



**NBPS School Improvement Plan (SIP)
School Year 2013-2014**

School's Name: John Hannigan School

Date Updated: 9.6.13 (Updated 10.10.13)

Timeline and Process Checklist

Overall Timeline	Action	Who is Responsible	By When	Complete?
Plan Development <i>May-September 2013</i>	Introduce DIP/SIP topics to principals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment between DIP & SIP • SIP development process and principles 	Superintendent	July 8 & 9	Yes
	Complete the DESE Conditions for School Effectiveness Self-Assessment	Principal	June-September	√
	Record, review, and analyze key school data	Principals	May-September	√
	Complete MCAS SIP Target Sheets for 2013-2014	Principals	Aug 19	√
	Action plan and set school targets with input from the School Instructional Leadership Team (SILT)	Principals	May-Sept	√
	Complete Initial DRAFT of SIP & Submit to Director of School Support	Principals	Sept 13	√
Plan Approval <i>September-October 2013</i>	Provide support to Principals on SIP development	Dir of School Support & Asst. Supt for Accountability & School Improvement	Aug-Sept	√
	Review DRAFT with input from the School Council	Principals	Sept	□
	Submit FINAL SIP to Director of School Support	Principals	On or before Oct 4	√
	Review and approve SIPs	Superintendent	Oct 14	□
	Share SIP with parents and other stakeholders	Principals	Oct 21	□
	Share forum and timeline for monitoring progress	Superintendent	Oct 14	□
Implementation & Progress Monitoring <i>Oct 2013 – June 2014</i>	School Instructional Leadership Teams (SILT) meet at least monthly to monitor progress on plan, analyze performance data, and plan for future improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School and district generate data for ongoing monitoring • SILT meeting topics focus on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Generating concrete intervention and improvement strategies – Sharing what is working via measurable increases in student learning – Analyzing performance data – Updating data to display and share progress towards goals 	Principals with District ILT support	School year	□
	Share progress towards goals with key stakeholders	Principals	School year	□

Template Modified: 8/21/2013



NBPS School Improvement Plan (SIP) School Year 2013-2014

School's Name: John Hannigan

Overview of District and School Improvement Planning

Focusing on the "Instructional Core"

The New Bedford Public Schools Accelerated Improvement Plan focuses on the quality of classroom instruction. Building on the same four strategic objectives from previous years, the 2013-2014 Accelerated Improvement Plan focuses on increasing the rigor of classroom instruction in reading, math, and science for all students.

The district's theory of action creates an articulated, coherent strategy for the district. The strategic initiatives included in the AIP focus on the core elements outlined in the district's theory of action that will bring about systemic change and improvement.

Theory of Action

IF the NBPS focuses on and persists in expecting, developing, supervising, and evaluating educators' capacity to deliver rigorous and engaging instruction that is:

- Aligned to state standards,
- monitored so student progress in attaining those standards reaches to a level of proficiency,
- adjusted and differentiated so that all students will be supported and stretched to make progress
- and evidence of student learning is demonstrated every day in every classroom in every school

THEN student achievement will significantly increase in each New Bedford school and in the New Bedford Public Schools as a district.

Objective 1: Prepare all NBPS students for college and career success by implementing rigorous standards and monitoring student progress in attaining those standards to a level of proficiency

Objective 2: Develop a collaborative and accountable culture of using data to improve instructional practice and decision-making

Objective 3: Expand district, school, and educator capacity to develop, deliver, and supervise effective instruction to all students

Objective 4: Create, communicate, build, and support momentum for the vision of NBPS that will be embraced by the New Bedford community and all of its stakeholders

To ensure that principals can easily identify the final outcomes, strategic initiatives, activities, and action steps for which they are accountable, the document uses specific district language and maps early evidence of change and short-term outcomes to the goal-setting process in the educator evaluation cycle. For example:

- Schools will be expected to use the AIP final outcomes as the final outcomes in their individual School Improvement Plans
- Educators will be expected to set student learning goals that are aligned with the short-term outcomes in the AIP, and professional practice goals that are aligned with the early evidence of change

These through-lines to school-level and educator-level work will help ensure that the district maintains a narrow yet intense focus on the district's four strategic objectives.



