

CHITTENDEN CENTRAL SUPERVISORY UNION
Thomas Fleming School
School Action Plan for Continuous Improvement
K-12 Needs Assessment and Fleming S.M.A.R.T. Goals
2010 – 2012

21st Century Framework	CCSU K-12 Comprehensive Areas Targeted for Improvement: Administrative Data Analysis and Comprehensive Needs Assessment	Thomas Fleming School 2010-2012 S.M.A.R.T. Goals:																																																																																																																																																																																																								
21st CENTURY STANDARDS FOR ALL STUDENTS	<p>Student Achievement Needs Statements: Improve and /or sustain competence in <u>reading</u> achievement (over 80%) (further analyze performance in persistently low sub-topics: analysis and interpretation; informational text <i>where applicable</i>) based on “trends over time” analysis.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Reading</th> <th>2005</th> <th>2006</th> <th>2007</th> <th>2008</th> <th>2009 CURRENT</th> <th>2010 TARGET</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ALL</td> <td>75%</td> <td>77%</td> <td>79%</td> <td>81%</td> <td>82%</td> <td>86%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FRL</td> <td>52%</td> <td>51%</td> <td>56%</td> <td>57%</td> <td>59%</td> <td>62%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IEP</td> <td>15%</td> <td>18%</td> <td>25%</td> <td>26%</td> <td>31%</td> <td>31%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>FOCUS AREA OF NEED: Improve performance of all underachieving students (29% of CCSU students below proficiency in 2008) in the content area of <u>math</u> (further analyze performance in persistently low sub-topics: geometry and measurement and data, statistics and probability <i>where applicable</i>) based on “trends over time” analysis.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Math</th> <th>2005</th> <th>2006</th> <th>2007</th> <th>2008</th> <th>2009 CURRENT</th> <th>2010 TARGET</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ALL</td> <td>77%</td> <td>73%</td> <td>65%</td> <td>71%</td> <td>70%</td> <td>76%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FRL</td> <td>55%</td> <td>51%</td> <td>45%</td> <td>44%</td> <td>48%</td> <td>49%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IEP</td> <td>16%</td> <td>20%</td> <td>17%</td> <td>24%</td> <td>17%</td> <td>29%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Writing*</th> <th>2005</th> <th>2006</th> <th>2007</th> <th>2008</th> <th>2009 CURRENT</th> <th>2010 TARGET</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ALL</td> <td>58%</td> <td>62%</td> <td>50%</td> <td>57%</td> <td>65%</td> <td>63%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FRL</td> <td>36%</td> <td>46%</td> <td>24%</td> <td>31%</td> <td>40%</td> <td>36%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IEP</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>9%</td> <td>17%</td> <td>8%</td> <td>22%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><small>*2009 Results are for grade 11 only. No results were reported for 5 and 8 in 2009.</small></p> <p>Improve performance of all underachieving students (55% of CCSU students below proficiency in 2008) in the content area of <u>science</u> (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; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Science</th> <th>2008</th> <th>2009 CURRENT</th> <th>2010 TARGET</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ALL</td> <td>45%</td> <td>47%</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FRL</td> <td>19%</td> <td>26%</td> <td>24%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IEP</td> <td>11%</td> <td>5%</td> <td>17%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>OVERARCHING ACHIEVEMENT IMPROVEMENT NEEDS: Narrow and close achievement gaps for all underperforming subgroups in all CCSU schools. EJSD: Improve math support to students through Title I resource allocation. to improve student achievement.</p> <p>Essential Questions to Guide Action Planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? 	Reading	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009 CURRENT	2010 TARGET	ALL	75%	77%	79%	81%	82%	86%	FRL	52%	51%	56%	57%	59%	62%	IEP	15%	18%	25%	26%	31%	31%	Math	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009 CURRENT	2010 TARGET	ALL	77%	73%	65%	71%	70%	76%	FRL	55%	51%	45%	44%	48%	49%	IEP	16%	20%	17%	24%	17%	29%	Writing*	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009 CURRENT	2010 TARGET	ALL	58%	62%	50%	57%	65%	63%	FRL	36%	46%	24%	31%	40%	36%	IEP	0%	0%	9%	17%	8%	22%	Science	2008	2009 CURRENT	2010 TARGET	ALL	45%	47%	50%	FRL	19%	26%	24%	IEP	11%	5%	17%	<p>Student Achievement:</p> <p>Fleming Student Achievement Needs Statements: By April 2012, increase the 2009 achievement percentages for students scoring proficient or above in reading from 78% to 82%, as measured by the 2011 NECAP test results.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Reading</th> <th>2005</th> <th>2006</th> <th>2007</th> <th>2008</th> <th>2009 CURRENT</th> <th>2010 Projected</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>80%</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>55%</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>30%</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; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Math</th> <th>2005</th> <th>2006</th> <th>2007</th> <th>2008</th> <th>2009 CURRENT</th> <th>2010 Projected</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>76%</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>49%</td> <td>51%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IEP</td> <td>***</td> <td>13%</td> <td>18%</td> <td>19%</td> <td>20%</td> <td>25%</td> <td>26%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>By April 2012, increase the 2008 achievement percentages for students scoring proficient or above in writing from 51% to 61%, as measured by the 2011 NECAP test results.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Writing*</th> <th>2005</th> <th>2006</th> <th>2007</th> <th>2008</th> <th>2009</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>***</td> <td>61%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FRL</td> <td>36%</td> <td>50%</td> <td>27%</td> <td>38%</td> <td>***</td> <td>41%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><small>*2009 Results are for grade 11 only. No results were reported for 5 and 8 in 2009.</small></p> <p>By October 2012, increase the 2009 achievement percentages for students scoring proficient or above in science, as measured by the 2011 NECAP test results.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Science</th> <th>2008</th> <th>2009 CURRENT</th> <th>2010 Projected</th> <th>2011 Goal</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ALL</td> <td>54%</td> <td>55%</td> <td>57%</td> <td>59%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FRL</td> <td>28%</td> <td>39%</td> <td>39%</td> <td>40%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><small>*IEP number too small to set target by subgroup. Fleming’s progress contributes to SU aggregate goals.</small></p>	Reading	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009 CURRENT	2010 Projected	2011 Goal	ALL	73%	73%	76%	73%	78%	80%	82%	FRL	52%	52%	62%	50%	52%	55%	57%	IEP	27%	22%	12%	6%	27%	30%	>30%	Math	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009 CURRENT	2010 Projected	2011 Goal	ALL	80%	72%	76%	69%	72%	76%	77%	FRL	68%	46%	59%	42%	45%	49%	51%	IEP	***	13%	18%	19%	20%	25%	26%	Writing*	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2011 Goal	ALL	46%	62%	43%	51%	***	61%	FRL	36%	50%	27%	38%	***	41%	Science	2008	2009 CURRENT	2010 Projected	2011 Goal	ALL	54%	55%	57%	59%	FRL	28%	39%	39%	40%
