



Cover Page

# 2009-2010 School Improvement Progress Report and 2010-2011 Action Plan

As required by NH RSA 193-H and Federal Law 107-110 for Schools in Need of Improvement

## For Non-Title I Schools In Need of Improvement

SAU#: 12

---

District Name: Londonderry

---

School Name: Matthew Thornton School

---

Address: 275 Mammoth Road

---

Town/City: Londonderry

Zip: 03053

---

Principal: Carol Mack

---

Tel: 432-6937, ext. 6504 Fax: 425-1005

E-mail:  
cmack@londonderry.org

---

Contact person if different from Principal:

Name: Andrew Corey

---

Title: Assistant Superintendent

---

Address: 268C Mammoth Road

---

Town/City: Londonderry

Zip: 03053

---

Tel: 432-6920, ext. 1109 Fax: 432-1049

E-mail: acorey@londonderry.org

---

## 2009-2010 Progress Report Evidence of Progress in Plan Implementation

Instructions: *For each goal listed in your approved school improvement plan, use the format below to provide a status report on the strategies and activities implemented during the 2009-2010 school year. Duplicate this page as needed in order to report on the status of each goal in the plan.*

### AYP Area(s) of Focus

*List the area or areas (Reading, Mathematics, or Attendance/Graduation Rate) for which the school was designated as in need of improvement during School Year 2009-2010.*

Reading, in the areas of Education Disability and Economically Disadvantaged  
Mathematics, in the areas of Education Disability and Economically Disadvantaged



### Improvement Goal for 2009-2010

*State the improvement goal:*

To improve scores for students with disabilities and economic disadvantages on the Reading portion of the NECAP.

To improve scores for students with disabilities and economic disadvantages on the Math portion of the NECAP.



### Implementation of Approved Activities

*List the activities implemented during the 2009-2010 school year to accomplish this goal:*

**In the Area of Reading:**

- Review and analyzed NECAP, Iowa Test, Scott Foresman Reading Test and DIBELS data to prepare curriculum lessons and instruction to meet the needs of our economically disadvantaged reading students.
- Provided reading professional development for special education, reading specialists, reading teachers, and classroom teachers including LIPS Training, Visualizing and Verbalizing training, and other PD opportunities to develop new strategies for comprehension and fluency.

**In the Area of Mathematics:**

- Developed special education math curriculum maps, and modified assessments to the State GLE's, district math benchmarks and research-based math programs (this occurred in summer 2010).
- Continued the use of Computation tests (given 4 times each year) in Grades 3-5
- Reviewed and analyzed NECAP, Iowa Test, and Scott Foresman Math Test data to prepare curriculum lessons and instruction to the needs of our economically disadvantaged students.
- Provided math professional development for special education teachers, our math support teacher, and classroom teachers including On Cloud Nine Math, Mind over Matter training, and other PD opportunities to develop new strategies for math understanding and computation fluency (for example: Vocabulary and Writing Strategies to Enhance Math Learning).
- Developed "team-taught" math groups to implement accommodated math programming for grades 4 and 5.

*Select one descriptor that best describes the status of these activities at the end of 2009-2010:*

- Completed as planned and as described in the approved school improvement plan  
 Completed as planned, with changes/refinements to certain strategies and activities

- Progressing as planned, with no changes to strategies and activities*
- Progressing, with changes/refinements to certain strategies and activities*
- Beginning stages of implementation*
- No strategies or activities implemented*

### **Narrative Response**

Instructions: ***Describe the progress made in implementing the activities listed above. Include a description of any key factors or circumstances that resulted in a modification or change to the activities as they were originally described in the approved improvement plan.***

As a result of the strategies noted in our action plan above, we were able to significantly improve student learning in the area of Reading so that we met the requirements set by the state in both the Economically Disadvantaged and Educational Disability cohorts in Reading. We believe that our targeted professional development and individually targeted instruction as part of our Three Tier Model in Reading were the reasons we were so successful. We will continue this approach in School Year 2010-11. We did not complete the Special Education Reading curriculum maps as originally planned. Our school district is now working with a consultant from WestEd Consultants who is leading us through the process of identifying essential standards in Reading, unpacking the standards, and constructing an instructional calendar as part of our work to implement Professional Learning Communities. This work will be outlined in our new SINI strategies.

