


| | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------|
|  | School Improvement Division 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 | DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 2010-2011 |
|--|---|--|-----------|

I. General Information and Instructions:

Improvement plans are due **November 10, 2010**.

**DISTRICT or CHARTER SCHOOL (Multiple Sites)
IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION**

| | |
|---|---|
| District Name and Number: Buffalo Hanover Montrose Schools | Phone: 763-682-8777 |
| Superintendent/Director: Pam Miller, Director of Teaching & Learning | Fax: 763-682-8748 |
| Site Address: 214 First Avenue NE, Buffalo, MN 55313 | Email: pmiller@buffalo.k12.mn.us |

District Improvement Team Members (for additional members, please attach names to plan)

| <i>Improvement Team Members</i> | <i>Improvement Team Roles</i> |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 1. Pam Miller | Director of Teaching & Learning |
| 2. Jack Brady | District Assessment Coordinator |
| 3. Joy Kieffer | Director of Special Education Services |
| 4. Vicki Cary | District Diversity Coordinator |
| 5. Jenina Rothstein | District Title I Intervention Specialist |
| 6. Don Metzler | Tatanka Elementary Principal |
| 7. Gary Theis | Montrose Elementary Principal |
| 8. Julie Swaggert | Buffalo Community Middle School Principal |
| 9. Mark Mischke | Buffalo High School Principal |
| 10. Steve Hermanson | Secondary Math Teacher |
| 11. Karen Swart | Elementary Special Education Teacher |
| 12. Patty Gillespie | Elementary English Language Development Teacher |
| 13. Shana Bregenzer-Brenny | Secondary English Language Development Teacher |
| 14. Amy Krueger | School Psychologist |
| 15. Joan Danielson | Parent |
| 16. Scott Timmerman | Parent |
| 17. Sue Lee | School Board member |

AYP (In Need of Improvement) Stages 2010-2011 School Year

*Any district in Continuing In Need of Improvement must complete Appendix B (1.2, 2.1, 2.2)

**Any district in Corrective Action must complete Appendix C (3.1, 3.2)

Please Check the AYP stage that applies:

- In Need of Improvement 1.1 1.2
- Cont. In Need of Improvement 2.1 2.2
- Corrective Action 3.1 3.2

This document meets requirements for the District Improvement and Annual Measurable Achievement Objective (AMAO) Plans

Yes No



School Improvement Division
1500 Highway 36 West
Roseville, MN 55113-4266

DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

2010-2011

IMPROVEMENT PLAN ASSURANCES

Related to the consequences for Title I school improvement, the LEA agrees to the following assurances:

1. The identified district will create or revise a current improvement plan with input of AYP Coordinators, teachers, and parents as outlined in P.L. 107-110, Section 1116.
2. The improvement plan will be developed and/or revised within 90 days of identification and shall cover a two-year period.
3. The district identified for AYP status will reserve and spend at least 10% of the district's Title I, Part A allocation for professional development activities related to carrying out the initiatives of the improvement plan in the current school year.
4. The district will ensure that all teachers teaching core content classes meet the requirements of highly qualified.
5. District and school improvement funds/resources will supplement and not supplant state and local funds.
6. A notice of district AYP status must be provided to **all** parents/guardians of enrolled students before the beginning of the school year.
7. The district must maintain the improvement plan and related documentation to be available upon request by MDE as needed, including compliance requirements.
8. If updating an *In Need of Improvement* plan (stages 1.2, 2.1, 2.2) Appendix B of this application must be completed; a district in Corrective Action must complete Appendix C.

We hereby agree to the assurances as printed herein and verify that all the information provided in this school improvement application is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

(Signature of Superintendent/Director)

(Date)

(Signature of LEA Representative)

(Date)


LOCAL BOARD OF EDUCATION ACTION

The local Board of Education of _____ (District Name) has authorized

_____ (Name) at a monthly meeting on _____ (date) to act as the Local Education Agency (LEA) representative in reviewing and filing the attached plan as provided under P.L. 107-110 for school year 2010-11. The LEA Representative ensures the school district maintains compliance with the appropriate federal statutes, regulations, and procedures and acts as the responsible authority in all matters relating to the review and administration of this improvement plan. The district ensures that its designee(s) will participate as a member of the improvement team and work in collaboration with the education service cooperative and/or MDE providing technical assistance through the AYP Statewide System of Support.

(Signature of Superintendent/Director)

(Date)

| | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------|
|  | School Improvement Division 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 | DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 2010-2011 |
|--|---|--|-----------|

Title I districts identified as not making adequate yearly progress (AYP) for two consecutive years are required to develop (or revise) and implement an improvement plan based on the eight elements prescribed under PL 107-110 Section 1116:

Eight elements to be included in the needs improvement plan:

1. Ensure all students are proficient in core academic subjects by 2013-2014
2. Establish annual measurable objectives for continuous and substantial progress to achieve proficiency
3. LEA will incorporate strategies based on scientifically based research to strengthen core academic subjects
4. Ensure the professional development needs of instructional staff are met by providing opportunities to participate in high quality professional development
5. Address the fundamental teaching and learning needs in the district
6. Promote effective parent involvement strategies
7. Incorporate extended day and extended school year activities as appropriate
8. Outline the responsibility of the school, local education agency (LEA), and state education agency (SEA) including the technical assistance provided by the LEA

This can be accomplished as follows:

- Districts must **develop** an improvement plan using the current format and submit the completed and signed form to the assigned agency (see page one of this form for instructions)

~OR~

- Districts with an **existing improvement plan** may attach their previous plan and indicate where each required element is embedded within the attached plan. The completed and signed form and assurances, along with the attached plan, is submitted to the assigned agency (see page one of this form for instructions)

~AND~

- Use the attached rubrics (appendix A) to guide your school improvement planning

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY INTRODUCTION:


Please provide a brief description and introduction about your district. This should be the first page of the improvement plan to give the reviewers a general understanding of your district.

Address the following:

- District demographics
- Area of AYP identification and a brief overview of how it will be addressed in the improvement plan

The Buffalo-Hanover-Montrose School District 877 (BHM) includes a 157 square mile area that includes the communities of Buffalo, Hanover, Montrose and the surrounding townships. With a district population of over 25,000 residents, over 5,750 students attend six elementary schools, a middle school (grades 6-8), a high school (grades 9-12), an alternative high school and a transitions program.

The district's percentage of students qualifying for free/reduced priced meals is 27%. 93% of the BHM students are white, 3% Hispanic, 2% black, 2% Asian/Pacific, and 1% American Indian. Two percent of the students are identified as LEP, and 12% are identified as Special Education students. BHM has a 96% attendance rate and a 95% graduation rate.


| | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------|
|  | School Improvement Division 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 | DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 2010-2011 |
|--|---|--|-----------|

This is the district’s seventh consecutive year not making AYP, and the sixth consecutive year cited as “needs improvement.” The areas of AYP identification have varied each of the seven years. Subgroups identified as not making AYP over the years were:

- 2004:** Special Education reading
- 2005:** Hispanic reading and Special Education math
- 2006:** Hispanic, LEP and Special Education math
- 2007:** LEP and Special Education math
- 2008:** LEP, Black, and Special Education math, as well as Special Education reading
- 2009:** Hispanic, LEP, Special Education and Free/Reduced reading, as well as Special Education and Free/Reduced math
- 2010:** Asian, Black, LEP, Special Ed and Free/Reduced math. All populations made AYP or safe harbor in reading.

