Odyssey Work Plan 2013-2015

2-3 year goal: Students will grow in their learning at a rate that allows them to meet or exceed the Common Core State Standards.
Part 1 (Projected time frame: 1.5 years): Students will have a clear understanding of where they are in relation to the CCS standards and targets.

Rationale: After completing a two-year focus on the Habits of a Learner, the staff unanimously agreed it was time to shift the Work Plan to focus on student success in the realm of academics. The CCSS represent important shifts that are aligned with Odyssey's priorities and philosophies, most importantly that all students are capable of rigorous work and high achievement. In addition, our goal points to the development of routines and instructional strategies that will allow students to learn at different rates while meeting the increased demands of the CCSS. While our reading data is consistently strong, our writing and math scores are not where we want them to be. Also, since students will take new assessments aligned with the CCSS in 2015, now is the time for the staff to delve deeply into ensuring that planning, instruction, and assessment reflect the expectations set forth in the CCSS. With the strong foundation of our Habits of a Learner in place, and knowing that those skills are crucial to success with the CCSS, we can focus our efforts on other aspects of the standards.

Alignment with EL Core Practices: Curriculum: 1, 5, 7, 9; Instruction: 13, 14, 15; Assessment: 23, 24; Leadership: 33, 34
On last year's IR, Odyssey had scores of 2 on: Culture of Mathematics; Analyzing Assessment Data; Using Data; Supporting Planning, Instruction, and Assessment
Alignment with the Staff Evaluation Tool:

Faculty Learning Targets	Structures and Leadership Actions that support achievement of the Faculty Learning Targets	EL Support and Services	Data Points/Evidence for Monitoring Progress
A. I can name the CCSS shifts and describe the philosophy behind them. B. I can use the CCSS to create a scope and sequence for the year, determining what is taught in and out of expedition. C. I can use JumpRope to support myself and students with communicating progress toward meeting targets. D. I can explain what interim benchmark data means (from STAR, DRA, the internal writing assessment or My Access, and AIMS). LATER IN THE YEAR: E. I can develop assessments that accurately monitor students' progress toward specific math or ELA standards and targets. F. I can use instructional tools to help me support students meet the CCSS. (e.g. menus, workshop 2.0, guided reading, support with text selection, protocols).	A. July 10-11 (Math); August institute (ELA); BBK about EL modules/ relationship to CCSS (August institute); key resources on PD website. Reflection structure/routine to support on-going understanding of the shifts. B. First draft of document created during Fall institute/summer; give Engage NY scope (math) as a model. Progressions (math). Jen will create a model for (ELA). ½ day planning sessions.Structured time to revisit/revise in January and August, 2014. C. PD to introduce: 8-30, 9-6, 9-13; data entry support from Liza (class lists, targets; habit targets); buddy groups with JR piloters; additional PD around conferences & progress reports, JR office hours facilitated by a person who piloted in 2012-13. Get clear and communicate with teachers about when and how often they have to communicate. D. Whole-group PD followed by 1-on-1 meetings with Marcia and/or Liza; subset of ILT members get trained and turnkey it; ILT ensures that staff is supported before reports go out; Marcia handles frontline communication with families about reports and questions; Marcia makes decisions about DRA administration. E./F. Coaching, planning sessions, classroom labs (with	ILT facilitation = 11 days (Jen) Friday PD support = 4 days (Cyndi) Planning support w/ teachers = 5 days (10 half days - Jen) Fall institute 2014 = 2.5 days (Cyndi) Other, including Site Seminar prep = 5.5 days (1.5 Cyndi) Total = 23 days of direct support 16 Days 9 days gone 7 days left: - .5 ILT March 11th - 1 Planning 18th - .5 ILT April	**Student data** ● Growth data for all students in ELA and Math ● Proficiency data in ELA and Math (Using assessments listed in target D and TCAP) **Faculty data:** **Pre-assessment/Self-assessment** A. Exit ticket: shared/public. B. Completed scope and sequence documents C. JumpRope content and progress reports; written reflection D. Exit tickets (shared & public on website?) E. Assessments, drafts, and feedback. F. Observation notes, video, feedback.

