



School Information

School's Name	Sherman Elementary School	School District	Fairfield Public Schools
Principal's Name	Dr. Ian Banner	School Year	2022-2023

School's Mission/Vision

The school's mission, vision and core values are the district's mission, vision, and core values. Refer to link: https://www.fairfieldschools.org/district-information/dip22-27

District Mission

The mission of the Fairfield Public Schools, in partnership with families and community, is to ensure that every student acquires the knowledge and skills needed to be a lifelong learner, responsible citizen, and successful participant in an ever-changing global society through a comprehensive educational program

District Vision

The fulfillment of the mission, for all students PK-12+, demands our ongoing commitment to realize the Vision of the Graduate.

All students will be:

- 1. Critical thinkers
- 2. Collaborators
- 3. Communicators
- 4. Innovators
- 5. Goal-directed, resilient learners



6. Responsible citizens

District Core Values

All Fairfield Public School students will:

- 1. Achieve and exemplify mastery of the FPS Academic Expectations
- 2. Perform at high levels in regard to Social and Civic Expectations
- 3. Develop into responsible citizens who exhibit ethical behavior
- 4. Acknowledge, explore, and value the importance of diversity
- 5. Develop a healthy personal identity and self-reliance
- 6. Demonstrate strong motivational persistence to learn
- 7. Exhibit an inquisitive attitude, open mind, and curiosity
- 8. Acquire an understanding and appreciation of other cultures

Theory of Action

In literacy, we believe that...

- 1. By teachers (grades 3-5) becoming clearer about the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and how questions on the SBA reflect the standards, we will be better able to plan instruction and assessment (classroom questions/tasks) that have greater alignment to the CCSS and SBA, and a greater percentage of grade 3-5 students will score at a level 3 or 4 on the SBA.
- 2. Teachers (K-2) implementing the district phonics program with greater fidelity and consistency will lead to K-2 students acquiring the district-expected literacy skills and will later support more students in grades 3-5 scoring at a level 3 or 4 when they take the SBA.
- 3. Establishing classroom cultures that promotes student-to-student discourse which (a) requires students to accurately and articulately explain and defend their thinking will lead to them demonstrating greater understanding of what they read.
- 4. Developing and administering pre- and post-assessments in vocabulary and word-meaning will enable teachers to strategically plan for and instruct





students to correctly answer questions related to CCSS Target 3, Word Meanings.

In math, we believe that...

- 5. By teachers (grades 3-5) becoming clearer about the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and how questions on the SBA reflect the standards, we will be better able to plan instruction and assessment (classroom questions/tasks) that have greater alignment to the CCSS and SBA, and a greater percentage of grade 3-5 students will score at a level 3 or 4 on the SBA.
- 6. Establishing classroom cultures that promotes student-to-student discourse which requires students to accurately analyze information and precisely identify patterns/relationships will lead to them being better able to explain their thinking in math.
- 7. Including appropriate vocabulary (i.e. mean, median, mode) into units of study and presenting students with more tasks focused on representing and interpreting data meaning will enable teachers to strategically instruct students to be able to correctly answer questions and solve problems related to CCSS Target H, *Represent and interpret data*.

Regarding attendance, we believe that...

8. Continuing to identify the number and percentage of students and high-need students (HNSs)—those receiving specialized instruction and/or formal support services to address identified academic and/or functional needs—closely and frequently monitor their absence rate and intervene and support families as necessary will decrease this group's number/percentage of absences during the school year.



School Improvement Plan (SIP) Representatives

Name	Position	Name	Position
Dr. Ian Banner	Principal	Jessica Ottavio	Elementary Program Facilitator
Lauren Moreno	Literacy Specialist	Karli Smith	Literacy Specialist
Robyn Walters	Math/Science Teacher	DeAnna Kopchik	Teacher: Grade K
Marie Matarazzo	Teacher: Grade 2	Steph Hayes	Teacher: Grade 3
Krissy Ioanna	Teacher: Grade 4	Chris Carr	Teacher: Grade 4
Dan Luciano	Teacher: Grade 5		



J

Fairfield Public Schools - School Improvement Plan

School Data Review

In the section below, indicate all historical indicators of school performance (SBA, NGSS, PSAT, SAT, PE, etc.) and other historical school indicators (attendance, course taking, participation, etc.) over the past three years.

