

CHITTENDEN CENTRAL SUPERVISORY UNION
Thomas Fleming School
School Action Plan for Continuous Improvement
K-12 Needs Assessment and School-based S.M.A.R.T. Goals
2011 – 2013

21st Century framework	<p>CCSU K-12 Comprehensive Areas</p> <p>Targeted for Improvement by the CCSU Educational Leadership Team: <i>Collaborative Data Analysis and Comprehensive Needs Assessment</i> <i>(Requirement of No Child Left Behind and The Consolidated Federal Grant Program)</i></p>	<p>[Thomas Fleming School] 2011-2013 S.M.A.R.T. Goals/Action Steps:</p>																																																																																																																																																																																																																																								
21st CENTURY STANDARDS FOR ALL STUDENTS	<p><u>STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT CRITICAL CHALLENGES AND NEEDS :</u> 80% of CCSU students were proficient or above in reading. The Essex Junction School District did not make AYP for the third year for students receiving free and reduced lunch and for students with disabilities. For the first time, Fleming, Albert D. Lawton, and Essex High School did not meet AYP in reading for students receiving free and reduced lunch. 72% of CCSU students were proficient or above in math. The Essex Junction School District did not make AYP for the third year for students receiving free and reduced lunch, students with disabilities, and white students. For the first time, Albert D. Lawton did not meet AYP in math for students receiving free and reduced lunch and white students. Fleming and EHS did not meet AYP for the first time in math for students receiving free and reduced lunch. To further measure progress and growth there is a need to provide grade-level specific training on the use of NECAP scaled scores and locally designed formative assessments to drive instructional programming and lesson design at the classroom level.</p> <p>Improve and /or sustain competence in READING achievement (over 80%). Analyze performance in persistently low sub-topics: analysis and interpretation; informational text <i>where applicable</i>) based on school-based “trends over time” analysis and interventions in SAPs.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Reading</th> <th>2005</th> <th>2006</th> <th>2007</th> <th>2008</th> <th>2009</th> <th>2010 TARGET</th> <th>2010 ACTUAL</th> <th>2011 TARGET</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ALL</td> <td>76%</td> <td>78%</td> <td>79%</td> <td>81%</td> <td>82%</td> <td>86%</td> <td>80%</td> <td>82%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FRL</td> <td>51%</td> <td>53%</td> <td>57%</td> <td>57%</td> <td>60%</td> <td>62%</td> <td>62%</td> <td>65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IEP</td> <td>15%</td> <td>21%</td> <td>23%</td> <td>26%</td> <td>30%</td> <td>31%</td> <td>27%</td> <td>31%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Improve performance of all underachieving students (28% of CCSU students below proficiency in 2010) in the content area of MATH (further analyze performance in persistently low sub-topics: geometry and measurement and data, numbers sense, statistics and probability <i>where applicable</i>) based on school-based “trends over time” analysis and interventions in SAPs.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Math</th> <th>2005</th> <th>2006</th> <th>2007</th> <th>2008</th> <th>2009</th> <th>2010 TARGET</th> <th>2010 ACTUAL</th> <th>2011 TARGET</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ALL</td> <td>77%</td> <td>75%</td> <td>65%</td> <td>71%</td> <td>71%</td> <td>76%</td> <td>72%</td> <td>76%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FRL</td> <td>55%</td> <td>52%</td> <td>46%</td> <td>45%</td> <td>51%</td> <td>49%</td> <td>53%</td> <td>58%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IEP</td> <td>15%</td> <td>19%</td> <td>15%</td> <td>25%</td> <td>16%</td> <td>29%</td> <td>12%</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Improve performance of all underachieving students (55% of CCSU students below proficiency in 2010) in the content area of SCIENCE (further analyze performance in low sub-topics: inquiry and earth, universe, and environment <i>where applicable</i>) based on “trends over time” analysis.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Writing*</th> <th>2005</th> <th>2006</th> <th>2007</th> <th>2008</th> <th>2009</th> <th>2010 TARGET</th> <th>2010 ACTUAL</th> <th>2011 TARGET</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ALL</td> <td>59%</td> <td>62%</td> <td>50%</td> <td>58%</td> <td>65%</td> <td>63%</td> <td>62%</td> <td>70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FRL</td> <td>36%</td> <td>46%</td> <td>22%</td> <td>35%</td> <td>36%</td> <td>36%</td> <td>35%</td> <td>40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IEP</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>9%</td> <td>18%</td> <td>17%</td> <td>22%</td> <td>4%</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Improve performance of all underachieving students (55% of CCSU students below proficiency in 2010) in the content area of SCIENCE (further analyze performance in low sub-topics: inquiry and earth, universe, and environment <i>where applicable</i>) based on “trends over time” analysis.