Strategies of the improvement plan include:

1. Increase the engagement of all students in the learning process
 - A. Train additional staff and implement components of *Responsive Classroom* (at K-5) and *Developmental Designs for Middle School* (at 6-8). The philosophy of these programs is that there is a direct connection between engagement, sense of community, and the use of culturally relevant strategies on student achievement.
 - B. Increase the engagement of students with limited English skills by training teachers in the SIOP process with math as the primary subject. Provide a SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol) workshop designed to increase skills and strategies for teaching math to students with limited English skills.
2. Implementation of special education co-teaching instructional delivery model at the secondary level.
3. Implementation of new curriculums in reading and math.
4. Aligning core math and reading curriculum to state standards using the district’s curriculum mapping software.
5. Enhancing the work of professional learning communities to develop formative assessments, and examine and apply the data in math and reading instruction as the year progresses.
6. Fully implement *Response to Intervention* (RtI) at the elementary level to assist in identifying and assisting the progress monitoring students. Establish RtI time during the elementary school day to create more time in the student’s schedule to work on areas of need in math and/or reading
7. Offering Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) training to all elementary teachers in June 2011.
8. Research and recommend high-quality reading and math interventions to sites.
9. Provide training for all secondary teachers on elementary reading comprehension strategies.
10. Use data to identify students at risk of not performing at a proficient level in math on the MCA-IIIs and develop remediation opportunities both during and outside of the regular school day
11. Increase the capacity of staff to work effectively with students of different cultural backgrounds
12. Identify and communicate home strategies to improve the achievement of FRL and LEP students.
13. Increase collaborative opportunities between Special Education teachers and general classroom teachers at all levels focused on math and reading instruction.

| | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------|
|  | School Improvement Division 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 | DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 2010-2011 |
|--|---|--|-----------|

III. NEEDS ASSESSMENT:

NCLB requires a comprehensive needs assessment for your district. Please address the following:

- Date when comprehensive needs assessment was developed or updated
- Summarize the results of the district needs assessment
- Include a brief determination of why the district's previous plan did not bring about increased student academic achievement (for districts continuing *In Need of Improvement*)


The BHM school district has Teaching & Learning Councils at the secondary and elementary levels that serve to provide input and make decisions in a variety of curricular areas. They review district programs and assessment data, and provide input related to staff development activities. The Teaching & Learning Council members are asked on an annual basis to collect input from site-level colleagues in terms of professional development needs, and report those needs to the Director of Teaching & Learning. These identified needs are used in planning district and site level professional development activities, as well as in planning for district-sponsored classes held after school or in the evenings.

Needs assessment activities were conducted on April 8 and May 6, 2010. This data was reviewed and additional needs identified by the District AYP team on September 27 and October 13, 2010. The end result was the district adopting overarching theme to increase student engagement in the learning process that will drive staff development over the next two years. To meet this need it was also determined that staff development activities will concentrate on three broad areas: (1) reaching all students, (2) technology integration, and (3) assessments and grading.

Specific areas of greatest need identified by these groups in Spring 2010 included:

1. Large class sizes and a decrease in instructional resources available through multiple budget reductions in the district.
2. Old, outdated math curriculum, particularly at the elementary level (new curriculums are being implemented during 2010-11).
3. Increase in the number of economically disadvantaged students due to the recession and collapse of the real estate market.
4. Lack of engagement of students in the learning process, particularly students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds, students with limited English proficiency, as well as students from diverse cultural backgrounds.
5. Need to fully implement the Response to Intervention (RtI) process. Additional RtI training is required at the elementary level, and introductory training at secondary sites.
6. Train special and general education teachers in co-teaching strategies.
7. Discuss, review, and revise K-12 scope and sequence topics in all content areas.
8. Provide opportunities for integration of technology in K-12 classrooms.
9. Train teachers in reading and math instructional strategies across the curriculum.
10. Provide time for staff to work in professional learning communities and grade-level teams to continue to define core district curriculum, identify strategies to work with at-risk students, and develop formative/summative assessments.
11. Lack of a consistent core curriculum mapped, communicated and aligned to state standards in math and reading. The need is greatest at the elementary level to identify elementary core curriculum through the use of Atlas curriculum mapping and identify integration possibilities whenever possible.
12. Lack of differentiation strategies in math, specifically for EL and special education students.
13. Bridge the gap between home and school and encourage a closer connection.

The strategies listed in our improvement plan and supported by the professional development set-aside are those strategies the team felt would have the biggest impact in improving student achievement in identified student populations.

| | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------|
|  | School Improvement Division 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 | DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 2010-2011 |
|--|---|--|-----------|

IV. ELEMENTS SECTION:

Please complete each section, addressing the elements and attaching documents as necessary to clarify the information. This form is expandable so that as you type pages will add or adjust. Please refer to the attached rubric in Appendix A for additional information on element requirements.

1. Ensure all students are proficient in core academic subjects by 2013-2014

Identify actions that have the greatest likelihood of improving the achievement of children in meeting Minnesota's achievement standards

Address the following:

a) Identify challenges that have prevented the district from making adequate progress.

- Increased class sizes and a decrease in resources available through multiple budget reductions in the district
- Lack of consistent core curriculum mapped, communicated, and aligned to state standards in math and reading
- Old, outdated math curriculum (a new curriculum is being implemented during 2010-11)
- Parents struggling to support their child's learning, particularly in math instruction
- Lack of differentiated instructional strategies in math, specifically for LEP and Special Ed students
- Lack of effective interventions, particularly in math.
- Increased diversity in the district's student population
- Increased number of economically disadvantaged students due to the recession and collapse of the real estate market

b) Identify the fixed targets that are appropriately set for all students to be on track for 100% proficiency by 2013-2014 in reading and math.


The BHM Board of Education has adopted the following target goal for the **2010-2011** year with regards to MCA-II results. The goal was based on reaching 100% proficiency in reading and math for all students by 2014. Equal incremental increases are anticipated on an annual basis to reach 100% proficiency within the given timeframe.

District Goal: **Demonstrate a 7.7% increase in the overall percentage of students meeting proficiency standards on the MCA-IIs in math, and demonstrate a 5.4% increase in the overall percentage of students meeting proficiency standards on the MCA-IIs in reading.**

Targets: **83.9% of all students will score at the proficient level in reading**
76.9% of all students will score at the proficient level in math

Districts with an existing improvement plan should attach that plan and identify the page where this information can specifically be found.

Page where identified: _____

| | | | |
|---|---|--|-----------|
|  | School Improvement Division 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 | DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 2010-2011 |
|---|---|--|-----------|

2. Establish annual measurable goals for continuous and substantial progress to achieve proficiency

Include specific measurable achievement goals and targets for each of the groups of students identified in the disaggregated data pursuant to section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v), consistent with adequate yearly progress as defined under section 1111(b)(2)

Address the following:

a) Provide annual MCA-II measurable goals for identified student group(s).

The goals listed below for Special Education, LEP, FRL, Asian and Black students are based on the district achievement on the MCA-IIs in math and reading for these subgroups in 2010, and the expected goal of 100% proficiency in math for all students in 2014. Equal incremental increases are anticipated on an annual basis to reach 100% proficiency within the given timeframe.

Math Targets for MCA-IIs 2010:

- 51.7% of Special Education students will score at the proficient level in math**
- 45.0% of EL students will score at the proficient level in math**
- 64.7% of FRL students will score at the proficient level in math**
- 64.5% of Asian students will score at the proficient level in math**
- 52.2% of Black students will score at the proficient level in math**

Reading Targets for MCA-IIs 2010:

- 58.9% of Special Education students will score at the proficient level in reading**
- 45.5% of EL students will score at the proficient level in reading**
- 73.0% of FRL students will score at the proficient level in reading**
- 66.0% of Asian students will score at the proficient level in reading**
- 60.3% of Black students will score at the proficient level in reading**

b) Describe the process of tracking goal progress over the two years of the plan.

- **Identify assessment(s) used to track progress toward these goals**
- **Describe alignment between the various assessments used to measure progress (if using assessment(s) other than MCA-II)**

The district will use MCA-II results and NWEA's *Measures of Academic Progress* (MAP) data to track progress towards the goal of the plan. MAP tests are aligned to MN standards and provide another tool to determine student's progress. In addition, the development and use of formative assessments in relation to the standards will be encouraged as teachers work in professional learning communities, course-level teams, and grade-level teams to monitor student progress throughout the year.

Districts with an existing improvement plan should attach that plan and identify the page where this information can specifically be found.