Note.

- The percentages highlighted in yellow indicate an all-student cohort decline or plateau compared to the previous year.
- The percentages highlighted in blue indicate a HN-student cohort decline or plateau compared to the previous year.

Table 1.

SBA - ELA % Proficient	2018-2019 All Ss HNSs	2020-2021 All Ss HNSs	2021-2022 All Ss HNSs
3rd	91	95	86
	78	100	83
4th	88	90	85
	56	73	72
5th	90	90	87
	88	62	<mark>75</mark>

Table 2.

SBA - ELA Growth %	2018-2019 All Ss (3-4/4-5) HNSs (3-4/4-5)	2020-2021 All Ss (3-4/4-5) HNSs (3-4/4-5)	2021-2022 All Ss (3-4/4-5) HNSs (3-4/4-5)
School	86/75 77/76	N/A	75/ <mark>55</mark> <mark>67/</mark> 59



Table 3.

SBA - Math % Proficient	2018-2019 All Ss HNSs	2020-2021 All Ss HNSs	2021-2022 All Ss HNSs
3rd	98	89	91
	94	100	83
4th	89	81	90
	56	91	100
5th	84	87	87
	88	62	88

Table 4.

SBA - Math Growth %	2018-2019 All Ss (3-4/4-5) HNSs (3-4/4-5)	2020-2021 All Ss (3-4/4-5) HNSs (3-4/4-5)	2021-2022 All Ss (3-4/4-5) HNSs (3-4/4-5)
School	74/76 83/88	N/A	72/ <mark>51</mark> 90/89



J

${\bf Fairfield\ Public\ Schools-School\ Improvement\ Plan}$

Table 5.

NGSS % Proficient	2018-2019 All Ss HNSs	2020-2021 All Ss HNSs	2021-2022 All Ss HNSs
5th	81	91	95
	65	85	100

Table 6.

Attendance Chronic Abs.	2018-2019	2020-2021	2021-2022
All Students	5.2	4.7	13
High Needs	7.7	5.6	18.4

Table 7.



STAR - Early Literacy % Proficient	2018-2019 All Ss HNSs	2020-2021 All Ss HNSs	2021-2022 All Ss HNSs
Kindergarten	-	56	67

Table 8.

STAR - ELA % Proficient (Spring)	2018-2019 All Ss HNS	2020-2021 All Ss HNSs	2021-2022 All Ss HNSs
1st	89	68 42	64 <mark>50</mark>
2nd	86	89 82	84 <mark>46</mark>
3rd	95	79 80	84 80
4th	78	84 83	83 <mark>73</mark>
5th	77	77	<mark>77</mark>



J

	63	83

Table 9.

STAR - Math % Proficient (Spring)	2018-2019 All Ss HNS	2020-2021 All Ss HNSs	2021-2022 All Ss HNSs
1st	86	77 75	78 57
2nd	81	89 82	93 <mark>62</mark>
3rd	96	91 100	96 100
4th	92	88 67	86 86
5th	89	95 75	95 100



SMART Goal 1

Root Cause Analysis 1 - Based on School Performance

Background

In recent years, Sherman grade 3-5 students have achieved high scores on the ELA SBA (see Table 1). However, in 21-22, the percentage of grade 3-5 students scoring at level 3 or 4 in ELA dropped from the low- to mid-nineties to mid- to upper-eighties. Our cohorts (grade 3 in 20-21 to grade 4 in 21-22 decreased from 95% to 85% scoring at level 3 or 4. The same is true for grade 4 in 20-21 to grade 5 in 21-22 whereby the percentage of students scoring at level 3 or 4 decreased from 90% to 87%. Our HNS cohort level 3 or 4 scores also declined from 100% to 73% (grade 3 in 20-21 to grade 4 in 21-22), and the





grade 4 in 20-21 to grade 5 in 21-22 level 3 or 4 score percentage remained in the low- to mid-seventies. Therefore, to increase our achievement in this area, we believe that specific steps (outlined below) are necessary.

