



**Lake Washington**

**School District**

**Continuous Improvement Plans**

# **REDMOND LEARNING COMMUNITY**

**2012-2013**

- **Dickinson Elementary School**
- **Einstein Elementary School**
- **Mann Elementary School**
- **Redmond Elementary School**
- **Rockwell Elementary School**
- **Rosa Parks Elementary School**
- **Wilder Elementary School**
- **Evergreen Middle School**
- **Redmond Middle School**
- **Redmond High School**
- **Explorer Community School**

**Continuous Improvement Process Plan  
Emily Dickinson Elementary CIP 2012-2013**

**Purpose:** The Continuous Improvement Process (CIP) plan provides opportunity for the school staff to reflect and analyze results from the previous year’s SMART goals. The process uses the Planning, Learning, Implementation and Evaluation (PLIE) model, a Cycle of Inquiry, to improve learning for all students.

**Part 1: 2011-2012 Reflection Goals:**

**A. Data Summary, Reflection, and Analysis:**

<b>Class of 2020- current 5<sup>th</sup> graders</b>			
<b>2011-2012 SMART Goals</b>			
<b>Reading</b>	<b>Math</b>	<b>Writing</b>	
88%	86%	84%	

<b>Results:</b>							
Year	Reading		Math		Science	Writing	
	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	NA	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient
2012-4 <sup>th</sup>	54%	29%	36%	40%	NA	45%	19%
2011-3 <sup>rd</sup>	35%	50%	47%	33%	NA	NA	

<b>Class of 2021- current 4<sup>th</sup> graders</b>			
<b>2011-2012 SMART Goals:</b>			
<b>Reading</b>	<b>Math</b>		
87%	83%		

<b>Results:</b>						
Year	Reading		Math		Science	Writing
	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	NA	NA
2012-3 <sup>rd</sup>	37%	46%	31%	48%	NA	NA

**Class of 2022- current 3<sup>rd</sup> graders**

Year	EOY Reading DIBELS Benchmark	Math	Science	Writing
2012- 2 <sup>nd</sup>	85%	NA	NA	NA
2011- 1 <sup>st</sup>	79%	NA	NA	NA
2010- K	89%	NA	NA	NA

**Class of 2023- current 2<sup>nd</sup> graders**

Year	EOY Reading DIBELS Benchmark	Math	Science	Writing
2012- 1 <sup>st</sup>	84%	NA	NA	NA
2011- K	86%	NA	NA	NA

**Class of 2024- current 1<sup>st</sup> graders**

Year	EOY Reading DIBELS Benchmark	Math	Science	Writing
2012- K	86%	NA	NA	NA

### School-wide Analysis of Multiple Measures

Briefly explain school-wide systems used to improve student achievement in each of the following content areas:

Reading:

Systems used in 2011-2012:

- Safety Net
- Parent reading mentors
- Library reading challenges
- Big buddy reading partners
- Easy CBM for diagnostic formative interventions and progress monitoring

Changes for 2012-2013

- School-wide implementation of PLC cycle of inquiry focused on results
- Build staff readiness for new Literacy Adoption through professional development focused on shared learning

Math:

Systems used in 2011-2012:

- Safety Net
- Parent math mentors
- “Math Games” enrichment program
- IXL
- Easy CBM for diagnostic formative interventions and progress monitoring
- Professional development to backfill missed training during principal transition year

Changes for 2012-2013

- School-wide implementation of PLC cycle of inquiry focused on results
- Development of new project-based learning opportunities to challenge Level 4 students to increase rigor beyond what is provided in enVision, initially launched with cross-school collaboration among RLC elementary schools

Writing:	<p><u>Systems used in 2011-2012:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parent writing mentors</li> </ul> <p><u>Changes for 2012-2013</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data indicates that this is an area of focus for improvement. We will be working as a staff to identify the scope and sequence of instruction throughout the grade levels in the area of writing in preparation for the Literacy Adoption.</li> <li>• We have identified targeted LEAP Wednesdays to collaboratively examine writing CDSAs, as well as plan for instruction based on results</li> </ul>
Science:	<p><u>Systems used in 2011-2012:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applied science in the campus Wetlands through EcoSchools Initiative</li> </ul> <p><u>Changes for 2012-2013</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided staff release day to meet with teacher teams of highly successful schools within the area of science to plan for the school year and identify additional resources to support the provided science curriculum</li> </ul>

### **Sub-Group Analysis**

Which school-wide sub-group/s creates opportunities for celebration or cause for concern (e.g. Gender, Ethnicity, ELL, Special Education, SES)? Please provide examples and explanations.