We also met the requirements for Economically Disadvantaged students in Math. The only area that we did not meet the requirements was in Educational Disability in Math. This summer (summer of 2010), we targeted summer curriculum work for the development of modified assessments in math to be used at grades 3, 4 and 5. These will be used for low level math students, including regular and special education. We will use the results of these assessments to target our instruction to better meet individual student needs. Additional professional development opportunities will be provided to improve Math instruction, particularly for our low performing students.

## 2009-2010 Progress Report

### Evidence of Progress in Improving School Practices and Student Outcomes

**Instructions:** Respond to the following reflective questions:

- In addition to the annual state assessment, what assessments are administered in your school and district to regularly assess student learning in Reading and Mathematics? How are the results used to make instructional choices and decisions?

The Londonderry School District administers annually each spring the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, Form A Core Battery at grades 1-8 and at grade 9, the Iowa Tests of Educational Development, Form A Core Battery. At grades K-3, the district administers the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS).

In addition to standardized testing, the Londonderry School District utilizes reading unit benchmark and end of year assessments to the 2008 Scott Foresman *Reading Street* program K-5; grade 6 Prentice Hall *Reader's Journey* program, and grades 6-8 Pearson AMP Reading Program to regularly assess student learning as well as to regularly make instructional choices and decisions within a three-tier model. At LHS, common course competency assessments, mid-terms, and final exams are used to regularly assess student learning and to drive instructional decisions in the area of reading.

In the area of mathematics, frequent timed computation tests are used throughout the year at grades 3-8 (i.e. 5-6 times per year) to provide practice and reinforcement of basic math skills. In addition, grade K administers common trimester assessments while grades 1-5 utilize the 2004 Scott Foresman/Addison-Wesley chapter tests. These regular assessments in both reading and math are tracked and monitored on the district assessment system. Results are used to monitor student progress and to drive instructional decisions throughout the year. In addition, the district purchased in spring 2010 through ARRA Funds, Pearson KEYMATH 3 Diagnostic Assessments and Intervention Materials for students who struggle in math targeted at grades 4-8. Grades 3-5 SPED common math assessments and curriculum maps will be developed and implemented for fall 2010.

For a detailed listing of these and other local assessments, the District and Building Level Assessments and Timeline for 2009-2010 are attached.

- What activities are in place or planned, such as professional development in the use of *Performance Plus* or other data analysis tools, to provide teachers with access to and a better understanding of their students' assessment results and achievement strengths and weaknesses?

The district has developed its own customized internal assessment system whereby each teacher, grade level, team, department and administration may access their students' test data. The system continues to evolve and will have by fall 2010 the capability to track interventions as well as the ability for teachers to access confidential information securely from home. In addition, several research-based assessments designed for the districts at-risk and special education population will be programmed.

In addition to focusing on individual student improvement, school administration, teachers, grade level, teams, and departments meet regularly to review and analyze the data. From the analysis, they develop and implement action plans for group, team, department, and grade level improvement. This process is used at all levels systematically K-12.

- Describe the progress made in addressing the needs of struggling learners. What accomplishments can be documented during the 2009-2010 school year that resulted in improved outcomes for students scoring below proficient on NECAP?

Our results from NECAP Reading have shown declines among cohort groups of Matthew Thornton School students with educational disabilities from the previous year at grades 4-5 outlined below:

### Matthew Thornton NECAP Reading 2007-2009 – Educational Disabilities Results

Percent of IEP Students Scoring Proficient and Above (Level 4/3)

Class	2007	2008	2009
Grade 3 (Class of 2019)			50%
Grade 4 (Class of 2018)		38% (16)	33%(20)
Grade 5( Class of 2017)	22% (18)	29% (21)	25%(25)

The following actions were attempted to improve reading outcomes for the Class of 2019, Class of 2018, and Class of 2017:

As noted previously, we reviewed the results and provided appropriate, targeted instruction for each student. Students were taught in small groups that were arranged by student need (i.e. comprehension, fluency, etc.). Progress monitoring took place on a regular two week basis; adjustments were made as needed. Several students were given Wilson instruction to improve phonemic strategies. Teachers were trained in Visualization and Verbalization to enable them to assist with comprehension skills. Reading specialists and special education staff provided additional targeted instruction to those students who were demonstrating resistance to instruction.

