



**Ellis D. Parker Elementary School
Dr. Vicki Gilmer-Principal
Mary Salerno - Assistant Principal**

**Jenn Wharton - Chair
David Estrada, Courtney Blair, Susan Corder, Suzette Hilton - Team Members
Faculty and Staff of Parker Elementary**

**School Improvement Plan
SY 2018-2019 to 2020-2021**

Summary of Goals

#	Name	Details	Type	Total Budgetary Cost
1	Professional Learning Communities/Focused Collaboration	Objectives: 1 Strategies: 1 Activities: 5	Organizational	none
2	Mathematics	Objectives: 1 Strategies: 2 Activities: 12	Academic	none
3	Literacy	Objectives: 3 Strategies: 3 Activities: 13	Academic	none
4	Communication and Engagement	Objectives: 2 Strategies: 1 Activities: 5	Organizational	none

Goal 1 – Professional Learning Communities/Focused Collaboration

Alignment to DoDEA Blueprint for Continuous Improvement:

- Goal 2 – Strategic Initiative 2.1.a: Quality Implementation of Professional Learning Communities/Focused Collaboration
- Goal 2 – Strategic Initiative 2.1.c: Ongoing professional learning

SMART GOAL:

- Parker Elementary will increase from 94% in SY 19-20 to 96% very evident in SY 20-21 on Stage 4, Indicator D *“Develop lesson plans with differentiation and higher-level cognitive demand tasks”* as measured on the Focused Collaboration Observation Tool.

Information that supports the selection of SMART Goal

Data Source	Domain or Sub-skill	Measure	Scores
Focused Collaboration Observation	Stage 4, Indicator D: Develop lesson plans with differentiation and higher-level cognitive demand tasks	Percent Very Evident	94% (SY 19-20)
Learning Walkthrough Tool	Indicator 9 (lesson tasks require productive struggle, problem solving or reasoning)	Percent Observed	89.3% (SY 19-20)
Learning Walkthrough Tool	Indicator 5 (lessons are paced and structured to keep all students engaged throughout the learning)	Percent Observed	92% (SY 19-20)

Learning Walkthrough Tool	Indicator 12 (students respond to and/or use higher order questions in classroom discourse)	Percent Observed	no data (SY 19-20)
----------------------------------	--	-------------------------	---------------------------

Name of Strategies and Activities that support SMART Goal				
Strategy Name		Strategy Description		
Collaborative Lesson Planning and Instruction		Developing teacher team capacity to collaboratively plan content instruction based on agreed upon essential learning standards with appropriate cognitive demand and differentiation based on data		
Activities	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible	Completed Y/N
Conduct needs assessment to determine the needs of each PLC team	10-1-19	10-17-19	Admin, CSI team, PLC leadership team, teachers	Y
Decide what professional learning is required based on the results of the needs assessment	10-21-19	10-21-19	Admin, CSI team, PLC leadership team, teachers	Y
Design professional learning packages to meet the identified needs of each team	10-21-19	10-21-19	Admin, CSI team, PLC leadership team, teachers	Y
Deliver content according to School-wide 18-week plan	11-7-20	4-30-21	Admin, CSI team, PLC leadership team, teachers	
Evaluate the impact of the identified strategy and implementation of Professional Learning using the FCOT and Learning Walkthrough Tool	May 2021	May 2021	Admin, CSI team, PLC leadership team, teachers	

Evidence that demonstrates the effectiveness of the strategy (Use same data source and measures used to select SMART Goal)

Baseline Score	Middle of Year	End-of-Year Score	SMART Goal Met/Not Met
FCOT Stage 4 Indicator D 94% very evident			
LWT Indicator 9 89.3% observed			
LWT Indicator 5 92% observed			
LWT Indicator 12 no data			

Goal 2 – Mathematics

Alignment to DoDEA Blueprint for Continuous Improvement:

- Goal 1 – Strategic Initiative 1.1.c: Differentiated Instruction for All Students
- Goal 1 – Strategic Initiative 1.1.d: Access to Rigorous Instruction
- Goal 2 – Strategic Initiative 2.2.b: Aligned Standards-Based Instruction System