#### Celebrations

- 29% or greater of the 5<sup>th</sup> grade students receiving Special Education services were at or above standard on the MSP in reading, math and science
- 61% of 4<sup>th</sup> grade students and 56% of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students receiving Special Education services were at or above standard on the reading MSP
- 2<sup>nd</sup> grade students receiving Special Education services increased their DIBELS achievement by 12% across the year, indicating growth
- 53% of 1<sup>st</sup> grade students receiving Special Education services were at benchmark in the EOY assessment
- The number of Kindergarten ELL students assessed as meeting benchmark doubled from BOY to EOY
- 67% of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students from low SES homes were at or above standard in MSP reading
- Math achievement improved at the cohort level; this could be attributed to our focused work on improving competency within the enVision curriculum

#### Cause for Concern

- Low SES students demonstrate a lower achievement level than school-wide trends in all areas and levels
- In all grade levels, the percentage of female students that are at or above standard is significantly higher than that of male students
- Level of writing proficiency across all subgroups is statistically underperforming

## Perception Data Summary, Reflection, and Analysis

Year	Goal Area #1 From- To Percentage	Goal Area #2 From – To Percentage
2012	#42: Teachers receive regular feedback on how they are doing. <i>Target: move from 61% to 75%</i>	#29: Staff members trust one another. <i>Target: move from 60% to 80%</i>
2011	#42: Teachers receive regular feedback on how they are doing. <i>Target: move from 89% to 95%</i>	#29: Staff members trust one another. <i>Target: move from 92% to 100%</i>
2010	Data unavailable	Data unavailable

### Analysis of Perception Data

Why were these goal areas selected? What actions were taken to achieve these goals?

#### **2011-2012**

##### **Goal #1: Teacher Feedback**

- The goal was selected in conjunction with the shared RLC focus on improving classroom instruction through providing regular feedback to teachers.
- Efforts made to meet this goal:
  - Principal created system to monitor ICED protocol, including providing instant feedback to teachers via email from a tablet device
  - Renewed building focus on PGE process throughout the year, providing frequent check-ins by principal and support for growth from colleagues
  - Instructional Leadership Team created, developing regular accountability protocols around data and increased teacher collaboration. This created opportunities for peers to provide feedback to one another in addition to the Principal

##### **Results:**

9 Characteristics Survey indicates that we exceeded our goal, with 93% of teachers indicating that they receive regular feedback on how they are doing. This is a 32% increase over the previous year.

**Goal #2: Trust Among Staff**

- This goal was selected due to dramatic decline of trust among staff members as indicated in the 9 Characteristics Survey in the year prior to administrative transition
- Efforts made to meet this goal:
  - New Principal assigned to building, assessed need through 1 on 1 interviews
  - August LEAP staff retreat to Challenges Northwest to develop trust through teambuilding activities
  - Principal established building-wide systems and distributed leadership teams
  - Principal established clearly defined protocols, roles and structure for the staff
  - Staff developed and monitored norms for all adults at school
  - Principal provided multiple opportunities for all staff to provide feedback and input regarding interests and needs
  - Staff made a united effort to increase the level of professionalism throughout all areas of their work

**Results:**

9 Characteristics Survey indicates that we exceeded our goal, with 86% of teachers expressing agreement that they trust one another. This is a 26% increase over the previous year.