**NBPS School Improvement Plan (SIP)
School Year 2013-2014**

School Improvement Planning: Each School Improvement Plan in the district aligns to the District Improvement Plan. While each school has its unique character, it is critical for the district to operate as one whole to support all students. The basic principles each school should keep in mind for SIP planning are:

- Schools will be expected to use the AIP final outcomes as the final outcomes in their individual School Improvement Plans
- Complete the **DESE Conditions for School Effectiveness Self-Assessment**, prepare/revise accordingly to reflect the planning or implementation of one or more corrective actions or restructuring steps based on NCLB Accountability Status
- Involvement of SILT is integral to the implementation of each schools’ SIP and the AIP
- School suggested ILT members include:
 - Principal
 - School Data Team Representative/Teaching and Learning Specialists (TLS)
 - One representative from Special Education team
 - One representative from English Language Learners (ELL) team
 - For Elementary Schools: One representative each from K–2 and 3–5
 - For Secondary Schools: One representative from each content area
 - Representative from Guidance team
 - ‘At large’ representative
- Schools should not take on lots of “other” initiatives, unless a solid plan is in place to achieve the objectives and outcomes laid out in the district plan.

Members of School’s ILT:

Name of Staff Member	Position
Susan Beck	Principal
Daniel Viegas	TLS
Cynthia Loomer	Grade 5 Inclusion Classroom Teacher
Brenda Rocha	Grade 3 Classroom Teacher
Stacy Sullivan	Grade 3 Inclusion Classroom Teacher
Sally Frazee	Grade 1 Inclusion Classroom Teacher



**NBPS School Improvement Plan (SIP)
School Year 2013-2014**

School Analysis of Needs in Relation to the District Improvement Plan (AIP)
(Include reference to completed DESE Conditions for School Effectiveness Self-

Assessment)

AIP	Strengths	Focus areas																		
<p>Objective 1: Prepare all NBPS students for college and career success by implementing rigorous standards and monitoring student progress in attaining those standards to a level of proficiency</p>	<p>MCAS ELA Percentages of Proficient/Advanced (P/A) for All Grade 3-5 Students is on an upward trend, even with our 40% teacher turn-over rate for each of the past three (3) years due to “owned” and “temporary assignment” classroom positions resulting in no grade level with the same teaching team for the past 3 years.</p> <p align="center">MCAS ELA P/A %</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="451 682 704 779"> <tr> <td>2013</td> <td>27%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2012</td> <td>18%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011</td> <td>32%</td> </tr> </table> <p>MCAS PPI increased from 0 points in 2012 to 50 points in 2013. Deeper analysis showed that Grade 3 had the greatest increase in the number of students in proficiency/advanced (18% in 2012; 36.8% in 2013) as a result of unpacking and framing reading instruction using the <i>John Hannigan Reading Foundational Map</i> in SY 2011-2012 (when grade 3 would have been 2nd graders) and data-driven, tiered instructional practices for “at-risk” students SY 2012-2013.</p> <p>MCAS ELA 2 year standard analysis (2012 to 2013) demonstrated the following trends for Grades 3-5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ELA Open Response</i> increased by 9% correct responses (38.33% to 47.33%) • <i>Key Ideas and Details</i> flat-lined with 56.33% 2013 School/State Differential: -2.6 points 2012 School/State Differential: -10.67 points 	2013	27%	2012	18%	2011	32%	<p>To close the achievement gap and meet our MCAS CPI Targets, we need to increase the number of students who are not proficient /advanced (P/A):</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="889 506 1269 663"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>ELA 2013 # P/A</th> <th>ELA 2014 Target #P/A</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>14</td> <td>28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>6</td> <td>23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>9</td> <td>23</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>To target instruction with focus and purpose, SILT members drilled MCAS data to identify the curriculum standard with the lowest proficiency rate. A two (2) year standard analysis (2012 to 2013) demonstrated the following trend for Grades 3-5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Craft and Structure</i> decreased by .33% (from 60% to 59.67%) 2013 School/State Differential: -17.67 points 2012 School/State Differential: - 16.67 points <p>Therefore, Grade 3-5 educators will unpack and target data-informed, differentiated instruction for Common Core State Standards (CCSS) <i>Craft and Structure</i> with the implementation of rigorous Literacy Blocks.</p> <p>Framing our work in this area, as identified by SILT members’ analysis of the DESE <i>Conditions for School Effectiveness</i> will be CSE III-B-3, “...aligns assessments an devaluates student work based on a common understanding of what mastery looks like,” and CSE IV-A-3, “...provides students with lessons that...promote higher-order thinking (HOT).”</p>	Grade	ELA 2013 # P/A	ELA 2014 Target #P/A	3	14	28	4	6	23	5	9	23
2013	27%																			
2012	18%																			
2011	32%																			
Grade	ELA 2013 # P/A	ELA 2014 Target #P/A																		
3	14	28																		
4	6	23																		
5	9	23																		
<p>Objective 2: Develop a collaborative and accountable culture of using data to improve instructional practice and decision-making</p>	<p>SY 2012-2013, Hannigan Data Team members (4 classroom teachers) were trained with the RBT Data Inquiry process and implemented the data-inquiry cycle to adjust instructional practices. A trend was seen in the DIBELS data with educators, in the same grade level, who implemented the data inquiry process to target differentiated instruction (Classroom A) and with those (Classroom B) who had not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom A 2012-13 DIBELS Composite: BOY - 72% MOY - 74% EOY - 71% • Classroom B 2012-13 DIBELS Composite: BOY - 72% MOY - 55% EOY - 32% 	<p>2012-2013 Galileo ELA Benchmark Assessment scores demonstrated higher proficiency percentages in grade 2 classrooms with data-driven (DD), differentiated instruction(DI) demonstrated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom with DD/DI: -Pretest: 19% (3 students) -Posttest: 33% (6 students) • Classroom without DD/DI: -Pretest: 21% (8 students) -Posttest: 20% (8 students) <p>Therefore, SILT members will train and build capacity for Grade 1 and 2 educators to drive differentiated instruction/interventions for reading fluency and retelling skills, as guided by the TCT data-inquiry process.</p>																		