Our results from NECAP Math have shown gains among cohort groups of Matthew Thornton School students with educational disabilities from the previous years at grades 4-5 outlined below:

### Matthew Thornton NECAP Mathematics 2007- 2009 – Educational Disabilities Cohort Results

Percent of IEP Students Scoring Proficient and Above (Level 4/3)

Class	2007	2008	2009
Grade 3 (Class of 2019)			25%
Grade 4 (Class of 2018)		35% (16)	38%
Grade 5 (Class of 2017)	12% (18)	24% (21)	29%

The following actions were used to improve math outcomes for the Class of 2017, Class of 2018, and Class of 2019:

As noted previously, we reviewed the results for each student and provided appropriate, targeted instruction. In Grade 3, students were taught in small groups, with additional school personnel used to teach those students who demonstrated difficulties. Number Worlds instructional materials were used to assist in concept mastery at all levels. In grades 4 and 5 we grouped students by abilities, keeping the class sizes smaller for those students who demonstrated difficulties. Progress monitoring took place on a regular basis; adjustments were made as needed. Special education teachers and low level math class teachers were trained in On Cloud Nine Math to enable them to assist with acquisition of skills and concept mastery. Special education staff provided additional targeted instruction to those students who demonstrated resistance to instruction.

In addition to NECAP assessments, the district relies on a variety of assessments to determine improvement including the nationally recognized Iowa Tests (ITBS/ITED) at grades 1-9 and Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills at grades K-3. Growth demonstrated in the Iowa Test of Basic Skills is reflected in the charts to follow:

**Londonderry School District ITBS/ITED  
Average Rate of Academic Growth 2008-2010**

Class of 2019 –All Students (Grades 1-2-3) – MT SPED -10 students tested 2009:  
16 students tested in 2010.

Test	Average Developmental Standard Score 2008	Average Developmental Standard Score 2009/Year's Growth in Year's Time* (Yes/No)*	Average Developmental Standard Score 2010/Year's Growth in Year's Time** (Yes/No)*	SS Difference 2009-2010***
Reading Total	150	<b>160 No</b>	<b>181 Yes</b>	<b>21</b>
Math Total	152	<b>166 No</b>	<b>192 Yes</b>	<b>26</b>
Reading Vocab.	153	<b>162 No</b>	<b>173 Yes</b>	<b>17</b>
Reading Comp.	147	<b>157 No</b>	<b>184 Yes</b>	<b>27</b>
Math Concepts	149	<b>164 No</b>	<b>193 Yes</b>	<b>29</b>
Math Prob. Solv.	157	<b>170 No</b>	<b>191 Yes</b>	<b>21</b>
Math Computa.	148	<b>165 No</b>	<b>186 Yes</b>	<b>21</b>

\*Average Annual Academic Growth from Grades 1-2 = 18 standard score points.

\*\* Average Annual Academic Growth from Grades 2-3 = 17 standard score points.

\*\*\*The smaller the number in this column, the smaller the academic gain.

Source: *The Iowa Tests, Interpretive Guide for School Administrators (c. 2001)*

**Londonderry School District ITBS/ITED  
Average Rate of Academic Growth 2008-2010**

Class of 2018 –SPED - 20 students tested 2009; 25 students tested 2010

Test	Average Developmental Standard Score 2008	Average Developmental Standard Score 2009/Year's Growth in Year's Time* (Yes/No)	Average Developmental Standard Score 2010/Year's Growth in Year's Time** (Yes/No)	SS Difference 2009-2010***
Reading Total	159	183 Yes	197 No	14
Math Total	166	187 Yes	196 No	9
Reading Vocab.	157	183 Yes	194 No	11
Reading Comp.	160	184 Yes	199 Yes	15
Math Concepts	168	186 Yes	196 No	10
Math Prob. Solving	166	187 Yes	202 Yes	15
Math Computation	163	187 Yes	190 No	3

\*Average Annual Academic Growth from Grades 1-2 = 18 standard score points.