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Science</th> <th>2008</th> <th>2009</th> <th>2010 TARGET</th> <th>2010 ACTUAL</th> <th>2011 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ALL</td> <td>47%</td> <td>47%</td> <td>50%</td> <td>53%</td> <td>56%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FRL</td> <td>19%</td> <td>27%</td> <td>24%</td> <td>23%</td> <td>27%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IEP</td> <td>11%</td> <td>5%</td> <td>17%</td> <td>9%</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Narrow and close achievement gaps for all underperforming subgroups in all CCSU schools. Address AYP identification in reading and math for EJSD, Fleming, ADL, and Essex High School through unified action and PD steps. [AGGREGATED SCORES AVERAGED AND ROUNDED USING EDW TEACHING YEAR DATA]</p>	Reading	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 TARGET	2010 ACTUAL	2011 TARGET	ALL	76%	78%	79%	81%	82%	86%	80%	82%	FRL	51%	53%	57%	57%	60%	62%	62%	65%	IEP	15%	21%	23%	26%	30%	31%	27%	31%	Math	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 TARGET	2010 ACTUAL	2011 TARGET	ALL	77%	75%	65%	71%	71%	76%	72%	76%	FRL	55%	52%	46%	45%	51%	49%	53%	58%	IEP	15%	19%	15%	25%	16%	29%	12%	20%	Writing*	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 TARGET	2010 ACTUAL	2011 TARGET	ALL	59%	62%	50%	58%	65%	63%	62%	70%	FRL	36%	46%	22%	35%	36%	36%	35%	40%	IEP	0%	0%	9%	18%	17%	22%	4%	10%	Science	2008	2009	2010 TARGET	2010 ACTUAL	2011 Target	ALL	47%	47%	50%	53%	56%	FRL	19%	27%	24%	23%	27%	IEP	11%	5%	17%	9%	15%	<p><u>Essential Questions to Guide Action Planning:</u> What are the KEY TRENDS in our data? What are our CRITICAL CHALLENGES in achievement? What are our measures of progress over time? How does the school community communicate high expectations for all students? Are students able to articulate those expectations and monitor their own achievement? Have learning and teaching goals to improve achievement been developed and prioritized in school action plans? To what extent are they aligned with KEY TRENDS over time?</p> <p><u>Student Achievement:</u> <u>Fleming Student Achievement Needs Statements:</u> By April 2012, increase the 2010 achievement percentages for students scoring proficient or above in reading from 79% to 82%, as measured by the 2011 NECAP test results.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Reading</th> <th>2005</th> <th>2006</th> <th>2007</th> <th>2008</th> <th>2009</th> <th>2010 Current</th> <th>2011 Goal</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ALL</td> <td>73%</td> <td>73%</td> <td>76%</td> <td>73%</td> <td>78%</td> <td>79%</td> <td>82%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FRL</td> <td>52%</td> <td>52%</td> <td>62%</td> <td>50%</td> <td>52%</td> <td>64%</td> <td>57%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IEP</td> <td>27%</td> <td>22%</td> <td>12%</td> <td>6%</td> <td>27%</td> <td>6%</td> <td>>30%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>By April 2012, increase the 2009 achievement percentages for students scoring proficient or above in math from 72% to 77%, as measured by the 2011 NECAP test results.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Math</th> <th>2005</th> <th>2006</th> <th>2007</th> <th>2008</th> <th>2009</th> <th>2010 CURRENT</th> <th>2011 Goal</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ALL</td> <td>80%</td> <td>72%</td> <td>76%</td> <td>69%</td> <td>72%</td> <td>82%</td> <td>77%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FRL</td> <td>68%</td> <td>46%</td> <td>59%</td> <td>42%</td> <td>45%</td> <td>66%</td> <td>51%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IEP</td> <td>***</td> <td>13%</td> <td>18%</td> <td>19%</td> <td>20%</td> <td>12%</td> <td>26%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>By April 2012, increase the 2010 achievement percentages for students scoring proficient or above in writing from 56% to 61%, as measured by the 2011 NECAP test results.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Writing*</th> <th>2005</th> <th>2006</th> <th>2007</th> <th>2008</th> <th>2010</th> <th>2011 Goal</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ALL</td> <td>46%</td> <td>62%</td> <td>43%</td> <td>51%</td> <td>56%</td> <td>61%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FRL</td> <td>36%</td> <td>50%</td> <td>27%</td> <td>38%</td> <td>26%</td> <td>41%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>*2009 Results are for grade 11 only. No results were reported for 5 and 8 in 2009.</i></p> <p>By October 2012, increase the 2010 achievement percentages for students scoring proficient or above in science from 53% to 59%, as measured by the 2011 NECAP test results.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Science</th> <th>2008</th> <th>2009</th> <th>2010 CURRENT</th> <th>2011 Goal</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ALL</td> <td>54%</td> <td>55%</td> <td>53%</td> <td>59%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FRL</td> <td>28%</td> <td>39%</td> <td>17%</td> <td>40%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>*IEP number too small to set target by subgroup. Fleming’s progress contributes to SU aggregate goals.</i></p>	Reading	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 Current	2011 Goal	ALL	73%	73%	76%	73%	78%	79%	82%	FRL	52%	52%	62%	50%	52%	64%	57%	IEP	27%	22%	12%	6%	27%	6%	>30%	Math	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 CURRENT	2011 Goal	ALL	80%	72%	76%	69%	72%	82%	77%	FRL	68%	46%	59%	42%	45%	66%	51%	IEP	***	13%	18%	19%	20%	12%	26%	Writing*	2005	2006	2007	2008	2010	2011 Goal	ALL	46%	62%	43%	51%	56%	61%	FRL	36%	50%	27%	38%	26%	41%	Science	2008	2009	2010 CURRENT	2011 Goal	ALL	54%	55%	53%	59%	FRL	28%	39%	17%	40%
Reading	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 TARGET	2010 ACTUAL	2011 TARGET																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
ALL	76%	78%	79%	81%	82%	86%	80%	82%																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
FRL	51%	53%	57%	57%	60%	62%	62%	65%																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