Page where identified: _____

3. Incorporate strategies based on scientifically based research to strengthen core academic subjects

Incorporate scientifically based research strategies that strengthen the core academic program in schools served by the local educational agency

Address the following:

a) Identify scientifically research-based strategies that are clearly stated and aligned to performance goals (developed under element number 2).


Teams of K-12 teachers will work collaboratively to accomplish the following tasks:

- Train additional staff and implement components of *Responsive Classroom* (at K-5) and *Developmental Designs for Middle School* (at 6-8). The philosophy of these programs is that there is a direct connection between engagement, sense of community, and the use of culturally relevant strategies on student achievement.
- Train teams of teachers who will work with clusters of EL students in the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) process with math as the primary subject.
- Facilitate and train special education and participating general education teachers in the co-teaching instructional delivery model at the secondary level.
- Implementation of new K-12 math curriculum
- Aligning core math and reading/language arts curriculum to state's revised standards using the district's curriculum mapping software.
- All instructional staff will work in professional learning communities to develop, examine, and apply formative and summative assessment data in math and reading.
- Fully implement *Response to Intervention* (RtI) at the elementary level to assist in identifying and assisting the progress monitoring students. Establish RtI time during the elementary school day to create more time in the student's schedule to work on areas of need in math and/or reading
- Offering Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) training to all elementary teachers in June 2011.
- Research and recommend high-quality reading and math interventions to sites.
- Provide training for all secondary teachers on elementary reading comprehension strategies.
- Use data to identify students at risk of not performing at a proficient level in math on the MCA-II's and develop remediation opportunities both during and outside of the regular school day

b) Describe how the identified strategies will improve student achievement in the cited area(s).

The strategies described below are currently being implemented in the BHM school district. All target increased student achievement. These strategies are (1) professional learning communities, (2) Cognitively Guided Instruction, (3) Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol, (4) Response to Intervention, and (5) Responsive Classroom/Developmental Designs for Middle School. All are supported through research as having positive effects on student achievement.

The following is a list of sources providing references to supportive research for these practices:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------|
|  | School Improvement Division 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 | DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 2010-2011 |
|--|---|--|-----------|

Responsive Classroom/Developmental Designs for Middle School:

Since the 1990s, the *Responsive Classroom* approach has been the focus of considerable research interest. Findings have associated the approach with higher student test scores, better social skills, and fewer problem behaviors. Findings show an increased sense of efficacy and more high-quality instruction. In urban, rural, and suburban settings nationwide, educators using these strategies report increases in student investment, responsibility, and learning, and decreases in problem behaviors.

One of the most recent completed studies was the *Social and Academic Learning Study* (SALS) that was conducted in an urban school district in the Northeast from 2001-2004. The principal Investigator was Dr. Sara Rimm-Kaufman, an associate professor at the University of Virginia Curry School of Education. This three-year longitudinal, quasi-experimental study compared three schools implementing the Responsive Classroom approach at a school-wide level with three non-implementing schools and found that the Responsive Classroom approach is associated with better academic and social outcomes for elementary school children.

There were six key findings. In schools using the Responsive Classroom approach:

- (1) Children showed greater increases in reading and math test scores.
- (2) Teachers felt more effective and more positive about teaching.
- (3) Children had better social skills.
- (4) Teachers offered more high-quality instruction.
- (5) Children felt more positive about school.
- (6) Teachers collaborated with each other more.


Rimm-Kaufman says Responsive Classroom holds promise in helping “children thrive academically, socially and emotionally.” She goes on to say that “the RC approach is designed to give teachers a set of skills to create classroom environments more conducive to learning.”

The U.S. Department of Education’s Institute of Educational Sciences is supporting her research with a three-year, \$2.9 million grant to expand her earlier study, which found that children taught with the Responsive Classroom approach for two or three years showed greater increases in math and reading tests scores than children in comparison schools. “Only when children know how to manage themselves and their interactions with others are they free to focus on the academic challenges,” Rimm-Kaufman wrote in her previous study of the Responsive Classroom approach.

SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol)

The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model was developed to provide teachers with a well-articulated, practical model of sheltered instruction. The SIOP Model is currently used in most of the 50 states and in hundreds of schools across the U.S. as well as in several other countries.

The SIOP Model includes teacher preparation, and instructional indicators, such as comprehensible input and the building of background knowledge. It comprises strategies for classroom organization and delivery of instruction. The intent of the model is to facilitate high quality instruction for ELLs in content area teaching. The SIOP Model can be viewed as an umbrella under which other programs developed for improving instruction can reside. The SIOP Model is not another "add on" program but rather it is a framework that can bring together a school's instructional program by organizing methods and techniques, and ensuring that effective practices are implemented -- and can be quantified.

| | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------|
|  | School Improvement Division 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 | DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 2010-2011 |
|--|---|--|-----------|

A 2004 study, “The Effects of Sheltered Instruction on the Achievement of Limited English Proficient Students” concluded that there is a positive impact on non-ELL teachers:

“For teachers of English-only students, the SIOP facilitates reflection and self-evaluation about teaching. Some of the areas the teachers have self-identified as needing improvement are language and content objectives, grouping, vocabulary development, comprehension strategies, and pacing.”

The SIOP classroom that integrates language and content and infuses sociocultural awareness is an excellent place to scaffold instruction for students learning English. According to Vygotsky (1978) and others (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988), students' language learning is promoted through social interaction and contextualized communication, which can be readily generated in all subject areas.

After several years of field-testing and refining the SIOP, a study was conducted (Echevarria, Garino & Rueda, 1997) to establish the validity and reliability of the instrument. The findings of the study indicated that the SIOP was confirmed to be a highly reliable and valid measure of sheltered instruction.

Professional learning communities:

Researchers who have studied schools where educators engage in PLC practices have consistently cited those practices as our best hope for sustained, substantive school improvement (Darling-Hammond, 2001; Fullan, 2005; Louis & Marks, 1998; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2001; Newmann, 1996; Reeves, 2006; Saphier, 2005; Schmoker, 2005; Sparks, 2005).


These practices have been endorsed by the National Staff Development Council, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, and the National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform. They certainly "complement" the recent recommendations presented in *Success in the Middle* by the National Middle School Association (2006) and *Breaking Ranks in the Middle* by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (2006).

Richard DuFour, whose already high-achieving high school district near Chicago made record gains over an extended period, attributes much of his success to goal-oriented “collaborative teams” that were “the primary engine of our school improvement efforts.” (Richard DuFour, “The Learning Principal,” *Educational Leadership*, May 2002, p. 14.). In fact, DuFour has referred to the strategy as “*the most promising strategy for sustained, substantive school improvement is developing the ability for school personnel to function as professional learning communities.*” (DuFour & Eaker, 1998, p. xi).

Research in the Chicago Public Schools also indicated that those schools with “strong professional learning communities were four times more likely to be improving academically than schools with weaker professional communities.” (Anne C. Lewis, “School Reform and Professional Development,” *Phi Delta Kappan*, March 2002, p. 489).

“Professional learning communities have emerged as arguably the best, most agreed-upon means by which to continuously improve instruction and student performance.” (Smoker, Results Now, 2006, p. 106).

Milbrey McLaughlin speaks for a legion of esteemed educators and researchers when she asserts that “*the most promising strategy for sustained, substantive school improvement is building the capacity of school personnel to function as a professional learning community*” (Richard DuFour and Robert Eaker, *Professional Learning Communities at Work* (Bloomington, Ind.: National Education Service, 1998), p. xi.)

| | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------|
|  | School Improvement Division 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 | DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 2010-2011 |
|--|---|--|-----------|

Cognitively Guided Instruction:

Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) is a professional development program that increases teachers’ understanding of the knowledge that students bring to the math learning process and how they connect that knowledge with formal concepts and operations. The program is included on *The Promising Practices Network on Children, Families and Communities* (PPN) which features evidence-based programs and practices proven to be effective in schools. All information has been screened for scientific rigor, relevance, and clarity. CGI is guided by two major theses. The first is that children bring an intuitive knowledge of mathematics to school with them and that this knowledge should serve as the basis for developing formal mathematics instruction in primary school. This thesis leads to an emphasis on assessing the processes that students use to solve problems. The second thesis is that math instruction should be based on the relationship between computational skills and problem solving, which leads to an emphasis on problem solving in the classroom instead of the repetition of number facts (e.g., practicing the rules of addition and subtraction). Two separate research studies have validated the effectiveness of CGI: The Carpenter et al. (1989) and Villasenor and Kepners (1993).