SMART Goals

- Students in grades K-2 will score 60% in Performance Level 3 (meets the standard) using DoDEA Americas End of Year Summative Assessment in SY 2020-2021.
- Students in 3rd Grade will increase achievement in Mathematics Sub Claim A - Major Content on the CCRS Summative Assessment from 34% in SY 2017-2018 in the Meets or Exceeds levels to 39% in the Meets or Exceeds levels in SY 2020-2021.
- Students in 4th Grade will increase achievement in Mathematics Sub Claim C- Express Math Reasoning on the CCRS Summative Assessment from 35% in SY 2017-2018 in the Meets or Exceeds levels to 50% in the Meets or Exceeds levels in SY 2020-2021.
- Students in 5th Grade will increase achievement in Mathematics Sub Claim C- Express Math Reasoning on the CCRS Summative Assessment from 46% in SY 2018-2019 in the Meets or Exceeds levels to 48% in the Meets or Exceeds levels in SY 2020-2021.
- Students in 6th Grade will increase achievement in Mathematics Sub Claim D- Modeling and Application on the CCRS Summative Assessment from 36% in SY 2018-2019 in the Meets or Exceeds levels to 38% in the Meets or Exceeds levels in SY 2020-2021.

Information that supports the selection of SMART Goal(s)			
Data Source	Domain or Sub-skill	Measure	Scores
CCRS Summative Assessment SY 2017-2018	Sub Claim A - Major Content Sub Claim B - Additional and Supporting Content Sub Claim C - Express Math Reasoning	Performance Levels 4 & 5 Meets or Exceeds Expectations	3rd Grade (A) 34% 4th Grade 35% (C) MET 5th Grade 42% (B) MET 6th Grade 40% (B) MET
CCRS Summative Assessment SY 2018-2019	Sub Claim A - Major Content Sub Claim C - Express Math Reasoning Sub Claim D - Modeling and Application	Performance Levels 4 & 5 Meets or Exceeds Expectations	3rd Grade (A) 34% 4th Grade (C) 49% 5th Grade (C) 46% 6th Grade (D) 36%

Name of Strategies and Activities that support SMART Goals(s)					
Strategy Name		Strategy Description			
Multi-Tiered Interventions		Multi-leveled approach for supporting students that is monitored and modified as needed for student success.			
Activities		Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible	Completed Y/N
Math Tiered Intervention - daily multi-tiered instruction and intervention matched to individual needs		Aug 2018	May 2019	Teachers, Math IS, Admin	Y
Grade level teams use benchmark assessments for initial evaluation of student needs (DoDEA Americas SHK BOY		Aug 2019	Aug 2019	Teachers, Math IS	Y

math assessment and local assessments) and formation of student groups				
Differentiated flexible student groups are progress monitored and adjusted regularly by grade level focused collaboration teams, based on student needs	Aug 2019	May 2021	Teachers, Math IS, SPED	
Members of each grade level team implement daily Tier 1 instruction and support through the Mathematics Instructional Component (MIC) model	Aug 2019	May 2021	Teachers, Math IS, SPED	
Tier 2 Interventions are developed for differentiated standards-based small group instruction, focusing on specific needs in math, and using progress monitoring	Aug 2019	May 2021	Teachers, Math IS, SPED	
Tier 3 interventions are developed for individualized standards-based support and implemented by the Math IS in support of SST goals	Aug 2019	May 2021	Math IS	
Tier 4 student intervention support in mathematics is developed and implemented by Special Education teachers in accordance with IEP/504 plan goals	Aug 2019	May 2021	SPED	
Strategy Name	Strategy Description			
Progress Monitoring	The process of frequently gathering student achievement data, analyzing the data in a timely manner, and making instructional/intervention decisions based on the data.			
Activities	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible	Completed Y/N