IEP	15%	21%	23%	26%	30%	31%	27%	31%																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
Math	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 TARGET	2010 ACTUAL	2011 TARGET																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
ALL	77%	75%	65%	71%	71%	76%	72%	76%																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
FRL	55%	52%	46%	45%	51%	49%	53%	58%																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
IEP	15%	19%	15%	25%	16%	29%	12%	20%																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
Writing*	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 TARGET	2010 ACTUAL	2011 TARGET																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
ALL	59%	62%	50%	58%	65%	63%	62%	70%																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
FRL	36%	46%	22%	35%	36%	36%	35%	40%																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
IEP	0%	0%	9%	18%	17%	22%	4%	10%																																																																																																																																																																																																																																		
Science	2008	2009	2010 TARGET	2010 ACTUAL	2011 Target																																																																																																																																																																																																																																					
ALL	47%	47%	50%	53%	56%																																																																																																																																																																																																																																					
FRL	19%	27%	24%	23%	27%																																																																																																																																																																																																																																					
IEP	11%	5%	17%	9%	15%																																																																																																																																																																																																																																					
Reading	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 Current	2011 Goal																																																																																																																																																																																																																																			
ALL	73%	73%	76%	73%	78%	79%	82%																																																																																																																																																																																																																																			
FRL	52%	52%	62%	50%	52%	64%	57%																																																																																																																																																																																																																																			
IEP	27%	22%	12%	6%	27%	6%	>30%																																																																																																																																																																																																																																			
Math	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 CURRENT	2011 Goal																																																																																																																																																																																																																																			
ALL	80%	72%	76%	69%	72%	82%	77%																																																																																																																																																																																																																																			
FRL	68%	46%	59%	42%	45%	66%	51%																																																																																																																																																																																																																																			
IEP	***	13%	18%	19%	20%	12%	26%																																																																																																																																																																																																																																			
Writing*	2005	2006	2007	2008	2010	2011 Goal																																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
ALL	46%	62%	43%	51%	56%	61%																																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
FRL	36%	50%	27%	38%	26%	41%																																																																																																																																																																																																																																				
Science	2008	2009	2010 CURRENT	2011 Goal																																																																																																																																																																																																																																						
ALL	54%	55%	53%	59%																																																																																																																																																																																																																																						
FRL	28%	39%	17%	40%																																																																																																																																																																																																																																						