Reading	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009 CURRENT	2010 TARGET																																																																																																																																																																																																				
ALL	75%	77%	79%	81%	82%	86%																																																																																																																																																																																																				
FRL	52%	51%	56%	57%	59%	62%																																																																																																																																																																																																				
IEP	15%	18%	25%	26%	31%	31%																																																																																																																																																																																																				
Math	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009 CURRENT	2010 TARGET																																																																																																																																																																																																				
ALL	77%	73%	65%	71%	70%	76%																																																																																																																																																																																																				
FRL	55%	51%	45%	44%	48%	49%																																																																																																																																																																																																				
IEP	16%	20%	17%	24%	17%	29%																																																																																																																																																																																																				
Writing*	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009 CURRENT	2010 TARGET																																																																																																																																																																																																				
ALL	58%	62%	50%	57%	65%	63%																																																																																																																																																																																																				
FRL	36%	46%	24%	31%	40%	36%																																																																																																																																																																																																				
IEP	0%	0%	9%	17%	8%	22%																																																																																																																																																																																																				
Science	2008	2009 CURRENT	2010 TARGET																																																																																																																																																																																																							
ALL	45%	47%	50%																																																																																																																																																																																																							
FRL	19%	26%	24%																																																																																																																																																																																																							
IEP	11%	5%	17%																																																																																																																																																																																																							
Reading	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009 CURRENT	2010 Projected	2011 Goal																																																																																																																																																																																																			
ALL	73%	73%	76%	73%	78%	80%	82%																																																																																																																																																																																																			
FRL	52%	52%	62%	50%	52%	55%	57%																																																																																																																																																																																																			
IEP	27%	22%	12%	6%	27%	30%	>30%																																																																																																																																																																																																			
Math	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009 CURRENT	2010 Projected	2011 Goal																																																																																																																																																																																																			
ALL	80%	72%	76%	69%	72%	76%	77%																																																																																																																																																																																																			
FRL	68%	46%	59%	42%	45%	49%	51%																																																																																																																																																																																																			
IEP	***	13%	18%	19%	20%	25%	26%																																																																																																																																																																																																			
Writing*	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2011 Goal																																																																																																																																																																																																				
ALL	46%	62%	43%	51%	***	61%																																																																																																																																																																																																				
FRL	36%	50%	27%	38%	***	41%																																																																																																																																																																																																				
Science	2008	2009 CURRENT	2010 Projected	2011 Goal																																																																																																																																																																																																						
ALL	54%	55%	57%	59%																																																																																																																																																																																																						
FRL	28%	39%	39%	40%																																																																																																																																																																																																						