**NBPS School Improvement Plan (SIP)
School Year 2013-2014**

		<p>Framing our work in this area will be CSE IV-A-3, “...integrates differentiated instruction so that 80-90% of students learn key concepts through core instruction and without the need for tiered support.”</p>																																		
<p>Objective 3: Expand district, school, and educator capacity to develop, deliver, and supervise effective instruction to all students (Rigor)</p>	<p>MCAS Math Percentages of Proficient/Advanced (P/A) for all Grade 3-5 Students is on a slight upward trend, even with a change in grade 3-5 classroom teachers for each of the past 3 years: grades 3 and 5 had a change in SY 2011-2012 and grade 4 has had a change of teachers in all three years. In addition to this 33% were first year teachers on a “temporary assignment.”</p> <p align="center">MATH P/A %</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>2013</td> <td>26%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2012</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011</td> <td>31%</td> </tr> </table> <p>Data analysis of two MCAS years (2012 to 2013) demonstrated the following trends for Grades 3-5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Math Open Response</i> items decreased by 9 % correct responses (41.33% to 32%) • <i>Number and Operations Fractions</i> increased by 13.66 % points (43.34% to 57%) and was the domain with the least percentage of correct responses <p>Fall 2012, a grade 3 teacher was trained in <i>Fraction Safe-T Kits</i> designed to advance students’ conceptual understanding of fraction numbers. Using the “train-the-training model, she trained her grade 3 colleague. As a result of this PD and focus, the greatest proficiency growth and decreasing school/state differential were evidenced in Grade 3. The following MCAS <i>Number and Operations Fractions</i> (2012-13 Domain) and <i>Number and Operations</i> (2011 Strand) table of proficiency percentages and school/state differentials demonstrates this data trend:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>2013</th> <th>2012</th> <th>2011</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>78% (-1)</td> <td>61% (-27)</td> <td>62% (-11)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>54% (-27)</td> <td>31% (-30)</td> <td>54% (-13)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>39% (-26)</td> <td>38% (-27)</td> <td>57% (-12)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2013	26%	2012	20%	2011	31%	Grade	2013	2012	2011	3	78% (-1)	61% (-27)	62% (-11)	4	54% (-27)	31% (-30)	54% (-13)	5	39% (-26)	38% (-27)	57% (-12)	<p>To close the achievement gap and meet our MCAS CPI Targets we need to increase the number of students who are not proficient /advanced:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>Math 2013 # P/A</th> <th>MATH 2014 Target of # P/A</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>21</td> <td>28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>1</td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>21</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Therefore, Grade 3 will use the “train-the-trainer model” to guide Grade 3-5 educators’ unpacking and targeting data-informed, differentiated instruction for CCSS for <i>Number and Operations-Fractions</i> anchor standards, as evidenced with the development, implementation, calibration and analysis of Open Response common formative assessments.</p> <p>Framing our work in this area will be CSE III-A-2, “...unpack standards so that they have a working knowledge of proficiency.”</p>	Grade	Math 2013 # P/A	MATH 2014 Target of # P/A	3	21	28	4	1	19	5	6	21
2013	26%																																			
2012	20%																																			
2011	31%																																			
Grade	2013	2012	2011																																	
3	78% (-1)	61% (-27)	62% (-11)																																	
4	54% (-27)	31% (-30)	54% (-13)																																	
5	39% (-26)	38% (-27)	57% (-12)																																	
Grade	Math 2013 # P/A	MATH 2014 Target of # P/A																																		
3	21	28																																		
4	1	19																																		
5	6	21																																		