CHITTENDEN CENTRAL SUPERVISORY UNION
Thomas Fleming School
School Action Plan for Continuous Improvement
K-12 Needs Assessment and School-based S.M.A.R.T. Goals
2011 – 2013

21st CENTURY STANDARDS FOR ALL STUDENTS	<p><u>EQUITY CRITICAL CHALLENGES AND NEEDS:</u></p> <p><i>Improve understanding of how demographic variables impact achievement</i> of all students (a collaborative review of Demographic Profiles is needed) and how that relates to setting and holding HIGH EXPECTATIONS for all students; target efforts in the collection of student behavior data/school climate data to ensure that all students are accessing classroom instruction – especially those students that are found in multiple disaggregated groups and to narrow and close achievement gaps for all students.</p> <p>Action Focus for Central Office: <i>Commit to Supporting and Sustaining Reform</i></p> <p><u>Essential Questions to Guide our Responses to Critical Challenges:</u> What evidence exists to ensure that all students have access to the CCSU Guaranteed, Viable Curriculum as well as rigorous Comprehensive Curriculum at all grade levels? What evidence persists that they do not, and is that evidence addressed in school action plans?</p>	<p><u>Equity (Student Demographics):</u></p> <p>By December 2011, implement a reading and math, benchmark-based progress monitoring system (RTI) for at risk students that fits the vertical team collaborative meeting structure, as measured by team/house tools that document identified targets and measurable interventions that are implemented with fidelity.</p> <p>Beginning September 2010 and by June 2012, increase the daily student-centered, equitable (by classroom and house) access and standards-based use of multiple learning resources (books, technology tools, S.M.A.R.T. Board, periodicals, reference materials etc.) available in our Fleming School Learning Center, as measured by data collected by teachers, librarian, and students (e.g. circulation, participation, flexible scheduling plans, etc.).</p>
21st CENTURY LEADERSHIP	<p><u>LEADERSHIP CRITICAL CHALLENGES AND NEEDS:</u></p> <p><i>Improve leadership skill set</i> related to the components of “Universal Classroom” (learning communities, a mapped, guaranteed, viable curriculum, differentiated instruction, formative assessment, and supported learning environments) and map out and fully communicate among all stakeholders a 3-5 year roadmap of what the CCSU will look like with all components of a Universal Classroom fully implemented, taking into account the readiness variability of schools.</p> <p><i>Re-establish common goals in utilizing and gathering data related to improvement systems- approaches such as</i> distributed leadership, collaborative teaming, professional learning communities , and calibrated classroom walk-throughs.</p> <p>Action Focus for Central Office: <i>Redefine Leadership and Implement Strong Accountability Systems</i></p> <p><u>Essential Questions to Guide our Responses to Critical Challenges:</u> In what ways does the Central Office support the school’s teacher leaders and administrators in their school improvement efforts? To what extent does the ELT focus on educational leadership that explores the linkages among educational leadership, improving schools, and positive achievement outcomes for students? In what ways has the ELT established a culture of trust and institutionalized a commitment to continuous improvement and accountability for performance? How is distributed leadership demonstrated and what evidence do we have that it is effective?</p>	<p><u>Leadership:</u></p> <p>By December 2011, collaboratively analyze revised curriculum and benchmark maps and evidence to facilitate consistent conferencing and reporting out practices for standards-based programs between and among houses, as measured by teacher-reported practices, parent conference feedback, and calibrated standards-based reports.</p> <p>By December 2011, identify lead teachers in each house to receive training in co-teaching strategies (after January overview), focused on but not limited to math support, as measured by house/team participation in subsequent trainings.</p> <p>By June 2012 evaluate and profile where Fleming staff is on the continuum of professional skills related to the components of Universal Classroom and determine further professional development, resource, and action step needs to meet the understood target of a fully implemented Universal Classroom model school.</p>