Progress Monitoring - frequently gathering data using exit tickets, formative assessments, observation of student work, and other means, and using this data to monitor progress toward grade level standards and identified areas of need below grade level	Aug 2018	May 2021	Teachers, Math IS, Admin	
1. Grade level teams develop and implement a system for regular progress monitoring during math units	Aug 2019	May 2021	Teachers, Math IS, SPED	
2. Grade level teams develop and utilize regular formative assessments for progress monitoring to include: exit tickets, quick checks, turn and talk, station work products, and teacher observation of student work during small group instruction	Aug 2019	May 2021	Teachers, Math IS, SPED	
3. Teachers use common formative assessments to monitor student progress, adjust small groups, and determine needed interventions	Aug 2019	May 2021	Teachers, Math IS, SPED	
4. Teachers in focused collaboration use a “looking at student work protocol” (e.g., 3 Stack Protocol) to collaboratively evaluate student work and inform changes to instructional practice.	Aug 2019	May 2021	Teachers, Math IS, SPED, Admin	
5. Teachers report progress monitoring data in SST, CSC, grade level focused collaboration, and on school-level data tracker as required	Aug 2019	May 2021	Teachers, Math IS, SPED, Admin	

<p>Quarterly focus on specific standards clusters using selected word problems/performance assessments and “looking at student work protocol” at grade level to monitor student progress toward identified areas of need:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Problem solving in kindergarten (K.OA) focuses on understanding addition as putting together and adding to, and subtraction as taking apart and taking from (within 10 - use Table of Common Addition and Subtraction Situations from CCRSM Overview) ● Problem solving in first grade (1.OA.A) focuses on representing and solving one-step word problems with the unknown in different locations (within 20 - Table of Common Addition and Subtraction Situations from CCRSM Overview) ● Problem solving in second grade (2.OA.A) focuses on representing and solving one- and two-step word problems with the unknown in different locations (within 100 - use Table of Common Addition and Subtraction Situations from CCRSM Overview) ● Problem solving in third grade (3.OA.D) focuses on representing and solving two-step word problems using the four operations and assessing the reasonableness of answers (use Table of Common Addition and Subtraction Situations AND Table of Common Multiplication and Division Situations from CCRSM Overview) ● Problem solving with factors and multiples (4.OA.B) in fourth grade - finding errors in computation and reasoning 	Oct 2019	May 2021	Grade Level PLC, Admin, Math IS, Math ISS	
---	-------------	-------------	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Problem solving with conversions of measurement units (5.MD.A) in fifth grade - finding errors in computation and reasoning ● Problem solving involving modeling and reasoning with securely held knowledge and grade level content in sixth grade 				
---	--	--	--	--

Evidence that demonstrates the effectiveness of the strategy (Use same data source and measures used to select SMART Goal)

Baseline Score	Quarter 2 Score	Quarter 3 Score	End-of-Year Score	SMART Goal Met/Not Met
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● K-2 gathering baseline data ● Grade 3 (SubClaim A 39%) - Not Met in SY 18-19 (34% no change) ● Grade 4 (SubClaim C 39%) - Met in SY 18-19 (35% to 49%) ● Grade 5 (SubClaim B 47%) - Met in SY 18-19 (42% to 54%) ● Grade 6 (SubClaim B 45%) - Met in SY 18-19 (40% to 47%)

Goal 3 – Literacy

Alignment to DoDEA Blueprint for Continuous Improvement:

- Goal 1 – Strategic Initiative 1.1.c: Differentiated Instruction for All Students
- Goal 1 – Strategic Initiative 1.1.d: Access to Rigorous Instruction
- Goal 2 – Strategic Initiative 2.2.b: Aligned Standards-Based Instruction System

SMART Goal(s):

SMART Goal A -

- Parker ES students in Kindergarten and Grade 1 will achieve 60% proficiency on the Reading Proficiency Tool in SY 20-21.
- Parker ES students in Grade 2 will improve from 81% proficiency in October 2020 to 84% proficiency in June 2021 on the Reading Proficiency Tool.
- Parker ES students in Grade 3 will improve from 63% proficiency in October 2020 to 66% proficiency in June 2021 on the Reading Proficiency Tool.

SMART Goal B -

- Parker ES students in grades 3-5 will achieve 50% scoring in Meets and Exceeds in Literacy on the *CCRS Summative Assessment* in SY 20-21.