\*\* Average Annual Academic Growth from Grades 2-3 = 17 standard score points.

\*\*\* Average Annual Academic Growth from Grades 3-4 = 15 standard score points.

\*\*\*The smaller the number in this column, the smaller the academic gain.

*Source: The Iowa Tests, Interpretive Guide for School Administrators (c. 2001)*

For Class of 2017-SPED – 27 students tested 2009; 25 students tested 2010

Test	Average Developmental Standard Score 2008/Year's Growth in Year's Time* (Yes/No)	Average Developmental Standard Score 2009/Year's Growth in Year's Time** (Yes/No)	Average Developmental Standard Score 2010/Year's Growth in Year's Time*** (Yes/No)	SS Difference 2009-10****
Reading Total	178	199 Yes	209 No	10
Math Total	178	199 Yes	212 No	13
Reading Vocab.	178	197 Yes	212 Yes	15
Reading Comp.	176	201 Yes	206 No	5
Math Concepts	180	200 Yes	210 No	10
Math Prob.Solving	178	202 Yes	213 No	11
Math Computation	176	193 Yes	213 Yes	20

\* Average Annual Academic Growth from Grades 1-2 = 18 standard score points.

\*\* Average Annual Academic Growth from Grades 2-3 = 17 standard score points.

\*\*\* Average Annual Academic Growth from Grades 3-4 = 15 standard score points

\*\*\*\* Average Annual Academic Growth from Grades 4-5 = 14 standard score points.

\*\*\*\*The smaller the number in this column, the smaller the academic gain.

*Source: The Iowa Tests, Interpretive Guide for School Administrators (c. 2001)*

- Overall, where there is greatest evidence of improvement in implementing the plan, what factors were most influential in generating change?

Matthew Thornton School administration and staff have found a variety of assessments (i.e. DIBELS, reading unit assessments, weekly “fresh read” assessments from our Scott Foresman Reading series, computation tests, math chapter tests, and Iowa scores) particularly useful to determine academic growth of individual students, or groups of students. We used a compilation of all of this data to make frequent instructional decisions which adjusted teaching strategies that have resulted in improved student performance.

- Where improvement is less evident, what factors have impeded the desired change?

This work has led us to conclude that our current spiraling curriculum is quite broad. In dialoging with teachers they have articulated that as they move through the many concepts covered they are not seeing consistent student mastery of basic concepts. Reteaching is not emphasized since it is understood that a child may not master the concept when it is first presented, but will demonstrate mastery over the child’s completion of the program during his/her elementary education.

- Based on these outcomes, what refinements to the 2009-2010 SINI plan are proposed for 2010-2011? *Note: If the school is now identified for an additional area (i.e. was identified for Reading and is now also identified for Math), what revisions are being made to the plan to now address the new area?*

Our 2009-10 plan started a focused dialog among our district wide elementary administrators on how to move our schools away from being SINI schools and how to improve our students’ learning. We were particularly interested in looking into Professional Learning Communities (PLC’s). We contacted a consultant from WestEd Consulting to help us with this initiative. We also visited an elementary school in Merrimack NH that had already adopted PLC’s so that we could get a big picture of what they would look like in action. In April 2009, the school principals from the district attended a two day workshop on PLC’s. The focus of the workshop was on identifying essential standards and working to target these standards for student mastery. After attending this workshop, our district elementary administrative team met to fine tune our plan to adopt PLC’s over the course of the next two years for reading, and then to apply the process to our math curriculum. In our initial professional development activity with WestEd, representatives from each grade level for both regular and special education have worked together to identify 20 essential standards in Reading that are aligned with state GLE’s and local benchmarks. During professional development time that is scheduled for 2010-2011 our teacher leaders will be unpacking those standards to better understand the skills and concepts that each student needs to master. Formative assessments will then be developed to be used in school year 2011-12.