CHITTENDEN CENTRAL SUPERVISORY UNION
Thomas Fleming School
School Action Plan for Continuous Improvement
K-12 Needs Assessment and School-based S.M.A.R.T. Goals
2011 – 2013

<p>21ST CENTURY SUPPORT SYSTEMS: CURRICULUM, AND INSTRUCTION; CORE SUBJECTS AND 21ST CENTURY THEMES; LIFE AND CAREER SKILLS; LEARNING AND INNOVATION SKILLS</p>	<p><u>CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTION, AND ASSESSMENT CRITICAL CHALLENGES AND NEEDS:</u></p> <p>Improve CCSU knowledge base of the Common Core Standards and the Smarter Balanced Assessment and develop a timeline with action steps to implement the Common Core that will also address alignment issues with Common Core.</p> <p>Ensure proficiency in utilizing differentiated instruction and standards-based curriculum, instruction, and assessment to support a Universal Classroom by establishing common understandings and shared expectations.</p> <p>Action Focus for Central Office : Take a System-wide Approach to Improving Instruction and Create a District Curriculum Aligned with Standards and Assessments</p> <p>Essential Questions to Guide our Responses to Critical Challenges: Is there a supervisory union curriculum that is aligned with the Common Core Standards in English Language Arts and Math? Do all teachers use the curriculum in planning instruction? Is there a process to ensure that curriculum is fully implemented? What evidence is there that all teachers have a deep knowledge and understanding of their content and best practice strategies for how to teach it? To what extent are all students engaged in learning? Are assessments designed to measure performance in ways that advance learning through the development of critical thinking and problem solving skills? How is assessment data used to drive instructional practice and address student needs during the learning?</p>	<p><u>Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction:</u></p> <p>By June 2012 demonstrate that all Fleming teachers have an effective working knowledge, understanding, and professional application of the CCSU curriculum standards, as measured by teacher-designed curriculum maps and through teaching observations.</p> <p>By April 2012, evaluate the effectiveness of differentiated instruction and formative assessment strategies (aligned with Universal Classroom) to improve student achievement (focused on but not limited to math), as measured by NECAP results, student reports, teachers surveys, classroom walk-throughs, teacher self-reporting, etc.</p> <p>By June 2012, determine equitable student access to technology integration tools in curriculum, instruction, and assessment to support standards-based progress for all learners, as measured by student and teacher interviews and surveys, classroom walk-throughs, and digitally documenting best practices.</p>
<p>21ST CENTURY SUPPORT SYSTEMS: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</p>	<p><u>PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR HIGH QUALITY STAFF CRITICAL CHALLENGES AND NEEDS:</u></p> <p>Improve decision-making and communication for focused improvement initiatives in DI and FA and their relationship to professional learning.</p> <p>Narrow and close achievement gaps by designing multiple year implementation plans that outline the P.D., timeline, and communication for each identified outcome.</p> <p>Address educators “need to know” concerning the Common Core and SBAC through the creation of a timeline with action steps to implement the Common Core.</p> <p>Action Focus for Central Office: Coordinate and Embed On-going Professional Development Opportunities</p> <p>Essential Questions to Guide our Responses to Critical Challenges: Is there evidence that professional learning to advance student achievement is valued? What professional development opportunities do teachers receive to assist them in implementing the curriculum and their school’s action steps? What evidence is there that student learning is tied to teacher learning? How relevant is our professional development to teaching, learning, research, or creative inquiry? Do teachers feel they receive adequate professional development?</p>	<p>By June 2011 and continuing through the 2012 school year participate in training and ongoing coaching in literacy assessment (F&P) to monitor students literacy progress K-5 and plan literacy instruction and targeted interventions for students. Integrate writing and word study professional learning into this literacy work.</p> <p>By June 2012 advanced schoolwide practices of Responsive Classroom program strands with emphasis on targeted training in the area of “academic choice”.</p> <p>By March 2012 conduct a professional development needs assessment and use this feedback to plan targeted action plan supportive professional development.</p> <p>By January 2012 engage Fleming staff in professional learning opportunities related to teaching and learning to be creative. (Resources include readings of such books as Sir Ken Robinson’s, “Out of Our Minds” Learning to be Creative.</p>