Response to Intervention (RTI)

Response to Intervention integrates assessment and intervention within a multi-level prevention system to maximize student achievement and to reduce behavior problems. With RTI, schools identify students at risk for poor learning outcomes, monitor student progress, provide evidence-based interventions and adjust the intensity and nature of those interventions depending on a student’s responsiveness, and identify students with learning disabilities or other disabilities. Progress monitoring is conducted at least monthly to (a) estimate rates of improvement, (b) identify students who are not demonstrating adequate progress and/or (c) compare the efficacy of different forms of instruction to design more effective, individualized instruction.


Findings from a research synthesis conducted by National Center for Learning Disabilities indicates that there is an emerging body of empirical evidence to support claims that RTI is an effective method for identifying children at risk for learning difficulties and for providing specialized interventions either to ameliorate or to prevent the occurrence of learning disabilities. While there was considerable variability across studies in how RTI was implemented and evaluated, there was general agreement across studies about the conceptualization of RTI in terms of its key components and tiered implementation

Some research (Coyne et al., 2004; Torgesen & Davis, 1996) provides preliminary evidence that kindergarteners who are at risk for learning difficulties can catch up by first grade, if provided the appropriate supports in kindergarten. Moreover, the findings from these studies indicate that gains made by these children were maintained through the first part of first grade. Other research (O’Connor, 2000; O’Connor, Harty, & Fulmer, 2005; O’Connor, et al., 2005) supports the use of a multi-tier approach prior to first grade as well.

The research synthesis findings suggest that RTI is a promising approach, particularly because of its focus on sound instructional principles, such as effectively teaching all children, intervening early, using research-based interventions and instruction, monitoring student progress, and using assessment data to inform instructional decision-making (NASDSE, 2005). Further research is needed to understand the unique contributions of each of these elements of RTI as well as how these elements constitute an intervention package.

Districts with an existing improvement plan should attach that plan and identify the page where this information can specifically be found.

Page where identified: _____

| | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------|
|  | School Improvement Division 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 | DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 2010-2011 |
|--|---|--|-----------|

4. Ensure the professional development needs of instructional staff are met by providing opportunities to participate in high quality professional development

Address the professional development needs of the instructional staff serving the agency by committing to spend not less than 10 percent of the funds received by the local educational agency under subpart 2 for each fiscal year in which the agency is identified for improvement for professional development (including funds reserved for professional development under subsection (b)(3)(A)(iii)), but excluding funds reserved for professional development under section 1119

Address the following:

a) Describe the high quality professional development supported by the 10% set-aside of the district Title I funds to meet the needs of the instructional staff.

b) Explain how the professional development plan will directly address the academic achievement challenges that caused the district to be identified.

The BHM district’s 10% set-aside from the regular Title I allotment amounts to \$36,156. These funds will be used for the following the following activities:


| Strategy | Budgeted |
|--|--------------------|
| Math SIOP Workshop (facilitators, books, substitutes) | \$6,450.00 |
| Provide Cognitively Guided Instruction training for K-5 elementary teachers | \$8,000.00 |
| Substitute teachers to provide time for professional learning communities (PLCs) and grade-level teams of teachers to analyze classroom assessment data, develop common assessments and develop instructional strategies | \$8,000.00 |
| Extended time curriculum work in math and reading instruction | \$4,721.00 |
| RtI Conference | \$3,900.00 |
| Conference registrations, hotels, mileage and food for activities designed to improve math and reading instruction | \$5,085.44 |
| TOTAL | \$36,156.44 |

The BHM district’s 10% set-aside from the Title I ARRA (stimulus) allotment amounts to \$10,224 (year two of two). These funds will be used for the following activities:

| Strategy | Budgeted |
|---|--------------------|
| Conference registrations for <i>Responsive Classroom</i> and/or <i>Developmental Designs for Middle School</i> | \$7,724.00 |
| Purchase professional intervention resources for teachers to enhance professional development in reading and math interventions | \$2,500.00 |
| TOTAL | \$10,224.00 |

Districts with an existing improvement plan should attach that plan and identify the page where this information can specifically be found.

Page where identified: _____

| | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------|
|  | School Improvement Division 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 | DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 2010-2011 |
|--|---|--|-----------|

5. Address the fundamental teaching and learning needs in the district

Address the fundamental teaching and learning needs in the schools of that agency, and the specific academic problems of low-achieving students, including a determination of why the local educational agency's prior plan failed to bring about increased student academic achievement

Address the following:

a) Identify fundamental teaching and learning needs as identified from the district needs assessment process in the area(s) cited that contributed to the identification of needs improvement status.

The fundamental teaching and learning needs in the district were already identified on page 5. Fundamental needs include:

1. New, revised math curricular materials (old, outdated materials were used through 2009-10)
2. Need to review and revise K-12 scope and sequence in all content areas
3. Incomplete curriculum alignment to new state standards in math and reading/language arts (using Atlas Curriculum Maps)
4. Need for increased collaborative planning time for general education, special education, and EL teachers to implement differentiation strategies
5. Enhance the effectiveness of co-teaching experiences at the secondary level with general and special education teachers
6. Develop and utilize common formative assessments in planning individualized instruction
7. Need to increase the sense of community and commitment to school among students (facilitated through training and implementation of *Responsive Classroom* and *Developmental Designs for Middle School*)
8. Curriculum fidelity
9. Improved communication between elementary/middle and middle/high school regarding reading/language arts and math skills acquired by students
10. Strengthen cultural competency of staff to enhance their effectiveness of meeting the needs of students other than themselves and make a connection with their families

b) Describe teaching and learning needs that will be addressed such as choice of instructional programs and materials, use of instructional time, improved use of assessments, etc.

BHM has adopted a new elementary reading program in 2008-09 and a new K-12 math program is being implemented during the 2010-11. Our new elementary reading program, *Literacy by Design*, is a balanced literacy program that is showing very positive effects. All district subgroups made AYP in reading in 2009-10. The percentage of BHM students scoring in the proficient range in reading increased from 74.2% in 2009 to 78.5% in 2010.

BHM is implementing new *enVisonMath* (Scott Foresman-Addison Wesley) curriculum at K-5, *IMPACT Math* (Glencoe) and *Prentice-Hall Mathematics* at high school during 2010-11. Much time and research went into purchasing curriculums with sufficient rigor to meet the state's new math standards, as well as be engaging for students. We anticipate strong gains in the near future.

In addition, stronger remediation programs are being implemented at Buffalo High School. A new reading enhancement class is being developed for students who do not pass the GRAD reading test. Similar plans are in place to implement a math enhancement class for students not successfully passing the GRAD math test.

| | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------|
|  | School Improvement Division 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 | DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 2010-2011 |
|--|---|--|-----------|

Creating more instructional time for math and reading has been a constant. With the implementation of *Literacy by Design* at the elementary level, the amount of time devoted to reading was increased from a range of 60 to 90 minutes per day to a required minimum of 120 minutes of literacy instruction in Grades 1-5 district wide. In addition, all Grades 1-5 classrooms are required to teach a minimum of 60 minutes of math core instruction.

While students working substantially below grade level at the middle school have an additional “reading” class in their schedule to increase their skills, students working well below grade level in math do not currently have a similar opportunity. Efforts will be made during 2010-11 to find ways to provide more math time during the school day for these students at the middle school.

BHM teachers are well-versed in the use of MAP data to determine where their student’s needs lie and how to provide activities to improve their skills. We are finding, however, that drawing conclusions from this one data point may be counter-productive. As a result, our teachers will make a concerted effort to develop high-quality common formative assessments that they can use to make instructional decisions.

