational data, self-assessment data, etc)

**SMART Goal for Goal 2:**

# School Improvement Plan, 2019-20

School: Edison

| **Our goal is to ensure that all teachers are implementing responsive teaching strategies and structures in writing conventions and written expression with 80% of students meeting or exceeding expectations on SBR report cards.** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **First Trimester Action Plan with Specific Measures of Progress (August through mid-November):** | | | |
| **Action Step** | **Person Responsible** | **Target Date** | **Evidence** |
| Order F&P Continuum Book for all staff | Admin | Sept. 2019 | Each teacher will have their own manual |
| Determine scope and sequence of teaching conventions from F&P Continuum. | Leadership Team | Sept. 2019 to Oct 2019 | Conventions Scope and Sequence established for each grade level |
| Late Arrival Focus on Text Layout, Grammar Usage, Capitalization and Punctuation | Admin and Coach | Sept. 2019 to May 2020 | Late Arrival Agendas, notes and presentations. |
| Classroom Walkthroughs | Admin | Weekly | Schedules and notes from walkthroughs |
| Participation in bi-weekly PLCs | Administration | Aug. 2019 May 2020 | Agendas, notes and admin calendar |
| **Second Trimester Action Plan with Specific Measures of Progress (mid-November through February):** | | | |
| Late Arrival Focus on Text Structure, Idea Development, Language Use, Word Choice and Voice | Admin and Coach | Jan. 2020 to May 2020 | Late Arrival Agendas, notes and presentations. |
| Classroom Walkthroughs | Admin | Weekly | Schedules and notes from |

# School Improvement Plan, 2019-20

School: Edison

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | walkthroughs |
| Participation in bi-weekly PLCs | Administration | Aug. 2019<br>May 2020 | Agendas, notes and admin calendar |
| **Third Trimester Action Plan with Specific Measures of Progress (February through May)** | | | |
| Late Arrival Focus on Handwriting and Word Processing, Writing Process and Spelling | Admin and Coach | March. 2019 to May 2020 | Late Arrival Agendas, notes and presentations. |
| Classroom Walkthroughs | Admin | Weekly | Schedules and notes from walkthroughs |
| Participation in bi-weekly PLCs | Administration | Aug. 2019<br>May 2020 | Agendas, notes and admin calendar |