Root Cause

We theorize that many of our teaching staff in grades 3-5 are unclear on how to develop questions/tasks (as on the SBA) that best represent the state standards. We also theorize that our teaching staff in grades K-5 are not able to expertly articulate how the ELA standards are being directly addressed in daily student-work tasks and assessments so that when students are asked questions on the SBA in grades 3-5, they are well versed in the vocabulary and thinking expectations required. It is critical to emphasize that this is not test-prep for the SBA, but moreover, to ensure that students are being provided daily work as part of the regular district curriculum that best represents that Common Core State Standards.

Theory of Literacy Action

In literacy, we believe that...

- 1. By teachers (grades 3-5) becoming clearer about the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and how questions on the SBA reflect the standards, we will be better able to plan instruction and assessment (classroom questions/tasks) that have greater alignment to the CCSS and SBA, and a greater percentage of grade 3-5 students will score at a level 3 or 4 on the SBA.
- 2. Teachers (K-2) implementing the district phonics program with greater fidelity and consistency will lead to K-2 students acquiring the district-expected literacy skills and will later support more students in grades 3-5 scoring at a level 3 or 4 when they take the SBA.
- 3. Establishing classroom cultures that promotes student-to-student discourse which (a) requires students to accurately and articulately explain and defend their thinking will lead to them demonstrating greater understanding of what they read.
- 4. Developing and administering pre- and post-assessments in vocabulary and word-meaning will enable teachers to strategically plan for and instruct students to correctly answer questions related to CCSS Target 3, *Word Meanings*.



School's Goal	Increase overall <i>literacy</i> performance.	
SMART Goal	90% of students (in each grade level, 3-5) will score at Level 3 (Meet) or 4 (Exceed) on the 2023 ELA SBA 85% of the High Needs subgroup students (currently at 76%) will score at Level 3 (Meet) or 4 (Exceed) on the ELA SBA by June 2023.	
Evidence of Success 1 IAGDs minimum Inclusive and Equitable	 90% of students in grades K-1 will score at Meet or Exceed on the district literacy assessment in phonological awareness by June 2023 90% of students in grade 2 will score at Meet or Exceed on the district literacy assessment in phonics by June 2023 90% of students in grades 3-5 will score at Meet or Exceed on the district literacy screener by June 2023 80% of HN students in each grade (K-5) will score at or above Proficiency on the district literacy screener by June 2023 95% of students in grades K-5 will be reading on grade level by June 2023 as measured on the district's literacy assessments (F&P) by June 2023 	
District Improvement Plan Connection	All grade 2 students will complete second grade reading at or above a grade 2 end-of-year level based on the district's reading screener	



English Language Arts performance, as measured by SBA proficiency indicator (3-8) will close the gap between subgroup performance by 20% and raise the bar by 10% from 2021 district performance in a positive direction

Goal 1 (a) - Strategic Plan

Copy the below table for each SRBS that is included in the plan and change the letter accordingly (e.g.: a, b, c)

Scientifically Research Based Strategy	Planning for and instruction in targeted small-group instruction with a focus on specific and measurable student learning outcomes to increase PA, phonics and vocabulary
MOY Results (Expectation/ Reality)	1. 80% of students in grades K-1 will score at Meet or Exceed on the district literacy assessment



	 in phonological awareness by June 2023 80% of students in grade 2 will score at Meet or Exceed on the district literacy assessment in phonics by June 2023 80% of students in grades 3-5 will score at Meet or Exceed on the district literacy screener by June 2023 75% of HN students in each grade (K-5) will score at or above Proficiency on the district literacy screener by June 2023 85% of students in grades K-5 will be reading on grade level by June 2023 as measured on the district's literacy assessments (F&P) by June 2023
EOY Results (Expectation/ Reality)	 90% of students in grades K-1 will score at Meet or Exceed on the district literacy assessment in phonological awareness by June 2023 90% of students in grade 2 will score at Meet or Exceed on the district literacy assessment in phonics by June 2023 90% of students in grades 3-5 will score at Meet or Exceed on the district literacy screener by June 2023 80% of HN students in each grade (K-5) will score at or above Proficiency on the district literacy screener by June 2023 95% of students in grades K-5 will be reading on grade level by June 2023 as measured on the district's literacy assessments (F&P) by June 2023
Responsible Individuals	All classroom teaching and SpEd staff
Timeline	From September 2022 to June 2023