SMART Goal C -

- Students in 6th Grade will increase achievement in Literacy Sub Claim Informational Text on the *CCRS Summative Assessment* from 58% in the Meets and Exceeds level in SY 17-18 to 62% in the Meets and Exceeds Level in SY 20-21.

Information that supports the selection of SMART Goal(s)

Data Source	Domain or Sub-skill	Measure	Scores
Reading Proficiency Tool	Reading Level	Reading Proficiency	Grade K - MOY Grade 1 - 52% Oct 2020 Grade 2 - 81%

			Grade 3 - 68%
CCR Summative Assessment Grades 3-5	Sub Claim	Level 4 and 5 Meets or Exceeds Expectations	No Data Yet
CCR Summative Assessment grade 6 SY 17-18	Sub Claim: Informational Text	Level 4 and 5 Meets or Exceeds Expectations	Grade 6 - 58%

Name of Strategies and Activities that support SMART Goals(s)					
Strategy Name		Strategy Description			
Balanced Literacy Workshop Model		Comprehensive, research-proven approach that builds foundational skills: phonics, word study, and fluency to produce proficient readers			
Activities		Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible	Completed Y/N
Grade level teams use the workshop model to provide rigorous, integrated reading, writing, speaking, and listening instruction enabling all students to master rigorous learning goals with the support of strong differentiated instruction and responsive teaching based upon ongoing assessments.		Aug 2018	May 2019	Teachers, Reading ISS, SLL, Admin	Y
Strategy Name		Strategy Description			
Guided Reading		Small, flexible reading groups developed according to student reading level			
Activities		Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible	Completed Y/N
Grade level teams use benchmark assessments for initial evaluation of student needs (Reading Proficiency Test) and formation of student groups.		Oct 2020	Oct 2020	Teachers, Reading IS	Y

Differentiated flexible guided reading groups are progress monitored and adjusted regularly by grade level focused collaboration teams, based on student needs.	Aug 2019	May 2021	Teachers, Reading IS, SPED	
Members of each grade level team conduct daily tiered guided reading group instruction to support CCRS-L standards/concepts from adopted curricular resources.	Aug 2019	May 2021	Teachers, Reading IS, SPED	
Tier 1 guided reading is grade-level reading support implemented for all students in the general education classroom setting, using appropriate leveled text based on regular progress monitoring.	Aug 2019	May 2021	Teachers, Reading IS, SPED	
Tier 2 interventions are developed for differentiated standards-based daily small group instruction, focusing on specific needs in reading, and using weekly progress monitoring. Reading IS supports Tier 2 in addition to push-in support of guided reading groups who are reading just below grade level.	Aug 2019	May 2021	Teachers, Reading IS, SPED	
Tier 3 interventions are developed for daily individualized standards-based support and implemented by the classroom teacher and Reading IS in support of SST goals for students reading well below grade level.	Aug 2019	May 2021	Teachers, Reading IS	
Tier 4 student intervention support in reading is developed and implemented by Special Education teachers in accordance with IEP/504 plan goals.	Aug 2019	May 2021	SPED	
Guided Reading training is conducted regularly by District-level Literacy ISS to support teacher needs.	Aug 2019	May-2021	Literacy ISS, Admin, Teachers, Reading IS	
Strategy Name	Strategy Description			

Targeted Literacy Intervention	Targeted, small group instruction designed to provide scaffolded support for students who read below grade level			
Activities	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible	Completed Y/N
Targeted Literacy Intervention	Aug 2018	May 2021	Reading IS, Admin	