Districts with an existing improvement plan should attach that plan and identify the page where this information can specifically be found.

Page where identified: _____

6. Promote effective parent involvement strategies

Include strategies to promote effective parental involvement in the school.


Address the following:

a) Identify research-based or best practice strategies used to increase parent involvement, including new efforts and enhancements to existing strategies.

Five years ago the BHM district began offering training in *Responsive Classroom*. According to *Origins*, the regional training company, *Responsive Classroom* is “an approach to teaching and learning that fosters safe, challenging, and joyful classrooms and schools, kindergarten through eighth grade ... It consists of practical strategies for bringing together social and academic learning throughout the school day. In *Responsive Classroom* teaching, we begin from a belief in the parent’s best intentions. Some parents may not know what might be best, but we operate from a belief that all parents want what is best for their children and that parent involvement is essential to children’s education.” (www.originsonline.org)

This training opportunity, offered to any elementary teacher at the cost of the district, has truly gained momentum in interest and success as trained teachers begin to implement the components of *Responsive Classroom* in their own environments. In summer of 2006 we trained 28 elementary teachers, followed by 40 in the summer of 2007, 50 teachers in the summer of 2008, 49 teachers in the summer of 2009 and 25 teachers in the summer of 2010.

Because of the success of the *Responsive Classroom* district initiative, middle school teachers were interested in piloting *Developmental Designs for Middle School*, which is Origins parallel program for middle school-aged students. Beginning in the summer of 2009 six middle school teachers attended an

| | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------|
|  | School Improvement Division 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 | DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 2010-2011 |
|--|---|--|-----------|

initial *Developmental Designs* training. During the summer of 2010 an additional 25 middle school staff participated in training.

There are seven basic principles underlying this approach. One of the seven basic principles speaks specifically to parent involvement. This principle reads as follows:

Knowing the families of the children we teach and working with them as partners is essential to children’s education.

There are also six basic teaching practices associated with *Responsive Classroom*. As with the principles, one of the six teaching practices speaks specifically to parent involvement. The practice, *Working with Families* includes ideas for involving families as true partners in their children’s education.


In addition, the BHM district has hired three cultural liaison positions. Two positions are Hispanic cultural liaisons, and the third is a Hmong cultural liaison position. The job summary of the cultural liaison is “to create and maintain a culturally integrating learning environment in collaboration with students, parents, school staff, and community resources.” Several of the task items listed on the cultural liaison job description specifically address working closely with parents and families to increase the parent involvement for these families. The cultural liaisons are primarily responsible for facilitating home/school relationships. They also translate district information, and interpret at parent conferences, special education staffings, and other family/school activities.

The district added a diversity coordinator position for the 2009-10 school year. The diversity coordinator is responsible for planning cultural competency professional development activities for staff, but also is responsible for increasing home/school communication for families of diverse backgrounds. There are several activities the diversity coordinator is planning this year to specifically increase parent involvement. The diversity coordinator works with the NW Suburban Integration District who have strategies on family/parent involvement that she will share with staff throughout the year.

Buffalo Community Middle School (BCMS) established a Parent Advisory Council (PAC) in the 2007-2008 school year and is continuing the fourth year of the council during 2010-2011. The purpose of the council is to provide parents an opportunity to provide input on teaching and learning topics specific to BCMS. There had been no history of a PAC at BCMS before 2007. Buffalo High School established a PAC for the high school level during the 2008-2009 school year and is continuing the third year of the council during 2010-2011.

All elementaries have parent advisory groups that meet on a regular basis.

The District/Community Teaching & Learning Council is a group of 25 members, two-thirds of which are parents of students in our district. This Teaching & Learning Council meets monthly and consistently provides feedback and input regarding parent involvement activities, as well as other district curricular and programmatic topics.

| | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------|
|  | School Improvement Division 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 | DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 2010-2011 |
|--|---|--|-----------|

b) Explain how these effective parent involvement strategies will contribute to improved student learning in the specifically cited area(s).

The goal of the *Responsive Classroom* and *Developmental Designs* initiative is to increase the sense of community within our schools, as well as involve parents in their children’s education. Nationwide data from *Origins*, as well as our own unscientific observations, students exposed to these strategies show increases in student investment, responsibility, and learning, and decreases in problem behaviors.

The use of cultural liaisons district wide is designed to reach out to families that might not feel a sense of connection and community with our schools. As previously mentioned, the job description of our cultural liaisons specifically addresses that they work closely with parents and families to increase their involvement in our school community. It is our hope that this will lead to greater achievement success among this population. Similarly, activities designed by the district’s Diversity Coordinator attempt to help our staff effectively interact with families of diverse backgrounds as well as increase home/school communication.

In addition, our attempts to involve parents directly with their schools through PACs, as well as in our District/Community Learning Council is designed to lead to increased student achievement.


c) If Continuing in Need of Improvement or Corrective Action, describe process to evaluate parent involvement strategies.

District staff members most closely associated with parent involvement activities will solicit input and feedback from parents to determine effectiveness of the activities and strategies used, as well as seeking ideas to improve parent involvement strategies for use in the future.

One of the primary goals of the District/Community Teaching & Learning Council is to provide feedback and input regarding parent involvement activities, as well as other district curricular and programmatic topics.

Districts with an existing improvement plan should attach that plan and identify the page where this information can specifically be found.

Page where identified: _____

| | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------|
|  | School Improvement Division 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 | DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 2010-2011 |
|--|---|--|-----------|

7. Incorporate extended day and extended school year activities as appropriate

Incorporate, as appropriate, activities before school, after school, during the summer, and during an extension of the school year

Address the following if providing extended day activities:

a) Describe the activities to be conducted before or after school, during the summer, and/or during an extension of the school year to meet student needs.

The BHM district will use a variety of extended day and extended school year activities to target learners performing below their peers. Because we believe in early intervention, many resources are utilized at the kindergarten and primary grades. We believe targeting the interventions at the early grades will prevent a more intensive intervention needed as the students are older. Thus, we also believe, the early interventions will improve MCA-II scores as the students are older as we provide the interventions at the first sign of a student struggling to perform at the grade level expectations.

As the students grow older, the interventions are planned as appropriate to the needs identified through a variety of assessment data. The assessment data used for identification of intervention services includes MCA-IIs in reading and math, NWEA's MAP testing in reading and math, Rigby READS in reading, a variety of diagnostic reading assessments including the DRA or the QRI, and local classroom assessments. Students identified through a variety of data as performing below grade level expectations are encouraged to participate in the targeted services opportunities provided before or after school as described in number 3 below. Activities and instruction connected to the standards and benchmarks for the students' grade level are planned to help students gain the skills needed to improve their achievement on the assessments they will be involved with in the spring of 2010. Meeting and/or exceeding growth targets for all students is a goal of the district.

A few of the district activities are outlined below.

1. Extended Day Kindergarten for Identified At-Risk Kindergarten Students


All three of our elementary sites receiving Title I funds have implemented an Extended Day program for their most at-risk kindergarten students from January-June. In the fall, teachers use assessment and observation data to identify students qualifying for this extended-day opportunity. Families are notified and provided the option of their student to attend kindergarten for the full day from January through the end of the school year. Beginning in January, those identified students will attend their regular kindergarten class for ½ day with their kindergarten teacher. The second half of their day will be with a Title I teacher working on targeted skills in literacy, mathematical thinking, and social/emotional skills. The class size will be capped at ten students per Title I teacher.

2. Before and After School Targeted Services Programs for Grades K-12 Students Identified as Performing Below Grade Level Expectations

Several elementary sites, as well as the middle school and high school, provide before school or after school opportunities for students to target improvement in reading and/or math skills. The programs are designed around the needs of the learners involved with the activity.