## 2010-2011 School Improvement Action Plan Proposed Strategies and Activities

**Instructions:** Use the format below to describe the 2010-2011 action plan. Provide sufficient detail to assist the reviewers in understanding how the activities are designed to achieve the anticipated changes/outcomes in professional practice and student learning. Duplicate this page as needed. Complete one form for each goal.

<p><b>Goal</b></p>	<p><b>To improve scores for students on the reading portion of the NECAP</b></p>		<p>The following strategies will be implemented to achieve this goal <b>(check all that apply)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>x Addresses teaching and learning needs of all students</li> <li>x Addresses needs of specific low-achieving students</li> <li>x Implementation of Scientifically Based Research</li> <li>x Professional Development</li> <li>x External Technical Assistance Provider(s)</li> <li>x Extended-Time Learning</li> <li>x Parent and Community Involvement</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Strategy</b></p>	<p>Hire West Ed Consultants to assist us in learning the components of local accountability through the use of professional learning communities</p> <p><i>What are the anticipated outcomes? How will professional practice be modified and improved by implementing this strategy?</i></p>				
<p><b>Objectives</b> (to be written as responses to the italicized questions)</p>	<p><b>OBJECTIVE:</b> Developing Professional Learning Communities will improve and insure consistent alignment with the state GLE's and local benchmarks. We will continue to improve our skills in providing opportunities for professional dialog that will focus on using data to drive instruction.</p> <p><i>What are the anticipated outcomes? How will student learning be improved by implementing this strategy/activity?</i></p>				
<p><b>Proposed Activities for 2010-2011</b> Describe the activities to be implemented to achieve the desired outcomes in school practices and student learning. Provide sufficient detail regarding the purpose of each activity and how it will be implemented.</p>	<p><b>Resources</b> <i>What existing and/or new resources will be used to accomplish the activity?</i></p> <p>We will be guided through this process by WestEd consultants.</p>	<p><b>Timeline</b> <i>Projected timeframe for this activity</i></p> <p>School year 2010-11</p>	<p><b>Oversight</b> <i>Who is primarily responsible for this activity?</i></p> <p>Elementary administration will oversee the teacher leaders from each grade</p>	<p><b>Monitoring (Implementation)</b> <i>What evidence will be collected to document that the activity is being implemented as intended? How often and by whom?</i></p> <p>The 20 unpacked standards for each grade level 1-5</p>	<p><b>Monitoring (Effectiveness)</b> <i>What evidence will be collected to demonstrate effectiveness of this activity? How often and by whom?</i></p> <p>The consultant from WestEd will provide feedback on the unpacked standards. Formative Assessments will be created during summer 2011 that will be used during 2011-2012 to</p>

<p>identify essential skills and concepts that each student needs to master. This will occur during school year 2010-2011.</p>			<p>level as they complete this activity</p>			<p>monitor student mastery of basic skills and concepts.</p>
<p>Time will be allotted in the bi-weekly schedule for grade level teams to meet and use data from assessments to discuss student performance and steps that need to be taken to provide additional support for those students who don't demonstrate mastery.</p>	<p>The bi-weekly schedule will be adapted</p>	<p>School year 2010-11</p>	<p>School administration</p>	<p>Team level meeting notes will be collected</p>	<p>Feedback from WestEd Consultants and Surveyed responses from teaching teams</p>	
<p>Devise an instructional calendar that will outline a timeline for teachers to follow to teach each of the twenty standards to mastery. This will be consistently followed by all teachers in the same grade.</p>	<p>Professional development time that is included in school district calendar</p>	<p>Nov. 2010</p>	<p>School administration</p>	<p>Completed Instructional Calendar for each grade level 1-5</p>	<p>School administration will observe consistency in teaching essential standards during informal and formal observations</p>	
<p>Information will be shared with parents through the MTPTA</p>	<p>PTA</p>	<p>School year 2010-11</p>	<p>School administration</p>	<p>PTA Minutes and Newsletter</p>	<p>Parental feedback</p>	

## 2010-2011 School Improvement Action Plan Proposed Strategies and Activities

**Instructions:** Use the format below to describe the 2010-2011 action plan. Provide sufficient detail to assist the reviewers in understanding how the activities are designed to achieve the anticipated changes/outcomes in professional practice and student learning. Duplicate this page as needed. Complete one form for each goal.