CHITTENDEN CENTRAL SUPERVISORY UNION
Thomas Fleming School
School Action Plan for Continuous Improvement
K-12 Needs Assessment and Fleming S.M.A.R.T. Goals
2010 – 2012

	<p><u>Equity (Student Demographics) Needs Statements:</u></p> <p>Hold and communicate high expectations for achievement for all students (no <i>common expectations</i> currently exist other than the adoption of Power Standards).</p> <p>Improve understanding of how demographic variables impact achievement of all students (a collaborative review of Demographic Profiles is needed).</p> <p>Continuously improve equitable access to challenging curriculum (tracking patterns create barriers for groups of students in accessing challenging curriculum).</p> <p>Narrow and close achievement gaps for all subgroups. 83% of Students with Disabilities score below proficiency in math.</p> <p>EISD: Improve math support to students through Title I resource allocation.</p> <p>Essential Questions to Guide Action Planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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><u>Equity (Student Demographics):</u></p> <p>By November 2010, audit students' weekly opportunities to engage in differentiated standards-based reading and writing tasks (related to analysis and interpretation and informational text – expository/constructed response writing) including short answer responses in math, as measured by a Fleming –developed tool that can assist in analyzing the results of the audit and determine any possible changes in classroom/house/school literacy and math practices.</p> <p>By June 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>
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">21ST CENTURY LEADERSHIP</p>	<p><u>Leadership Needs Statements:</u></p> <p>Improve communication to stakeholders concerning focused improvement initiatives.</p> <p>Improve leadership skill set related to the components of “Universal Classroom” (learning communities, a mapped, guaranteed, viable curriculum, differentiated instruction, formative assessment, and supported learning environments).</p> <p>Improve the distribution of leadership within, between, and among schools throughout the supervisory union through collaborative teaming and PLC processing.</p> <p>EISD: Improve the coordination of math support to students through Title I resource allocation</p> <p>Essential Questions to Guide Action Planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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><u>Leadership:</u></p> <p>By September 2010, begin the implementation of a trimester reporting progress monitoring system, using Power School, as measured by trimester reports to parents.</p> <p>By November 2010, 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 March 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 2011, implement distributed roles and responsibilities within vertical teams that facilitate student- centered decision making, effective communication, collaboration, and co-teaching opportunities, of the fully implemented components of Universal Classroom, as measured by team documentation (agenda, minutes)</p>

CHITTENDEN CENTRAL SUPERVISORY UNION
Thomas Fleming School
School Action Plan for Continuous Improvement
K-12 Needs Assessment and Fleming S.M.A.R.T. Goals
2010 – 2012

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">21ST CENTURY SUPPORT SYSTEMS: CURRICULUM, AND INSTRUCTION; CORE SUBJECTS AND 21ST CENTURY THEMES; LIFE AND CAREER SKILLS; LEARNING AND INNOVATION SKILLS</p>	<p>Curriculum, Assessment and Instruction (“Backwards Design”) Needs Statements:</p> <p>Improve equitable access to challenging curriculum.</p> <p>Expand the use of research-based differentiated instructional methods aligned with “Universal Classroom” to support all students in reading and writing across the curriculum, as well as math and science.</p> <p><i>EJSD: Expand the use of research-based differentiated instructional methods students in reading and math beyond the school day and school year through Title I resource allocation. Improve the coordination of support to teachers to improve instruction in math with regular coaching in math instruction and assessment best practices through Title I resource allocation.</i></p> <p>Improve the use of Power Standards-based formative assessments to measure student progress and achievement.</p> <p>Essential Questions to Guide Action Planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a supervisory union curriculum that is aligned with national and state standards and grade expectations? • 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>Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction:</p> <p>By December, 2010 and June 2011, establish and review common implementation 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 observable student-centered classroom instruction and assessment and Power Standards-based reporting of student progress on trimester benchmarks.</p> <p>By June 2011 and 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 2011 and 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>
---	--	---

