|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Action/Service** | **Person Responsible** | **Timelines/Dates for Implementing Action Steps** | **Metrics/Evaluation** | **Review of the Progress Toward Goals, Assessment of the Effectiveness of the Actions and Description of Changes to the Specific Actions** |
| **Essential Questions***Is the Action/Service Explicit?**Do we need to add language/steps to clarify the action?* | **Essential Questions***Will the responsibility for action steps be divided up between members of the leadership team?* | **Essential Questions***Have all actions and sub-actions been calendared?**When will progress on the action steps be shared with the leadership team? When will data be shared with each of the stakeholder groups for input?* | **Essential Questions***Which Data/Metrics (Expected Annual Measurable Outcomes) will be used to identify the impact of this action? (effectiveness)* *As Leadership Team monitors progress of data, have we set/determined interim targets to assess whether or not we are on track (i.e.. If we expect to gain 5% increase in students reading at grade-level, at the mid-year data collection has reading improved? By how much? Are we on track to meet end-of-year target?)?* | **Essential Questions***What does the data tell us in terms of the effectiveness of the actions? What evidence do we have that the action/service was completed/implemented? Will we continue or stop this action/service, because 1) we met the intended outcome or 2) determined the action/service was not effective or not showing sufficient progress towards a measurable outcome or because 3) input from stakeholders changed the direction/focus of the district? How will we make decisions about mid-year adjustments (i.e. not abandon an action step, but adjust)?* |
| 1.5 Professional development for teachers in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math) for teachers in grades 6-8. | Sally Sue – 6th Grade Science LeadMike Sum – 7th Grade Science LeadTerry Lim – 8th Grade Science Lead | 9/9/15 – Attend Training: Investigating Questions – Model SEPs @SCOE9/14/15 – minimum day PLC Middle School Science leads – review plan and roll out steps, design local assessment10/9/15 Give end of trimester local assessment10/12 Attend Training: Evolution MS-LS4-110/13 Meet Science Leads10/15 Meet Principal to review data and give update. Direction for preparation for Board meeting.10/22/15 Board Meeting to report out on progress NGSS12/1 Attend Training: Plate Tectonics 1/4/15 minimum day PLC MS Science leads 2/10 Attend Training: Energy & Engineering MS-PS3-32/18 Give 2nd Trimester local assessment.3/1/16 – Update meeting with principal5/19 – Give 3rd trimester local assessment5/26 – Meet principal – summarize year data share end of year assessment scores and final trimester gradesGive summary of assessment of what was learned, what was implemented, successes and challenges with new NGSS learning – make recommendations for next year’s goals and priorities | 10/9/15 – 6th grade – 35% Below Benchmark, 40% - meeting benchmark, 25% - above benchmark, 7th grade – 25% below benchmark, 50% met benchmark, 25% above benchmark, 8th grade – 17% below benchmark, 23% met benchmark, 60% above benchmark2/18/16– 6th grade – 5% Below Benchmark, 75% - meeting benchmark, 20% - above benchmark, 7th grade – 10% below benchmark, 70% met benchmark, 20% above benchmark, 8th grade – 15% below benchmark, 80% met benchmark, 5% above benchmark5/19 – 6th grade – 3% Below Benchmark, 20% - meeting benchmark, 77% - above benchmark, 7th grade – 7% below benchmark, 30% met benchmark, 63% above benchmark, 8th grade – 5% below benchmark, 10% met benchmark, 85% above benchmark | The data remarkably went up each trimester. After analysis, we believe this was due to several factors. 1) Through the County Professional Development and PLC time teachers were better able to refine our local assessments to more closely align to standards being taught, 2) teachers improved instructional practices and content knowledge through the professional development, and 3) teachers added a 30 minute intervention/review time weekly to review material with students who were identified as struggling with daily quizzes. Because the 30 minute lessons were structured in such a way that students could join, even if not invited to participate, 100% of the students chose to join and we saw an increase in all students achievement. |
|  |  |  |  |  |