<p><b>Goal</b></p>	<p><b>To improve scores for students on the math portion of the NECAP</b></p>						<p>The following strategies will be implemented to achieve this goal <b>(check all that apply)</b></p>
<p><b>Strategy</b></p>	<p>Expand our use of research based interventions</p>						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>x Addresses teaching and learning needs of all students</li> <li>x Addresses needs of specific low-achieving students</li> <li>x Implementation of Scientifically Based Research</li> <li>x Professional Development</li> <li>x External Technical Assistance Provider(s)</li> <li>x Extended-Time Learning</li> <li>x Parent and Community Involvement</li> </ul>
<p><b>Objectives</b> (to be written as responses to the italicized questions)</p>	<p><i>What are the anticipated outcomes? How will professional practice be modified and improved by implementing this strategy?</i></p> <p><b>OBJECTIVE: Developing Professional Learning Communities</b> improve our skills in providing opportunities for professional dialog that will focus on using data to drive instruction.</p>						
	<p><i>What are the anticipated outcomes? How will student learning be improved by implementing this strategy/activity?</i></p> <p><b>OBJECTIVE: Through the use of new intervention materials</b></p>						
<p><b>Proposed Activities for 2010-2011</b> <i>Describe the activities to be implemented to achieve the desired outcomes in school practices and student learning. Provide sufficient detail regarding the purpose of each activity and how it will be implemented.</i></p>	<p><b>Resources</b> <i>What existing and/or new resources will be used to accomplish the activity?</i></p> <p>Kits have been purchased PD training offered through our school district</p>	<p><b>Timeline</b> <i>Projected timeframe for this activity</i></p> <p>PD is in summer 2010. Kits will be used during school year 2010-11</p>	<p><b>Oversight</b> <i>Who is primarily responsible for this activity?</i></p> <p>School administration</p>	<p><b>Monitoring (Implementation)</b> <i>What evidence will be collected to document that the activity is being implemented as intended? How often and by whom?</i></p> <p>Teachers will record use of Key Math interventions on our district database of assessments</p>	<p><b>Monitoring (Effectiveness)</b> <i>What evidence will be collected to demonstrate effectiveness of this activity? How often and by whom?</i></p> <p>Math support and special education teachers will use progress monitoring that will be discussed at school RTI meetings that are held weekly.</p>		
<p>Resource material kits for Key Math will be used for those students demonstrating difficulty in Math. The kits include assessment materials and targeted interventions for students who demonstrate weaknesses in the concepts</p>							

that are assessed.	Kits have been purchased	Kits will be used during school year 2010-11	School administration	Teachers will report use of Number Worlds interventions to administration	Math support and special education teachers will use progress monitoring that will be discussed at school RTI meetings that are held weekly on students who need interventions.
Resource material kits for Number Worlds will be used for those students demonstrating difficulty in Math. The kits include targeted interventions for students who demonstrate weaknesses in math concepts.	The bi-weekly schedule will be adapted	School year 2010-2011	School administration	Team level meeting notes will be collected	Surveyed results from grade level teams.
Time will be allotted in the bi-weekly schedule for grade level teams to meet and use data from assessments to discuss student performance and steps that need to be taken to provide additional support for those students who don't demonstrate mastery.	Chapter tests from our Scott Foresman math program have been modified by grade level representatives from each school for grades 3, 4 and 5	School year 2010-2011	School administration	Chapter test results for the modified assessments will be recorded on a trimester basis on our school district assessment data base	Review of assessment results will be ongoing by teachers and administration. End of year data will be carefully reviewed to determine success of the use of the modified assessments
Implement newly developed modified assessments for math	PTA	School year 2010-11	School administration	PTA Minutes and Newsletter	Parental feedback
Information will be shared with parents through the MTPA					