CHITTENDEN CENTRAL SUPERVISORY UNION
Thomas Fleming School
School Action Plan for Continuous Improvement
K-12 Needs Assessment and Fleming S.M.A.R.T. Goals
2010 – 2012

21ST CENTURY SUPPORT SYSTEMS: LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS
 CORE SUBJECTS AND 21ST CENTURY THEMES: CIVIC AND HEALTH LITERACY

Safe, Healthy, Student-Centered Learning Environments Needs Statements:

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	8 th grade	9 th grade	10 th grade	11 th grade	12 th grade
Percent of students who were offered, sold, or given illegal drugs on school property	CCSU	25%	5%	23%	24%	30%	33%
	Statewide	19%	10%	17%	24%	23%	21%
	Comparison	+6	-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).

EISD: Improve transition experiences between and among schools for students at risk of not meeting standards in reading and math to ensure seamlessness of support through Title I resource allocation.

Essential Questions to Guide Action Planning:

- Have the CCSU schools intentionally personalized the learning environments?
- What evidence do we have that our students are satisfied with our schools?
- Are clear and fair practices, policies, and procedures in place to support safe, healthy, student-centered learning environments?

Safe, Healthy, Student-Centered Learning Environments:

By August 2010, 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 September 2010, determine future collaboration with Essex C.H.I.P.S. in provide developmentally appropriate after-school programs for "tweens", as measured by data review from 2009-2010 pilot program and the results of an administered needs assessment.

By September 2010, pilot more 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 student awareness survey questions similar to YRBS.

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.

CHITTENDEN CENTRAL SUPERVISORY UNION
Thomas Fleming School
School Action Plan for Continuous Improvement
K-12 Needs Assessment and Fleming S.M.A.R.T. Goals
2010 – 2012

	<p><u>Educational Support System Needs Statements:</u></p> <p>Improve the alignment of educational supports, including Title I in Essex Junction School District, with the broader K-12 reform initiatives, within a shared design framework, to provide for more seamless student support in achieving standards.</p> <p><i>EJSD: Improve transition experiences between and among schools for students at risk of not meeting standards in reading and math to ensure seamlessness of support through Title I resource allocation.</i></p> <p><i>Essential Questions to Guide Action Planning:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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><u>Educational Support System:</u></p> <p>By September 2010, revise the tiered EST structure to align with the vertical team/house model, as measured by new guidelines and student plans.</p> <p>By September 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 June 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 Literacy Needs Statements:</u></p> <p>Improve the preparation of students to meet 21st Century challenges related to information, communication, and technological literacy.</p> <p>Improve awareness of the ethical/legal issues surrounding the access and use of information and technological tools.</p> <p>Improve the use of digital technology, communication tools and/or networks appropriately to access, manage, integrate, evaluate, and create information in order to function in a knowledge economy.</p> <p>There is no common definition of 21st Century Skills or vision for using technology as a tool to research, organize, evaluate, and communicate information.</p> <p><i>Essential Questions to Guide Action Planning:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How effectively is technology used in organizational and instructional practices throughout the supervisory union? How do we use the CCSU technology plan 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 Skills? 	<p><u>FLEMING EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY GOALS:</u></p> <p>Leadership to Promote a Student Centered Environment – By September 2011, 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 <u>transformed learning environments</u> 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.</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>

CHITTENDEN CENTRAL SUPERVISORY UNION
Thomas Fleming School
School Action Plan for Continuous Improvement
K-12 Needs Assessment and Fleming S.M.A.R.T. Goals
2010 – 2012

21ST CENTURY PARTNER-SHI PS	<p><u>Staff, Parent , and Community Involvement and Engagement Needs Statements:</u></p> <p>Improve and focus communication with parents on student learning.</p> <p>Improve connections and increase parent participations and with parents of “at risk” students.</p> <p><i>Essential Questions to Guide Action Planning:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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>By June 2011, 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>
---	---	--