Resources	Vocabulary and word meaning IAB teaching resources
Budget Implications	

Goal 1 - Implementation and Milestones

	Beginning of the Year (9/22 – 12/22)	Middle of the Year (1/23 – 4/23)	End of the Year (4/23 – 6/23)
Implementation Milestones	 Review and discuss assessment calendar with teaching staff so that all staff know what is expected and by when Review student achievement and 22-23 goals with all staff Develop teacher understanding and interpretation of standards (CCSS) Use baseline data from district screener and various sources (see below) to plan and execute (a) inclass small group instruction, and (b) 	 Conduct SRBI Conduct review of teacher/grade-level goals in GLMs Conduct SIP review with SIP team TBD and to be updated following the start of the school year 	 Conduct final SRBI Conduct final review of teacher/grade-level goals in GLMs/EoY meeting Conduct final SIP review with SIP team and determine areas for address in 23-24

	small-group, cross-grade-level intervention 5. Share and explain to teaching staff the refined plan, process and content for Grade-level Meetings (GLMs) that includes planning for outcomes,
	Teacher Professional Learning (TPL) and LASW 6. Require teacher goalsetting to focus on identified areas of need in grade-levels based on school achievement data (SAD) and grade-level expectations (GLE)
	7. Explain and conduct learning walkthroughs based on SIP Theories of Action (ToA)
Leading Indicators	 District screener (TBD for K-2; STAR for 3-5) Heggerty F&P Running Records



J

	5. Unit check-ins (outcomes focused on CCSS)6. IABs		
Lagging Indicators	-	-	SBA
Equity Goals and Shared Responsibility	Review and determine the achievement of all subgroups, especially focused on HNSs and whether there's a comparative difference between them and the All-S group	Review and determine the achievement of all subgroups, especially focused on HNSs and whether there's a comparative difference between them and the All-S group	



SMART Goal 2

Root Cause Analysis 1 - Based on School Performance

Background

In recent years, Sherman grade 3-5 students have achieved high scores on the Math SBA (see Table 2) and this was especially the case in 21-22, whereby the percentage of grade 3-5 students scoring at level 3 or 4 in ELA increased from the high-eighties to the lower-nineties. Our cohorts (grade 3 in 20-21 to grade 4 in 21-22 remained consistent from 89% to 90% scoring at level 3 or 4, and for grade 4 in 20-21 to grade 5 in 21-22, the percentage of students scoring at level 3 or 4 increased from 81% to 87%. Our HNS cohort level 3 or 4 scores also remained high or improved: 100% to 100% (grade 3 in 20-21 to grade 4 in 21-22), and the grade 4 in 20-21 to grade 5 in 21-22 level 3 or 4 score percentage remained consistent: 91% to 88%. However, to continue this and to further increase our achievement in this area, we believe that specific steps (outlined below) are necessary.

Root Cause

As with ELA, we theorize that many of our teaching staff in grades 3-5 are unclear on how to develop questions/tasks (as on the SBA) that best represent the state standards. We also theorize that our teaching staff in grades K-5 are not able to expertly articulate how the ELA standards are being directly addressed in daily student-work tasks and assessments so that when students are asked questions on the SBA in grades 3-5, they are well versed in the vocabulary and thinking expectations required. It is critical to emphasize that this is not test-prep for the SBA, but moreover, to ensure that students are being provided daily work as part of the regular district curriculum that best represents that Common Core State Standards.





Theory of Math Action

In math, we believe that...