Strategy Name	Strategy Description			
CORE 6 Strategy - Write to Learn (Grades 3-6) Emphasis on Readable Writing	<p>Write to Learn is a set of nested tools for writing and learning in all content areas. These tools support three different types of classroom writing, including READABLE WRITING, which requires students to clarify and organize their thinking to develop on-demand essays or responses (Research Simulation Task).</p> <p>CCRS have identified three types of texts that are particularly important for students' readiness for college and careers in the 21st century: arguments, informative/explanatory texts, and narratives (Core 6 Strategies-Silver, Dewing, & Perini).</p>			
Activities	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible	Completed Y/N
Apply the understanding by design (UbD) process to develop vertically- and horizontally-aligned year long plans, unit plans, and lesson plans that contain the essential content and skills students must learn to meet the CCRSL writing expectations.	Aug 2020	May 2021	3rd-6th grade teachers, Reading Specialists, ESOL, SPED teachers, PLC facilitator	
Provide students with frequent opportunities to work on provisional, readable, and polished writing tasks to inform, narrate, and express an opinion.	Aug 2020	May 2021	3rd-6th grade teachers, special area teachers and	

			support staff who work with 3rd-6th grade students	
Routinely incorporate high-quality models of written tasks into instruction, and frequently model their own writing process for students.	Aug 2020	May 2021	3rd-6th grade teachers, special area teachers and support staff who work with 3rd-6th grade students.	

Evidence that demonstrates the effectiveness of the strategy (Use same data source and measures used to select SMART Goal)				
Data Source	BOY Score	MOY Score	EOY Score	SMART Goal Met/Not Met
RPT	Grade 1 - 52% Grade 2 - 81% Grade 3 - 68%	Grade K - MOY	Grade K - Grade 1 - Grade 2 - Grade 3 -	Goal A - SMART Goals for Grades 2&3 adjusted from District goal of 60% due to BOY proficiency levels (SY 20-21)
CCR Summative Assessment Grades 3-5				Goal B - using District goal of 50% for baseline assessment year
CCR Summative Assessment Grade 6				Goal C (grade 6 - 62%) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Literacy SubClaim Informational Text - Not Met in SY 18-19 (58% to 47%)

Goal 4 – Communication and Engagement

Alignment to DoDEA Blueprint for Continuous Improvement:

- Goal 4 – Strategic Initiative 4.2a: Internal Communication — Develop and implement a DoDEA-wide internal communication plan.
- Goal 5 – Strategic Initiative 5.1b: Partnerships for Student Success — Promote, foster, and support partnerships for student success.

SMART Goal:

- The Parker ES staff perception of school leadership’s consideration of input or feedback as “quite a lot” will increase from 45% in November 2020 to 47% in May 2021.
- The Parker ES parent perception of the school’s consideration or use of input or feedback as “quite a lot” will increase from 29% in November 2020 to 31% in May 2021.

Information that supports the selection of SMART Goal

Data Source	Domain or Sub-skill	Measure	Scores
Parker Faculty and Staff Communication & Engagement Feedback Form SY 20-21	How much do you think your school’s leadership considers or uses your input or feedback?	Quite a lot	44.9% (Nov 2020) of 78 total responses
Parker Parent Communication & Engagement Feedback Form SY 20-21	How much do you think the school considers or uses your input or feedback?	Quite a lot	28.9% (Nov 2020) of 114 total responses

Name of Strategies and Activities that support SMART Goals(s)				
Strategy Name		Strategy Description		
Purposeful Planned Engagement		Implement research-based effective, regular communications and requests for feedback between administration and faculty/staff and administration and parents/families		
Activities	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible	Completed Y/N
Create a Parent Committee for meetings with administration to discuss issues (BOY/MOY/EOY)	Sept 2021		Admin	
Implement a "Patriot Press" school newsletter to standardize regular communications from the school to families	Feb 2021		CSI/PLC Teams/Admin	
Highlight families and individual students - cultural connections and exciting facts (monthly addition to "Patriot Press")	Feb 2021		CSI/PLC Teams/Admin	
Set times during the year (quarterly/after major events) to solicit feedback from parents and faculty/staff	March 2021		Admin	
Maintain faculty/staff "Digital Parking Lot" for general questions and feedback	Feb 2021		Admin	

Evidence that demonstrates the effectiveness of the strategy (Use same data source and measures used to select SMART Goal)		
Baseline Score	End-of-Year Score	SMART Goal Met/Not Met
Staff: 44.9% Nov 2020		
Parents: 28.9% Nov 2020		