3. Summer School Remediation Opportunities for Identified High School Students

The BHM district also provides remedial math and reading opportunities during summer school for high school students.

| | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------|
|  | School Improvement Division 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 | DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 2010-2011 |
|--|---|--|-----------|

b) Identify how these activities help students meet the measurable goals set to improve achievement in the cited area(s)

Activities use pre- and post-assessment data, as well as formative assessments, to determine students' targeted skill areas. Instruction is individualized based on that assessment data.

c) Describe how staff are identified and trained to provide effective services and activities to improvement achievement within the cited area(s).

Teachers who instruct in our extended day and extended school year opportunities are highly trained and highly motivated to help children succeed in reading. Many times flexible grouping is used to ensure that the students' needs are being met throughout the duration of the program. Teachers are selected by building principals based on their knowledge of the effectiveness of the individual teacher. The high-quality professional development provided to all teachers in our district provides opportunities for teachers to improve skills in the teaching of reading. Some sites also use book studies to improve their skill set in meeting struggling students' needs.

~OR~

Describe the rationale if the district is not providing extended day activities.

Districts with an existing improvement plan should attach that plan and identify the page where this information can specifically be found.

Page where identified: _____

8. Outline the responsibility of the school, local education agency (LEA), and state education agency (SEA) including the technical assistance provided by the LEA

Describe the responsibilities of the state educational agency and the local educational agency under the plan, including specifying the technical assistance to be provided by the state educational agency under paragraph (9) and the local educational agency's responsibilities under section 1120A

Address the following:

a) Describe the technical assistance that has been provided and/or is essential to effectively implement the district improvement plan.


The plan was developed in consultation with the regional service cooperative, Resource Training & Solutions. The regional service cooperative AYP coordinator communicated on an as-needed basis with the LEA.

b) After consultation with the regional service cooperatives or SEA, identify the technical assistance that will be provided specific to the district stage of *In Need of Improvement*.

Buffalo-Hanover-Montrose Schools is not currently participating in any of the regional service cooperative activities.

Districts with an existing improvement plan should attach that plan and identify the page where this information can specifically be found.

Page where identified: _____

| | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------|
|  | School Improvement Division 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 | DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 2010-2011 |
|--|---|--|-----------|

V. Highly Qualified Teachers - Public Law 107-110, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001:

All of the teachers in this district teaching core content classes are highly qualified:

Yes
 No

If no, a district must identify each teacher in the district that did not meet the federal highly qualified requirements and answer the questions below:

- Diana Birch (Autism) -- New to the district this year and will be scheduled for elementary core content exams to meet the HQ requirements.
- Deb Bestland (Dance) -- New to the district this year and is enrolled in a program for licensure. Currently has a community expert licensure.
- Carrie Walz (Autism) -- Second year in the district and will be scheduled for content exams to meet the HQ requirements.
- Michael Yanko (JMNG) -- New to the district this year and is enrolled in a program for licensure. He currently has a community expert licensure.
- Gretchen Lieb, Katherine Nelson and Joy Turner -- Teachers in an approved alternative program and have a Board of Teaching waiver. They teach in their content area as well as other subject areas.
- Describe the specific plan of action that shall be taken, e.g., classes, content exam, professional development, etc. in order for the teacher(s) to meet the federal “highly qualified” requirements.

All teachers listed above are teachers new to the district this year or in new positions. They all will be scheduled for content exams to meet the HQ requirements.

- Identify the expected date when the teacher(s) must meet the requirements.

June 2011

VI. DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT ACTION PLAN

Provide or attach the district improvement action plan with a timeline outlining the implementation of the plan over a minimum of two years. The plan must proficiently address all the elements; however, a quality plan will focus on a maximum of (3-5) goals (within these elements based on a comprehensive needs assessment). Utilize the format provided on the next two pages related to the identified student group area(s). Please use one box per activity.

District Improvement Action Plan for AYP

| AYP GOAL | Demonstrate a 7.7% increase in the overall percentage of students meeting proficiency standards on the MCA-IIs in math | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| INTENDED AUDIENCE | | | | | | |
| Strategies/Tasks | Goal | Measurement/ Evidence of Success | Date or Timeline | Person Responsible | Resources Needed | Progress Update Month, Day, Year |
| A. Provide SIOP math workshop for math teachers and ELD staff | Increase student achievement by EL population as measured by MCA and MAP tests | Increase in EL student achievement as measured by MCA-II and MAP data | August/ September 2010 | Jack Brady | “SIOP Model for Teaching Mathematics to English Learners” | September 2010 March 2010 |
| B. Train additional staff and implement components of <i>Responsive Classroom</i> (at K-5) and <i>Developmental Designs for Middle School</i> (at 6-8). | Enhancing the direct connection between engagement, sense of community, and the use of culturally relevant strategies on student achievement | Increase in student achievement as measured by MCA-II and MAP data | June 2010 | Pam Miller | None | April 2010 |
| C. Enhance the implementation of the co-teaching model between Special Ed and general education teachers in English and math at secondary sites | Increase student achievement by SpEd students as measured by MCA-II and MAP test data | Increase in student achievement as measured by MCA-II, GRAD and MAP data | November 2010 thru March 2011 | Joy Kieffer, Mark Mischke and Jack Brady | Release time for collaborative meeting | November 2010 February 2011 |
| D. Implement new K-12 math curriculums | Increase student achievement as measured by MCA-II and MAP test data | Increase in student achievement as measured by MCA-II, GRAD and MAP data | August 2010 | Pam Miller | New materials purchased for all grades | October 2010, January 2011 and May 2011 |
| E. Aligning core math curriculum to state standards using the district’s curriculum mapping software. | Increase awareness of scope and sequence among teachers, and familiarity with the curriculum by the public | Increase in student achievement as measured by MCA-II, GRAD and MAP data | June 2011 | Pam Miller | Release time for collaborative work time | November 2010 January 2011 March 2011 |
| F. Enhancing the work of professional learning communities to develop formative assessments, and examine and apply the data in math instruction as the year progresses. | Analyze student assessment data, develop common formative and summative assessments, dialogue about most effective instructional strategies | Increase in student achievement as measured by MCA-II, GRAD and MAP data | June 2011 | Pam Miller | Release time for collaborative work time | November 2010 January 2011 March 2011 |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|-----------|
|  | School Improvement Division 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 | DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 2010-2011 |
|---|---|--|-----------|


| Strategies/Tasks | Goal | Measurement/ Evidence of Success | Date or Timeline | Person Responsible | Resources Needed | Progress Update Month, Day, Year |
|--|---|--|-----------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| G. Offer CGI training for K-5 teachers | Increase teacher's instructional skills and strategies | Increase in student achievement as measured by MCA-II and MAP data | June 2011 | Pam Miller | None | June 2011 |
| H. Research and recommend high-quality math interventions and identify tiers of intervention for elementary, middle school, and high school students | Increase teacher's instructional skills and strategies | Increase in student achievement as measured by MCA-II, GRAD and MAP data | 2010-2011 school year | Pam, Principals, Vicki | Intervention resources | November 2010 January 2011 March 2011 |
| I. Increase the capacity of staff to work effectively with students of different cultural backgrounds | Increase in engagement and achievement by students, increased parental involvement in schools | Increase in student achievement as measured by MCA-II, GRAD and MAP data | 2010-2011 school year | Diversity Coordinator, Cultural Liaisons | Not Known | November 2010 January 2011 March 2011 |
| J. Identify and communicate home strategies to improve the achievement of FRL and LEP students. | Increase involvement of parents in the education of their children | Increase in student achievement as measured by MCA-II, GRAD and MAP data | 2010-2011 school year | Pam Miller, Joy Kieffer, Jack Brady and Jenina Rothstein | Not Known | November 2010 January 2011 March 2011 |
| K. Increase collaborative opportunities between Special Education teachers and general classroom teachers at all levels focused on math and reading instruction. | Increase effectiveness of special and general education teachers to work collaboratively within the classroom | Increase in student achievement as measured by MCA-II, GRAD and MAP data | 2010-2011 school year | Joy Keiffer and Jack Brady | Not Known | December 2010 February 2011 |
| L. Visit other schools who have been successful in moving students from partially proficient to proficient | Identification of strategies to use in BHM district | Increase in student achievement as measured by MCA-II, GRAD and MAP data | January 2011 | Pam, Principals | None | December 2010 January 2011 |

RATIONALE

****2% Programmatic Set-Aside:**

The BHM district is using the additional 2% programmatic set-aside to hire additional staff to enhance the extended day kindergarten programs at the three Title I sites. The extended day kindergarten program (briefly described on page 17), now in its fourth year, is an early intervention program demonstrating positive results for the students involved. With early evaluation results showing positive progress for students, we chose to enhance the program with the use of the additional 2% programmatic set-aside that this year will provide additional paraprofessional support to the Title I teachers in the three extended day kindergarten programs. By intervening in kindergarten, the goal is to decrease the number of students entering first grade performing below entrance grade level expectations.