**NBPS School Improvement Plan (SIP)
School Year 2013-2014**

<p>Objective 4: Create, communicate, build, and support momentum for the vision of NBPS that will be embraced by the New Bedford community and all of its stakeholders</p>	<p>From SY 2011 to present (tenure of current principal):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PTO increased from zero (0) to three - five (3-5) regular attendees at monthly meetings; • Volunteerism, as evidenced by number of COR'ed parents, increased from zero (0) to twelve (12); • All 2012-2013 SIP Family Collaboration goals were met increasing the number of community partners from zero (0) to three (3): Rev. Rodriques' <i>Violent-Free Healthy Choices</i>, <i>The Caring Network</i>, and <i>The Saturday Academy</i>. 	<p>Analysis of the DESE CSE demonstrated an area of focus for CSE X-A-1, "...ensure that students, families, and community partners understand the school's improvement plan and learning goals..."</p> <p>Therefore, the Principal will collaborate with families to increase the number of families actively engaged in Hannigan's PTO and School Council to provide opportunities for effective, on-going two-way communication.</p>
---	---	---

WHAT WE WILL ACHIEVE

DISTRICT & SCHOOL Improvement Plan FINAL OUTCOME 1.1:

All elementary schools will reduce by at least 40% the # of students who are not proficient or advanced on the 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade ELA and Math MCAS by the end of the year

Each school in NBPS will meet or exceed annual attendance targets of 95%+ attendance rate for Gr. K-8 and 92%+ for Gr. 9-12

Short-Term Outcomes 1.1 (Student Learning Goals)

[Administrator and teacher student learning goals will be aligned to these outcomes.]

DIBELS

- From BOY to MOY, all K-2 teachers will reduce by 20% the # of students not meeting benchmark on each DIBELS repeated subtest
- From BOY to EOY, all K-2 teachers will reduce by at least 40% the # of students not meeting benchmark on the DIBELS composite score

GALILEO

- From BOY to MOY, all grade 2-5 teachers will reduce by 25% the # of students not proficient on Galileo ELA and math
- From BOY to EOY, all grade 2-5 teachers will reduce by 40% the # of students not proficient on Galileo ELA and math

District Writing Benchmarks

- From BOY to MOY, all K-5 teachers will reduce by 25% the # of students not meeting proficiency on the benchmark writing assessments
- From MOY to EOY, all K-5 teachers will reduce by 25% the # of students not meeting proficiency on the benchmark writing assessments