CHITTENDEN CENTRAL SUPERVISORY UNION
Thomas Fleming School
School Action Plan for Continuous Improvement
K-12 Needs Assessment and School-based S.M.A.R.T. Goals
2011 – 2013

THIS SECTION IS STILL UNDER DEVELOPMENT BY THE ELT

SAFE, HEALTHY, STUDENT-CENTERED LEARNING ENVIRONMENT CRITICAL CHALLENGES AND NEEDS:

YRBS Executive Summary

Availability of Illegal Drugs on School Property: Essex High School students are more likely than students statewide to be offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property.

		ALL
Percent of students who were offered, sold, or given illegal drugs on school property	CCSU	25%
	Statewide	19%
	Comparison	+6

8 th grade	9 th grade	10 th grade	11 th grade	12 th grade
5%	23%	24%	30%	33%
10%	17%	24%	23%	21%
-5	+6	-	+7	+12

Perception of Risks from Marijuana Use: The perception of the risks of using marijuana regularly has declined significantly from 2007.

		ALL
Percent of students who think there is a great risk in using marijuana regularly	CCSU 2007	52%
	CCSU 2009	46%
	Comparison	-8

Alcohol Use Among High School Seniors: Alcohol use has been rising steadily among high school seniors since 2003, and is now above statewide levels.

		12 th grade		
		CCSU	State	Comparison
Percent of students who consumed at least one drink of alcohol in the past 30 days	1999	51%	60%	-9
	2001	55%	58%	-3
	2003	41%	56%	-15
	2005	48%	50%	-2
	2007	53%	55%	-2
	2009	56%	50%	+6

Continuously improve opportunities to engage student voices in the creation of safe and respectful 21 century learning environments that promote multiple literacies (i.e. civic, digital, economic, social, emotional, and aesthetic).

Build capacity of educators to support students with behavioral challenges within classrooms and schools.

Facilitate the implementation of biennial school climate surveys that are age/grade level appropriate.

Improve access to service learning opportunities both within and outside the school.