It is our understanding, as well as the understanding of other district staff members, that the 2% set-aside could be used for programmatic funding. This was communicated by MDE at a meeting at MDE in the fall of 2009. Other school districts also had this understanding. The additional staff for the Extended Day Title I Kindergarten program has been essential for achieving the goals we established for that program servicing at-risk kindergartners.

| | | | |
|---|---|--|-----------|
|  | School Improvement Division 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 | DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 2010-2011 |
|---|---|--|-----------|

District Improvement Action Plan for AYP

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| AYP GOAL | Demonstrate a 5.4% increase in the overall percentage of students meeting proficiency standards on the MCA-IIs in reading |
|-----------------|--|

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| INTENDED AUDIENCE | |
|--------------------------|--|

| Strategies/Tasks | Goal | Measurement/ Evidence of Success | Date or Timeline | Person Responsible | Resources Needed | Progress Update Month, Day, Year |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------|--|--|---|
| A. Train additional staff and implement components of <i>Responsive Classroom</i> (at K-5) and <i>Developmental Designs for Middle School</i> (at 6-8). | Enhancing the direct connection between engagement, sense of community, and the use of culturally relevant strategies on student achievement | Increase in student achievement as measured by MCA-II, GRAD and MAP data | June 2010 | Pam Miller | None | April 2010 |
| B. Enhance the implementation of the co-teaching model between Special Ed and general education teachers in English at secondary sites | Increase student achievement by SpEd students as measured by MCA-II and MAP test data | Increase in student achievement as measured by MCA-II, GRAD and MAP data | November 2010 thru March 2011 | Joy Kieffer, Mark Mischke and Jack Brady | Release time for collaborative meeting | November 2010 February 2011 |
| C. Strive for fidelity in the implement K-5 Reading/Language Arts curriculums | Increase student achievement as measured by MCA-II and MAP test data | Increase in student achievement as measured by MCA-II and MAP data | 2010-11 school year | Pam Miller | None | October 2010 January 2011 March 2011 |
| D. Aligning core reading curriculum to state standards using the district's curriculum mapping software. | Increase awareness of scope and sequence among teachers, and familiarity with the curriculum by the public | Increase in student achievement as measured by MCA-II, GRAD and MAP data | June 2011 | Pam Miller | Release time for collaborative work time | November 2010 January 2011 March 2011 |
| E. Enhancing the work of professional learning communities to develop formative assessments, and examine and apply the data in reading and English instruction as the year progresses. | Analyze student assessment data, develop common formative and summative assessments, dialogue about most effective instructional strategies | Increase in student achievement as measured by MCA-II, GRAD and MAP data | June 2011 | Pam Miller | Release time for collaborative work time | November 2010 January 2011 March 2011 |




School Improvement Division
 1500 Highway 36 West
 Roseville, MN 55113-4266

DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

2010-2011

| Strategies/Tasks | Goal | Measurement/ Evidence of Success | Date or Timeline | Person Responsible | Resources Needed | Progress Update Month, Day, Year |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| F. Research and recommend high-quality reading interventions and identify tiers of intervention for elementary, middle school, and high school students | Increase in student achievement as measured by MCA-II, GRAD and MAP test data | 2009-2010 school year | Pam, Principals, Vicki | Intervention resources | Not Known | June 2011 |
| G. Provide training for all secondary teachers on elementary reading comprehension strategies. | Increase teacher's instructional skills and strategies | Increase in student achievement as measured by MCA-II, GRAD and MAP test data | 2010-2011 school year | Pam, Principals, Vicki | Intervention resources | November 2010 January 2011 March 2011 |


| | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------|
|  | School Improvement Division 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 | DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 2010-2011 |
|--|---|--|-----------|

Appendix Attachments

Appendix A: Scoring Rubrics

Appendix B: Updating District In Need of Improvement Plan Addendum

Appendix C: District Corrective Action Addendum [*§1116(c)(10)(C)*]

| | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------|
|  | School Improvement Division 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 | DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 2010-2011 |
|--|---|--|-----------|

Appendix A: Scoring Rubrics

A Rubric for District Improvement Plans

| The essential requirements in the school or district improvement applications have been incorporated (general information, executive summary, needs assessment, highly qualified teachers and improvement action plan) | |
|---|--|
| <i>Completed</i> | <i>Not Completed</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General and contact information is included <input type="checkbox"/> Area(s) for identification are included <input type="checkbox"/> Overview of improvement plan for 2010-2011 school year is provided <input type="checkbox"/> Demographics are included in executive summary <input type="checkbox"/> Elements are addressed and easily located in the plan <input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive needs assessment summary for 2010-2011 school year is provided <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Qualified Teachers section is completed on the plan <input type="checkbox"/> District improvement action plan is included with all sections completed | <input type="checkbox"/> General information is incorrect or incomplete <input type="checkbox"/> Area(s) for identification are not included <input type="checkbox"/> Overview of improvement plan for 2010-2011 school year is incomplete <input type="checkbox"/> Demographics are not included in plan <input type="checkbox"/> Elements are not provided or are incomplete <input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive needs assessment summary is not provided or incomplete for 2010-2011 school year <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Qualified Teachers section is incomplete <input type="checkbox"/> District improvement action plan is not included or incomplete |

A Rubric for District Improvement Plans


(DISTINGUISHED ← PROFICIENT ← NEEDS REVISION)

| 1. Ensure all students are proficient in core academic subjects by 2013-2014 | | |
|---|---|---|
| Distinguished | Proficient | Needs Revision |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Challenges preventing the school or district from not making AYP are identified; actions, including policies and practices, are evident in the plan to address barriers <input type="checkbox"/> Targets are specific, clear, measurable and appropriately identified for all students to be on track for 100% proficiency by 2013-2014 in reading and math | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Challenges preventing the school or district from not making AYP are identified <input type="checkbox"/> Targets are identified for all students to be on track for 100% proficiency by 2013-2014 in reading and math | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Challenges preventing the school or district from not making AYP are not identified or not clearly presented <input type="checkbox"/> Targets are not provided or are unclear |

A Rubric for District Improvement Plans

(DISTINGUISHED ← PROFICIENT ← NEEDS REVISION)

| 2. Establish annual measurable goals for continuous and substantial progress to achieve proficiency | | |
|--|---|--|
| Distinguished | Proficient | Needs Revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Annual measurable goals for identified student group(s) are clearly identified via SMART goals <input type="checkbox"/> Goals are documented for identified student groups and plans for implementation and evaluation are evident | <input type="checkbox"/> Annual measurable goals for identified student group(s) are clearly identified <input type="checkbox"/> Goals for identified student group(s) are established and a means of tracking progress is provided over 2 years of plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Goals are not measurable <input type="checkbox"/> Goals are not identified for targeted student group(s) |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------|
|  | School Improvement Division 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 | DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 2010-2011 |
|--|---|--|-----------|