Objectives 1-3

SMART Goals that link to Final Outcomes	Activities and Action Steps to support Strategic Initiatives (resulting in Final Outcomes 1.1 and 1.2)	OWNER	TIMELINE
<p>From BOY to EOY, all grade 3-5 teachers will reduce by 40% the # of students not proficient on Galileo ELA</p>	<p>Establish systems and structures to adjust instructional practices for rigorous Literacy Block</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SILT will develop and distribute a school-wide common formative assessment schedule (3 times a year), using Galileo to target <i>Craft and Structure</i> skills • All grade 3-5 educators will develop criteria for success rubrics for common formative open response assessments scoring, as evidenced with TCT agendas and action plans • Three (3) common assessments, specific to \ <i>Craft and Structure</i>, will be administered, after each Galileo ELA Benchmark Assessment • Every 6-8 weeks, TCTs will analyze common formative and Benchmark data and calibrate rubrics to adjust instructional practices as evidenced with agendas, action plans and <i>Classroom Data Summary Sheets/Tally Sheets</i> • To monitor implementation of adjusted instructional practices, the principal will conduct 2 mini-observations and 1 Focused Learning Walk each week to provide educators with written growth-producing feedback specific to look-fors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1st cycle: <i>Think, Pair and Share</i> - 2nd cycle: <i>Higher Order Thinking Questioning</i> - 3rd cycle: <i>Think Aloud</i> • 90% of educators will be proficient in using common assessment formative data to inform and support the advanced learning of skills with rigorous reading lessons, as indicated by their rating in Standard I-A-3 and sampling of principal LW observations using the NBPS Rigor Rubric 	<p>Principal</p> <p>Grade 3-5 Teachers</p> <p>TLS</p> <p>SILT Grade 3, 4 and 5 Chairs</p> <p>Principal</p> <p>Principal</p>	<p>October 18</p> <p>October 31</p> <p>November 4-8 December 16-20 Feb. 10-14, 2014</p> <p>November 22; January 17 March 7; April 18; and May 30</p> <p>-Nov. 12- Dec. 13 -Jan. 2- Feb. 7 -March 3- 15 and April 1-May 2 (MCAS March 18-31 and May 5-20)</p> <p>June 27, 2014</p>
<p>BOY to EOY, all grade 1 and 2 teachers will reduce by at least 40% the # of students not meeting benchmark on the DIBELS composite score</p>	<p>Establish systems and structures for the implementation and monitoring instructional practices for differentiated reading instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 1 and 2 teachers will participate in Assistant Superintendent’s Literacy PD outlining expectations of designing a rigorous Literacy Block • All teachers use data-inquiry cycle process on a 6 week cycle: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -identify “at-risk” students using 2013 BOY and MOY DIBELS and Progress Monitoring data -target strategy-based flexible groups 	<p>Grade 1 and 2 Teachers</p> <p>SILT Grade 1 Chair</p>	<p>October 3</p> <p>October 17; November 22; January 17 March 7; April 18; and May 30</p>



NBPS School Improvement Plan (SIP) School Year 2013-2014

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers will participate in October Professional Development to implement rigorous reading instructional practices (<i>think, pair, share</i> and <i>higher order thinking questioning</i>), as evidenced in meeting criteria in <i>Lesson Plan Rubric (Leverage Leadership)</i> lesson plans, mini-observations, school-wide learning walks, and supervising/evaluating educators • TCTs will develop actions plans to target the instructional needs of the at-risk students, focus reading fluency and comprehension (4-6 week cycle) • DIBELS Progress Monitoring of DORF Fluency and Retell will be done with fidelity on a 6 week cycle: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to adjust instructional practices with support of the coaching cycle with TLS -provide extra-learning times for focused instruction • All educators will be effective in developing well-structured reading lessons, as indicated by their proficiency rating in Standard I-A-3, as evidenced by at least 3 mini-observation a week using Literacy Instructional Framework Rubric 	<p>Principal</p> <p>TLS</p> <p>SILT Grade 1 Chair</p> <p>Principal</p>	<p>October 24- November 2</p> <p>November 9- Ongoing 2014</p> <p>November 22; January 17 March 7; April 18; and May 30</p> <p>June 27, 2014</p>
<p>From BOY to EOY, all grade 2-5 teachers will reduce by 40% the # of students not proficient on Galileo Math</p>	<p>Grade 3-5 TCTs will administer and analyze open response math common formative assessments, specific to <i>Fraction Number and Operations</i>, to adjust instructional practices with growth-producing feedback.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers will use data-inquiry cycle process on a 6 week cycle: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -identify “at-risk” students using 2013 BOY and MOY Galileo -target flexible groups • Create and disseminate for implementation a common formative math open response assessment schedule for grade 3-5 general and special educators • Develop common formative assessments, with scoring rubrics, specific to <i>Number and Operations Fractions</i> using the Galileo Assessment system • Employ strategies from the <i>Fraction Safe-T Kit</i> to deepen conceptual understanding of fraction numbers as a result of train-the-trainer professional development, as evidenced by mini-observations and focused learning walks (see monitoring implementation schedule below) • Administer with fidelity and score with grade-level calibration three (3) math open response common formative assessment using the <i>Looking at Student Work Protocol</i> 	<p>Grade 3-5 Teachers</p> <p>Principal</p> <p>TLS</p> <p>SILT Grade 3 Chair & Principal</p> <p>Grade 3-5 Teachers</p>	<p>October 30</p> <p>November 2</p> <p>November 26</p> <p>January 27- February 14</p> <p>Feb. 24-28; March 3-7; April 14-18</p>