Action Focus for Central Office: Commit to Supporting and Sustaining Reform

Safe, Healthy, Student-Centered Learning Environments:

By October 2011, identify and respond to training needs and opportunities, based on analysis of data sets, for creating and maintaining safe and healthy school environments at Fleming School with the CCSU Prevention/Wellness Coordinator, as measured by the coordinator's monthly Prevention and Wellness activity reports and subsequent data sets.

By August 2011, review 2010-2011 pilot results of revised, effective means of communicating risk associated with inappropriate uses of technology, including but not limited to cyber bullying, sharing images (digital pictures, etc.), and inappropriate access to social networking, as measured by fewer incident reports of inappropriate uses of technology.

By September 2011, certify that all house teaching team members have received level one certified training in Responsive Classroom Program and can demonstrate knowledge, understanding, and evidence of effective implementation of the RC principles (including but not limited to Morning Meeting, **Academic Choice**) in a manner that fully supports all learners in the learning community, as measured by RC certification and observed practice.

By June 2012, increase student sense of belonging and appropriate learning challenges for all students through vertical teaming, as measured by student surveys.

By October 2011 complete a comprehensive review and vetting of Search Institute Developmental Assets Survey which was administered in November 2010. Develop action steps related to assets targeted for improvement revealed through this comprehensive review process.

By December 2011 establish lunchtime forums with students and administration/staff to increase opportunities for students to have voice and engagement with their school community.

CHITTENDEN CENTRAL SUPERVISORY UNION
Thomas Fleming School
School Action Plan for Continuous Improvement
K-12 Needs Assessment and School-based S.M.A.R.T. Goals
2011 – 2013

	<p><u>EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT SYSTEM CRITICAL CHALLENGES AND NEEDS:</u></p> <p>Use survey results to:</p> <p>Improve the quality and fidelity of the skill set within the educational support systems in functional behavior assessments, co-teaching, research-based interventions in reading and math.</p> <p>Improve understanding of students exhibiting characteristics of being on the autism spectrum and strategies to support them.</p> <p>Action Focus for Central Office: Commit to Supporting and Sustaining Reform</p> <p><u>Essential Questions to Guide our Responses to Critical Challenges:</u> Do all CCSU schools have programs of aligned support services that fully support the academic, social, and emotional well-being of all children as well as the improvement initiatives? What structures are in place for serving special populations (e.g., ELL, Title I, special education, academically talented) students? To what extent are staff members trained to meet the needs of these special populations? To what extent do specialists (e.g. ELL, Title I, special education, guidance, and social workers) collaborate with regular education teachers to support student achievement?</p>	<p><u>Educational Support System:</u></p> <p>By December 2011, select and utilize co-teaching strategies as part of a set of classroom interventions for improving student achievement (focused on but not limited to math), as measured by vertical team reporting (student plans, agendas, team minutes, AYP plans, etc.)</p> <p>By September 2011, establish educational teams (vertical, grade level, and learning specialists) that regularly analyze student data/work to inform instruction and ensure progress, as measured by documentation of team activity.</p> <p>By September 2011, implement a progress monitoring system for each vertical team that monitors the progress of at risk students within the team, as measured by team data, intervention, monitoring timeliness, and instructional adjustments.</p>
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">21st CENTURY STUDENT OUTCOMES: INFORMATION, MEDIA, AND TECHNOLOGY SKILLS – INFORMATION LITERACY, MEDIA LITERACY, AND ICT LITERACY</p>	<p><u>INFORMATION, COMMUNICATION, AND EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY CRITICAL CHALLENGES:</u></p> <p>Improve the preparation of students to meet 21st Century challenges related to information, communication, and technological literacy and ensure students have the skills to take the online SBAC assessment in by 2015.</p> <p>Improve awareness of the ethical/legal issues surrounding the access and use of information and technological tools and ensure the implementation of an Internet Safety measures that are age appropriate.</p> <p>Implement a common definition of 21st Century Skills or vision for using technology as a tool to research, organize, evaluate, and communicate information using the ISTE NETS (for students, teachers, ITs, and administrators) and the Vermont tech GE's, and improve alignment with vertical curriculum work .</p> <p>Improve the inclusion of assistive technology applications when designing 504, EST or 504 plans (students with significant cognitive, emotional, social, and/or behavioral difficulties).</p> <p>Action Focus for Central Office: Commit to Sustaining Reform</p> <p><u>Essential Questions to Guide our Responses to Critical Challenges:</u> How effectively is technology used in organizational and instructional practices throughout the supervisory union? How do we use the strategic planning informed by research (such as The 2011 Horizon Report) to fully inform and measure implementation of improvements by Technology PLC's such as school-based tech teams, the C21 Team, the Librarians Vertical Team, the ETIS Vertical Team, and the ELT? To what extent do we have a shared and common definition and set of expectations with respect to 21st Century Teaching and Learning and related, measurable skills?</p>	<p><u>FLEMING EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY GOALS:</u></p> <p>Leadership to Promote a Student Centered Environment – By April 2012, promote the understanding of transforming vs. product technology (technology literacy and adapting uses) that aligns with Grappling's Technology and Learning Spectrum and the International Society of Technology Education's National Educational Technology Standards (ISTE-NETS), as measured by teacher-identified indicators of success.</p> <p>21st Century Student Centered Learning - By June 2012, create transformed learning environments in which students use information and communication technologies in ways that both reflect their interests and foster independent and collaborative engagement in meaningful, relevant, and authentic learning tasks, as measured by teacher-identified indicators of success. Begin implementation of ISTE NETS standards in a planned sequenced manner guided by staff input.</p> <p>Flexible Learning Communities – By June 2012, use technology to promote student creativity and innovation in digital media applications to demonstrate transformed, standards-based learning beyond the traditional methods to further broaden career and college readiness awareness, as measured by teacher and student-identified indicators of success and student developed digital learning products.</p> <p>By June 2012 Improve the inclusion of assistive technology applications when designing 504, EST or 504 plans (students with significant cognitive, emotional, social, and/or behavioral difficulties).</p> <p>By September 2012 Improve staff/student awareness of the ethical/legal issues surrounding the access and use of information and technological tools and ensure the implementation of an Internet Safety measures that are age appropriate.</p>