- 5. By teachers (grades 3-5) becoming clearer about the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and how questions on the SBA reflect the standards, we will be better able to plan instruction and assessment (classroom questions/tasks) that have greater alignment to the CCSS and SBA, and a greater percentage of grade 3-5 students will score at a level 3 or 4 on the SBA.
- 6. Establishing classroom cultures that promotes student-to-student discourse which requires students to accurately analyze information and precisely identify patterns/relationships will lead to them being better able to explain their thinking in math.
- 7. Including appropriate vocabulary (i.e. mean, median, mode) into units of study and presenting students with more tasks focused on representing and interpreting data meaning will enable teachers to strategically instruct students to be able to correctly answer questions and solve problems related to CCSS Target H, *Represent and interpret data*.

School's Goal	Increase overall <i>math</i> performance.	
SMART Goal	90% of students (in each grade level, 3-5) will score at Level 3 (Meet) or 4 (Exceed) on the 2023 Math SBA by June 2023	





	90% of the High Needs subgroup students (currently at 90%) will score at Level 3 (Meet) or 4 (Exceed) on the Math SBA by June 2023.	
Evidence of Success 1 IAGDs minimum Inclusive and Equitable	 90% of students in grade K-5 will score at Meet or Exceed on the district math screener 90% of High Needs subgroup students in each grade (K-5) will score at or above Proficiency on the district literacy screener 90% of students in grades K-5 will meet expectations on the district's math unit assessments 	
District Improvement Plan Connection	Mathematics performance, as measured by the SBA proficiency indicator (3-8), will close the gap between subgroup performances by 20% and raise the bar by 10% from baseline 2021 district performance in a positive direction	

Goal 2 (a) - Strategic Plan

Copy the below table for each SRBS that is included in the plan and change the letter accordingly (e.g.: a, b, c)

Scientifically Research Based Strategy	 Planning for and instruction in targeted small-group instruction with a focus on specific and measurable student learning outcomes to increase students' capacity to accurately analyze information and precisely identify patterns/relationships Include appropriate vocabulary (i.e. mean, median, mode) into units of study and presenting students with more tasks focused on representing and interpreting data meaning 	
MOY Results (Expectation/ Reality)	 80% of students in grade K-5 will score at Meet or Exceed on the district math screener 80% of High Needs subgroup students in each grade (K-5) will score at or above Proficiency on the district literacy screener 85% of students in grades K-5 will meet expectations on the district's math unit assessments 	
EOY Results (Expectation/ Reality)	 90% of students in grade K-5 will score at Meet or Exceed on the district math screener 90% of High Needs subgroup students in each grade (K-5) will score at or above Proficiency on 	



	the district literacy screener 3. 90% of students in grades K-5 will meet expectations on the district's math unit assessments	
Responsible Individuals	All classroom teaching and SpEd staff	
Timeline	From September 2022 to June 2023	
Resources	IAB pre- and post-assessments	
Budget Implications		

Goal 2 - Implementation and Milestones

	Beginning of the Year (9/22 – 12/22)	Middle of the Year (1/23 – 4/23)	End of the Year (4/23 – 6/23)
Implementation Milestones	Review and discuss assessment calendar with teaching staff so that	1. Conduct SRBI	1. Conduct final SRBI
	all staff know what is expected and by when	Conduct review of teacher/grade-level goals in GLMs	Conduct final review of teacher/grade-level goals in GLMs/EoY meeting
	2. Review student achievement and 22-23 goals with all staff	3. Conduct SIP review with SIP team	Conduct final SIP review with
	3. Develop teacher understanding and interpretation of standards (CCSS)	4. TBD and to be updated following the start of the school year	SIP team and determine areas for address in 23-24
	4. Use baseline data from district screener and various sources (see below) to plan and execute (a) inclass small group instruction, and (b) small-group, cross-grade-level intervention		
	5. Share and explain to teaching staff the refined plan, process and content for Grade-level Meetings (GLMs) that includes planning for outcomes, Teacher Professional Learning (TPL)		