NBPS School Improvement Plan (SIP) School Year 2013-2014

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TCTs will use the data inquiry process to analyze Galileo Math MOY data to differentiate and target <i>Fraction Number and Operations</i> instruction following NBPS Math Curriculum Map • To monitor implementation of adjusted instructional practices, the principal will conduct 2 mini-observations and 1 Focused Learning Walk each week to provide educators with written growth-producing feedback specific to look-fors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1st cycle: <i>Think, Pair and Share</i> - 2nd cycle: <i>Higher Order Thinking Questioning</i> - 3rd cycle: <i>Think Aloud</i> 	SILT Grade 4 Chair	February 7-10, March 10-14; April 28-May 2
		Principal	Beginning November, then weekly

WHAT WE WILL ACHIEVE

Early Evidence of Change 4.1 (Professional Practice Goals)

- By MOY, over two-thirds of schools exhibit the criteria for a welcoming environment, as assessed by school learning walks and community feedback
- By MOY, over two-thirds of families rate their schools and teachers as effectively creating a welcoming environment and meeting their communication needs, as reported in parent surveys and/or at parent teacher meetings and conferences
- By MOY, over two-thirds of teachers and school administrators believe their schools are welcoming environments to all families and can point to specific changes in their schools that led to an improved environment in self appraisals of their schools, as measured on the Massachusetts TELL survey

HOW WE WILL GET THERE

STRATEGIC INITIATIVE 4.1

Establish policies, processes, practices, and monitoring mechanisms to ensure that all families are welcomed members of the school community and are communicated with effectively

Early Evidence of Change 4.1 (Professional Practice Goals)

- By MOY, over two-thirds of schools exhibit the criteria for a welcoming environment, as assessed by school learning walks and community feedback
- By MOY, over two-thirds of families rate their schools and teachers as effectively creating a welcoming environment and meeting their communication needs, as reported in parent surveys and/or at parent teacher meetings and conferences
- By MOY, over two-thirds of teachers and school administrators believe their schools are welcoming environments to all families and can point to specific changes in their schools that led to an improved environment in self appraisals of their schools, as measured on the Massachusetts TELL survey

STRATEGIC INITIATIVE 4.2

Establish a process for authentic two-way dialogue between schools and families that creates transparency and promotes partnership for academic success



**NBPS School Improvement Plan (SIP)
School Year 2013-2014**

SMART Goals that link to Final Outcomes	Activities and Action Steps to support Strategic Initiatives (resulting in Final Outcomes 4.1 and 4.2)	OWNER	TIMELINE
<p>By MOY, over two-thirds of families rate their schools and teachers as effectively creating a welcoming environment and meeting their communication needs, as reported in parent surveys and/or at parent teacher meetings and conferences</p>	<p>By EOY 2014 Hannigan’s PTO and School Council will have used culturally sensitive practices to welcome all families and assist in the understanding of how school operates and how to exercise their rights under state and federal education laws, as evidenced by informational flyers and agendas in three languages and attendance sign-in sheets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By September, parents of first grade students will have received an invitation in their home language to participate in an afterschool discussion to understand the operational aspects and expectations of Hannigan School. • By October, parents of all students will have received an invitation in their home language to participate in a school-wide Open House afterschool and hear about opportunities to get involved with PTO and School Council. • By December, parents of grade 1 and 2 students will have participated in an District Benchmark Assessment to understand how DIBELS and Galileo measures student learning, as evidenced with invitational flyers and attendance sheets. • By February, parents of grade 3 -5 students will have participated in an District Benchmark Assessment to understand how MCAS and Galileo measures student learning, as evidenced with invitational flyers and attendance sheets. • By March, families will have rated, via a survey, how welcome Hannigan staff was in terms of communicating their expectations, opportunities to participate in their children’s learning, and responses to family concerns. • By June 2014, families will have participated in school-wide events related to their children: Winter Concert, Spring Concert, and Grade 5 Promotion, as evidenced with sign-in sheets. 	<p>Principal</p> <p>School Secretary/ Principal</p> <p>TLS/Principal</p> <p>TLS/Principal</p> <p>Principal/ Secretary</p> <p>Principal</p>	<p>September 2013</p> <p>September 2013</p> <p>December 2013</p> <p>February 2014</p> <p>March 2014</p> <p>June 2014</p>



NBPS School Improvement Plan (SIP)
School Year 2013-2014