CHITTENDEN CENTRAL SUPERVISORY UNION
Thomas Fleming School
School Action Plan for Continuous Improvement
K-12 Needs Assessment and School-based S.M.A.R.T. Goals
2011 – 2013

21ST CENTURY PARTNER-SHI PS	<p><u>STAFF, PARENT, AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AND ENGAGEMENT CRITICAL CHALLENGES AND NEEDS:</u></p> <p>Improve and focus communication with parents on student learning.</p> <p>Improve connections and increase parent participation with parents of “at risk” students through the development of a more positive process that includes more personal contact, especially when trying to schedule student-led conferences, in order to involve our parents as their children move to middle and high school.</p> <p>Collaboratively determine the timeline for parent access to Power School for student grade information and provide parents with training and information on the purposes and non-purposes of this portal.</p> <p>Action Focus for Central Office: Commit to Supporting and Sustaining Reform</p> <p><u>Essential Questions to Guide our Responses to Critical Challenges:</u> To what extent do CCSU schools maintain positive relationships with parents and communicate frequently about students? What community businesses and organizations work in partnership with our schools? What do the partners contribute? How do we acknowledge their contributions?</p>	<p>By June 2012, redesign school-parent communications to provide a consistent, intentional focus on standards-based classrooms, standards-based student work, and student progress toward meeting standards, as measured by teacher, parent, and student surveys.</p> <p>By June 2011 and June 2012, gather feedback regularly from parents concerning standards-based reporting and student-led conferences to modify system, adjust and improve communications on student progress, and information dissemination on standards-based education, as measured by parent surveys and web postings.</p>
---	--	--