A Rubric for District Improvement Plans

(DISTINGUISHED ← PROFICIENT ← NEEDS REVISION)

| 3. Incorporate strategies based on scientifically based research to strengthen core academic subjects | | |
|---|--|---|
| Distinguished | Proficient | Needs Revision |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Strategies are identified and an action plan is detailed for implementation of each identified strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Strategies are aligned to the performance goals and specific activities and timelines are provided for each strategy <input type="checkbox"/> Sources of scientifically-based research are identified and evidence is linked to cited area(s) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Strategies are identified for each performance goal <input type="checkbox"/> Strategies are aligned to the performance goals <input type="checkbox"/> Sources of scientifically-based research are identified regarding cited area(s) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Strategies are not identified <input type="checkbox"/> Strategies are not aligned to the performance goals <input type="checkbox"/> Sources of research are not identified |

A Rubric for District Improvement Plans

(DISTINGUISHED ← PROFICIENT ← NEEDS REVISION)

| 4. Ensure the professional development needs of instructional staff are met by providing opportunities to participate in high quality professional development | | |
|---|--|--|
| Distinguished | Proficient | Needs Revision |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> All teachers participate in high quality professional development linked directly to student achievement including cited area(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Title I set aside funds are used for the purpose of providing high quality professional development that targets the needs of instructional staff to address district identification area(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Schedules provide time for opportunities to participate in high quality professional development in an aligned, planned manner <input type="checkbox"/> Professional development provides clearly organized, job-embedded collaboration to improve classroom practice | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Teachers participate in high quality professional development <input type="checkbox"/> Title I set aside funds are used for the purpose of providing high quality professional development that targets the needs of instructional staff | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Little or no description is provided about professional development <input type="checkbox"/> Use of 10% Title I set aside is unclear |

A Rubric for District Improvement Plans

(DISTINGUISHED ← PROFICIENT ← NEEDS REVISION)

| 5. Address the teaching and learning needs in the district | | |
|--|---|--|
| Distinguished | Proficient | Needs Revision |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A comprehensive needs assessment process is used to identify and review teaching and learning needs <input type="checkbox"/> Teaching and learning needs are aligned to identified areas for improvement and are supported by scientifically research based strategies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A needs assessment process is used to identify teaching and learning needs <input type="checkbox"/> Teaching and learning needs are aligned to identified areas for improvement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A needs assessment process to identify teaching and learning needs is incomplete or missing <input type="checkbox"/> Little or no alignment of teaching and learning needs to identified areas for improvement |

A Rubric for District Improvement Plans

(DISTINGUISHED ← PROFICIENT ← NEEDS REVISION)

| 6. Promote effective parent involvement strategies | | |
|---|--|--|
| Distinguished | Proficient | Needs Revision |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Strategies are identified that are effective based on research and best practice and an evaluation process is evident <input type="checkbox"/> Strategies are identified to inform families about continuous academic progress, especially in cited area(s) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Strategies are identified that are effective based on research and best practice (and include a process for evaluation when completing Appendix B or C) <input type="checkbox"/> Strategies are identified and linked to improving student learning in cited area(s) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Strategies are not identified or unclear to promote effective parent involvement <input type="checkbox"/> Strategies are not identified or are not linked with improving learning in cited area(s) |

A Rubric for District Improvement Plans

(DISTINGUISHED ← PROFICIENT ← NEEDS REVISION)


| 7. Incorporate extended day and extended school year activities as appropriate | | |
|---|--|---|
| Distinguished | Proficient | Needs Revision |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Goals are clearly stated, measurable and align with improvement goals <input type="checkbox"/> Extended day/ year activities meet student needs in cited area(s) and result in student achievement <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Qualified staff is trained in the area(s) they are servicing for the extended day program | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Goals are provided or align to improvement goals <input type="checkbox"/> Extended day/ year activities meet student needs in cited area(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Staff is trained and prepared for the extended day program | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Goals are vague or not provided <input type="checkbox"/> Activities have no correlation to cited area(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Little or no training is provided to staff |

REMINDER: For districts not providing extended day activities, please provide rationale in the plan.

A Rubric for District Improvement Plans


(DISTINGUISHED ← PROFICIENT ← NEEDS REVISION)

| 8. Outline the responsibility of the school, local education agency (LEA), and state education agency (SEA) including technical assistance provided by the LEA | | |
|--|--|---|
| Distinguished | Proficient | Needs Revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of LEA/SEA collaboration and technical assistance for development of the plan <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of LEA/SEA collaboration and technical assistance in the implementation of the plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of LEA/SEA customized coordination and technical assistance for development of the plan <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of LEA/SEA customized coordination and technical assistance in the implementation of the plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Little or no evidence of LEA/SEA support in development of the plan <input type="checkbox"/> Little or no evidence of LEA/SEA inclusion in the implementation of the plan |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------|
|  | School Improvement Division 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 | DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 2010-2011 |
|--|---|--|-----------|

Continuing In Need of Improvement Addendums

| Updating District Improvement Plan Requirements: In Need of Improvement (1.2) and Continuing In Need of Improvement (2.1, 2.2) | Found on page# |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p>Elements 1 & 2: After reviewing the fixed targets in Element 1(b), update goals for identified student group(s) in Element 2(a) regarding school year 2010-11.</p> | |
| <p>Element 3: Describe how identified strategies are impacting student achievement especially with identified student groups. If little or no evidence of increased achievement, describe proposed strategy changes.</p> | |
| <p>Element 4: Describe the professional development supported with Title I setaside funds for school year 2010-2011 (<i>narrative format</i>).</p> | |
| <p>Element 5: Describe how teaching and learning needs are being addressed. If any changes or updates please describe as well.</p> | |
| <p>Element 6: Describe the process to evaluate the parent involvement strategies being implemented. If strategies are not effectively engaging parents, particularly from those identified student groups, describe proposed research-based strategies.</p> | |
| <p>Element 7: Update, <i>if appropriate</i>, extended day activities.</p> | |
| <p>Element 8: Identify additional services and onsite consultation from the AYP Coordinators/Service Cooperative that could strengthen improvement implementation efforts <i>specifically</i> for your district. Please describe in detail.</p> | |
| <p>Highly Qualified: Are all teachers of core content classes highly qualified? <i>If no</i>, a district <i>must</i> identify each teacher who does not meet the federal “highly qualified” requirements. In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the specific plan of action that shall be taken, e.g., classes, content exam, professional development, etc. in order for the identified teacher(s) to meet the federal “highly qualified” requirements. Were these teachers or positions identified the previous year? If so, please provide an explanation and action plan to rectify. • Identify the expected date when the teacher(s) will meet the requirements. | |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|-----------|
|  | School Improvement Division 1500 Highway 36 West Roseville, MN 55113-4266 | DISTRICT LEVEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 2010-2011 |
|--|---|--|-----------|

Appendix C: District Corrective Action Addendum §1116(c)(10)(C)

| Public Law 107-110, No Child Left behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 Requirements | Found on page# |
|--|--|
| <p>1. Please complete in detail the “District Improvement Action Plan for AYP” template (currently used in district improvement plan or a similar tool) to describe how the required 2% programmatic setaside (corrective action) will be utilized (this is in addition to the 10% professional development setaside).</p> <p>Provide the rationale for choosing the focus of 1) programmatic funds, 2) relevant goals aligned to increase achievement of student groups, 3) strategies/activities aligned to identified areas, and 4) timelines.</p> | |
| <p>2. List any existing district improvement plan elements that have been revised to exit <i>Corrective Action</i> stage of <i>In Need of Improvement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revisit needs assessment • Update improvement goals • Evaluate the implementation of current instructional strategies • Align professional development with cited area(s) • Review and revise district teaching and learning needs • Evaluate the implementation of current parent involvement strategies • Identify additional technical assistance and support from AYP state wide system of support | Each element of the plan has been revised to address the bulleted list at the left. These are found in the appropriate sections throughout the revised plan. |
| <p>3. A district may delay implementation of the corrective action plan for a period not to exceed one year if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The district makes adequate yearly progress for one year ▪ Its failure to make adequate yearly progress is due to exceptional or uncontrollable circumstances (a natural disaster or a precipitous and unforeseen decline in the financial resources of the district.) <p>If such a situation has occurred, please describe in detail the rationale for delay in implementing the corrective action plan.</p> | N/A |