	Tollgate?), EL's toolkit booklets; mini EL institutes (?), differentiated PD later in the year	- .5 ILT May - 1 ILT May 27th - 1 ILT June clean-up 2.5 unscheduled with Jen (Billy, Andy and Stephen)	
Structures and Actions: ● Additional PD on how to analyze data, including the standards, triangulating data ● Continuation of looking at samples of student work - monitor needs for team ● Additional PD on how to use JR or another tool for RTI ● Additional PD on how to role JR with parents ● Offer JR office hours ● Monitor alignment of on-line tools - intentional progression ● Monitor JR use and how it is being used as a tool - notice patterns for support (RTI..) ● Create structures to support a data team meeting connected to target C and D ● Find more outside resources for target F - get out of belly button ● Find better models for E ● Support with a writing rubric ● Decide on our assessments - which ones and how often ● Create a routine around the data teams - pre-work/during/post ● How to role out the RTI EL Support	2014-15 update How will we know we are hitting targets C, D, E and F: ● Use the target criteria as framework E: ● We see a clear "proficiency story" using all the assessments ● We have a better understanding of what quality writing is and; ● Teachers agree what writing looks like at each grade level and why ● See more writing happening in Expeditions - intentional writing projects F: ● There is consistency of language being used by students ● Can see named instructional practices in teacher observations and evaluations ● Shifts in student perception survey ● Students will use the phases of enactive to symbolic to help them solve problems ● Teachers feel supported with using on-going assessments to drive their instruction ● People will be able to name and discuss practices (concrete discriptors) that they are using to help students meet the standards ● Clear observations of student improvement in fluency work ● Kids are growing at different rates - all making at least one year's growth ● Teachers can identify a year's growth ● plans are in one place for accountability and		**Possible assessments we would add:** **Target D:** ● **common note-catcher used with data teams** **OR** ● **use the comment section in JR - teachers identify needs and we would see evidence in the comment section** **Target F:** ● **Goal setting on narrow PD goal that is tracked in the evaluation tool** ● **Will see evidence of the new learning in plans** ● **Student Perception Survey**

-Support with resources specific to the needs of PD -Quality Models of ELA -Planning Support/Understanding the modules and connections to Expedition -High Quality Products-- bringing in models etc	accessibility C: ● Data in JR is used as a tool to really support instructional moves ● We would see an increase in amounts of data in the system ● We would hear teachers analyzing the data in team meetings ● Teachers would have habits and routines for using JR - less time on learning ● Teachers understand how to analyze the JR data well ● If JR works - monitor how teachers are using it to monitor interventions ● Use standards in JR to align to targets		
	D: ● We are clear about what benchmark data means for writing. ● Teachers can make sense of the data in order to make decisions for interventions (with support). They can see next steps based on the data. ● Teachers have data they trust - get rid of MyAccess - doesn't align? ● We have a reasonable experience for the internal writing benchmarking - sustainable with a strong rubric. ● We have a way to measure mathematical reasoning. Teachers use a math benchmark to analyze mathematical thinking. ● Teachers easily and frequently communicate to parents with data in mind - it is part of the conversation not just during isolated events. ● Teachers know how to use data to inform their instruction ● Teachers are skilled at reading the data ● Teachers triangulate between data points and think about instructional moves		

Odyssey – EL Professional Development Plan - 2013-2014

The long-term goal is to build the internal capacity of every school staff. In order to maximize your relationship with EL, we suggest that instructional leaders work alongside school designers whenever possible. Think strategically about how work with teachers or teams can impact school-wide implementation.

Most direct service days will be scheduled in advance and may include the following:	Direct service days (List dates and recurring structures):
 • Leadership coaching • **Leadership team meetings** - 1/month Sept-May, Tuesdays from 12-4 pm. Dates TBD. Full day in January; 2-3 days June-July. • Collecting and/or analyzing data related to the work plan goals • **Curricular planning sessions** - 10 half-days • PD planning and/or facilitation **- 4 days + more as needed** • Classroom observations/debrief sessions • Supporting coaching cycles • Support with National Conference preparation, Fund for Teachers applications, and other national activities • Participation at institutes with staff members to provide targeted support • Supporting the implementation of institute content in classrooms/schools **EL Institutes (Include date, location, and # of participants):** **Number of direct service days (as designated by MOU): 23**	

ILT Meeting Dates:
9/10
10/8 tentative; 10/1 as backup (6th grade trip TBD)
11/5
12/3
January 7 (1/2 day, 12-4 as usual)

2/4 (full day)
3/11
4/15
5/6
5/27 (full day; this is one of the "summer" days)
6/5 (8-12:45)
1 more TBD in July