Leading Indicators	and LASW 6. Require teacher goalsetting to focus on identified areas of need in gradelevels based on school achievement data (SAD) and grade-level expectations (GLE) 1. Explain and conduct learning walkthroughs based on SIP Theories of Action (ToA) 1. District screener (STAR for 1-5)		
	2. Unit check-ins3. IAB		
Lagging Indicators	-	-	SBA
Equity Goals and Shared Responsibility	Review and determine the achievement of all subgroups, especially focused on HNSs and whether there's a comparative difference between them and the All-S group	Review and determine the achievement of all subgroups, especially focused on HNSs and whether there's a comparative difference between them and the All-S group	

SMART Goal 3





Root Cause Analysis 1 - Based on School Performance

Background

In recent years, a steady increase in Sherman students being labeled chronically absent (see Table 6) as defined in district policy (5113). The recent pandemic has certainly accounted for much of this and while our overall percentage in 21-22 was 13% (46 students), this was primarily for reasons that demonstrated families' compliance with district and health department-direction for students to stay home when not feeling well or questionable in case it was Covid-related. For the very same reasons, approximately 20% of our HNSs were chronically absent.

Root Cause

Throughout the 20-21 and 21-22 school year, we monitored absences carefully, and intentionally exercised even greater sensitivity, understanding and compassion due to the possibility of the reported sicknesses being related to Covid and our district-communicated protocols. It is therefore not our perspective that absences at Sherman are the result of students feeling disconnected from nor discontent with school. Rather, in reviewing each of the chronically absence cases in 21-22, we were able to verify that almost all of them were for legitimate reasons related to possible Covid concerns. The three cases we intervened on were not Covid related and were for other legitimate non-school issues. Our intervention yielded a positive effect on the students' attendance immediately following meeting with the family. Thus, we believe that the steps outlined below will directly address our chronic absence percentages.

Theory of Attendance Action

Regarding attendance, we believe that...

8. Continuing to identify the number and percentage of students and high-need students (HNSs)—those receiving specialized instruction and/or formal support services to address identified academic and/or functional needs—closely and frequently monitor their absence rate and intervene and support families as necessary will decrease this group's number/percentage of absences during the school year.



School's Goal	Decrease chronic absenteeism for all students, especially high-need students (HNSs) in grades K-5	
SMART Goal	Reduce chronic absenteeism from 13% to 5% across all grade levels (K-5), and in particular, the percentage of HNSs (in each grade level K-5) from 20% in 21-22 to 5% by June 2023	
Evidence of Success 1 IAGDs minimum Inclusive and Equitable	Chronic absenteeism will drop from 13% to 5% overall across all grade levels (K-5). The percentage of HNSs (across all grade levels, K-5) will drop from 20% to 5%. By June 2023	
District Improvement Plan Connection	District Chronic Absenteeism rates will consistently be at 5% for all groups of students by 2027.	



J

Fairfield Public Schools – School Improvement Plan

Goal 3 (a) - Strategic Plan

Copy the below table for each SRBS that is included in the plan and change the letter accordingly (e.g.: a, b, c)

Scientifically Research Based Strategy	
MOY Results (Expectation/ Reality)	
EOY Results (Expectation/ Reality)	
Responsible Individuals	Administration, social worker, psychologist, classroom teachers
Timeline	
Resources	
Budget Implications	

Goal 3 - Implementation and Milestones

	Beginning of the Year (9/22 – 12/22)	Middle of the Year (1/23 – 4/23)	End of the Year (4/23 – 6/23)
Implementation Milestones	 Review student attendance and 22-23 goal, process and related policy with all staff Conduct monthly meetings with EPF, social worker, psychologist and secretarial staff to review the process and expectations per district policy, and to determine next steps for students with attendance issues. Keep teachers informed Emphasize the expectations for attendance, the process per district policy in parent communication 	TBD and to be updated following the start of the school year	 Conduct final review of attendance with EPF, social worker, psychologist and secretarial staff Conduct final SIP review with SIP team and determine areas for address in 23-24
Leading Indicators	IC attendance (data Viz)	IC attendance (data Viz)	IC attendance (data Viz)
Lagging Indicators	-	-	End of Year attendance in PSIS
Equity Goals and Shared	Review and determine the attendance of all subgroups, especially focused on		



J

Responsibility	HNSs and whether there's a comparative difference between them and the All-S	
	group	