Annual Review Meeting Minutes

Are We Implementing the 10 Components? A Programmatic Review of Our School-wide Program

School: South Side School Meeting Date: May 25, 2012

Persons in Attendance at the Meeting:

Name	Position
Gary Maynard	Principal
Sue Springer	Instructional Support Teacher
Jen Legere	Instructional Support Teacher
Maria Calabro	Instructional Support Teacher
Bryan Cistulli	Literacy Intern

1. Comprehensive Needs Assessment

We utilized phonological awareness assessments scores, Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) results, district assessments, such as the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) results, Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) results, daily running records, and check points to drive instruction. For students who were unable to meet grade level requirements, the Early Intervention Project (EIP) process was started.

2. School-wide Reform Strategies

a. Helping All Students Learn

To help our student be successful learners, we kept parents informed about Title One practices, instruction was differentiated for all students, and staff participated in Inquiry Teams to enhance teaching methods. Alternative techniques and services that were implemented to address student needs included forming small guided reading groups as well as grouping students according to their reading levels. We also made collaborative decisions with classroom teachers as how to proceed with helping our students.

b. Scientifically-Based Research

Our school participates in the NWEA, Inquiry Teams; Professional Development Days (PDD) either district guided or independently guided, Readers' and Writers' Workshops, and the Fountas & Pinnell Phonological Awareness Program.

c. Extended Learning Time

To increase the amount and the quality of learning time, Instructional Support Teachers and the Literacy Intern created small groups. South Side School was also fortunate to have more literacy staff this year including three Instructional Support Teachers and one Literacy Intern. The team also held two Title One Nights for parents. Since there was no funding available, we were unable to provide extended-day programs to our students.

d. Enriched, Accelerated Curriculum

South Side School students were able to learn in an enriched environment and were given the opportunity to learn at their own pace.

e. Alignment of School Accountability Plan to School Improvement Plan

The areas of need in both plans include assisting at risk students with math and reading. The goals of both plans were communicated to parents through newsletters and Title One events. The faculty was informed during PDD held every Wednesday afternoon.

3. Instruction by Highly Qualified Teachers

South Side School has highly qualified teachers with extensive reading backgrounds.

4. Highly Qualified Teachers to High Need Schools

We did not have a high teacher turnover rate this school year and the range of teaching experience was one year to 39 years of service.

5. Professional Development

We feel that we have more knowledge about programs and these programs have helped us to differentiate instruction among our students. We were able to utilize our Wednesday extended meetings, Monday collaboration times as well as math and literacy coaching sessions to strengthen Title One practices.

6. Strategies to Increase Parental Involvement

We were able to communicate with parents through several methods including: October and April parent teacher conferences, monthly newsletters, school-wide Title One Nights, progress reports, individualized reading plans, e-mails, and phone calls.

a. Reviewing the School-wide Parental Involvement Policy and Compact

No changes are needed for the parent compact at this time.

b. Review Results of Parent Survey

We had 24 surveys returned to the school. Parents indicated that they wanted more tips on how to help their child with homework assignments and assistance on how to transition from the elementary to the middle school setting.

7. Preschool Transitioning *(if appropriate)*

This section does not apply to South Side School students.

8. Teacher Participation in Making Assessment Decisions

Our assessments inform instruction very well as this time.

9. Timely Assistance

We identified our grade one and two students through the Leveled Literacy Intervention program screening process. We also identified other grade levels with the largest number of substantiately deficient students based on the CMT and DRA data. We agreed that the selection process accurately recognized students needing additional assistance. Once students were chosen they were placed on Instructional Support Teachers' and the Literacy Intern's caseloads.

10. Coordination of Programs

We also utilized the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) program to help our students be successful learners.

Other Items for Discussion/Planning for 2012-13

We would like to continue supporting our at risk students through small group instruction. This is only possible if the literacy staff does not fluctuate so often in our building. We were able to provide assistance to both our students and staff because there were an adequate number of Instructional Support Teachers and one Literacy Intern.