**Part 2: Goals for 2012-13:****Performance Goals – Statements (Current year’s work)**

"Class of"	Reading		Math		Science	Writing
	From:	To:	From:	To:	Baseline	Baseline
2020- 5 <sup>th</sup>	86%	97%	74%	86%	69%	NA
2021 -4 <sup>th</sup>	86.6%	88%	83.6%	88%	NA	80.5%
2022- 3 <sup>rd</sup>	NA	86%	NA	77%	NA	NA
2023-2 <sup>nd</sup>	82%	88%	NA	NA	NA	NA
2024- 1 <sup>st</sup>	80%	92%	NA	NA	NA	NA
2025- K	83%	91%	NA	NA	NA	NA

**Challenge Goal:** This goal is to increase the percentage of students exceeding standard (from 3 to 4) on the MSP in grades 3, 4, and 5 in a particular content area.

Grades 3-5: Identify content area	From	To
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math	36%	43%
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math	46%	50%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade Math	15%	36%

**Perception Goals:**

Year	Goal Area #1 From/To Percentage	Goal Area #2 From/To Percentage
2012-2013	#27: Staff routinely work together to plan what will be taught  From: 75% To: 85%	#44: Teachers provide feedback to each other to help improve instructional practice  From: 72% To: 82%

**Process Summary**

Highlight building-wide strategies to meet goals in reading, math, science and writing:
<p>Math:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade level targeted intervention/extension</li> <li>• Focus on computational fluency at all grade levels</li> <li>• Safety Net intervention</li> <li>• Cross-school LEAP collaboration to develop extension activity for Level 4 students</li> <li>• Math club (enrichment activity)</li> </ul> <p>Reading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Daily IA support for small group literacy in grades K-2</li> <li>• Weekly PLC meetings to monitor student learning</li> <li>• Safety Net intervention</li> <li>• Read Naturally program with parent volunteers</li> <li>• Read at home program</li> </ul> <p>Writing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 traits writing focus using Step Up to Writing curriculum</li> <li>• PLC data analysis of student achievement data to design next steps</li> <li>• Mentor text modeling</li> <li>• PLC analysis of Common District Assessment data; using data to drive next steps in writing instruction</li> </ul> <p>Science:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Science journals with teacher feedback</li> <li>• Nature Vision visits for all classes throughout the year</li> <li>• Hands-on work within the wetlands conservation area on campus K-5</li> <li>• Non-fiction science books in all classrooms to increase access to scientific concepts</li> </ul>



Highlight use of technology to improve student learning:

- Envision online
- IXL, xtramath.org and mathdrills.org for home practice
- Headsprout and Starfall for literacy in the classroom
- Tumblebooks online
- Activotes to increase student engagement
- Instruction in Powerpoint presentation skills in intermediate grades
- Daily use of netbooks at all grade levels
- Research skills focus during library instruction
- Teacher developed Haiku websites

Highlight steps to involve staff, students, parents, families, and community:

- Streamlined Master Schedule to increase IA time in working with kids
- Parent volunteers
- LINKS volunteers in all grade levels
- Parent newsletters that include weekly standards, learning targets and skills
- Regular survey of community for feedback and opportunities for involvement

Highlight process for progress monitoring, describing what assessments you will use throughout the year:

Math:

- Pre/Post assessment data to inform instruction & flexible groups
- Quick checks & quizzes
- Timed tests to monitor math fact fluency
- Common District Assessments

Writing:

- Common District Assessments
- Peer/Self Assessments
- Conventions Quizzes

Reading:

- DIBELS assessment & progress monitoring for students below benchmark
- Comprehension Assessments
- Word study project
- Individualized spelling programs in primary grades
- Regular 1 to 1 conferring
- Reading Journals

Science:

- Science journals
- Self-assessments
- Common District Assessments

Social Studies:

- Chapter tests
- Performance assessments

Highlight strategies to address the PLC questions #3 and #4:

*Question #3: How will we respond if students do not learn?*

- Intervention/Extension block times for flexible grouping between grade level
- Weekly PLC meetings with grade level teachers, using a 4 week cycle of inquiry
- Teacher or volunteer working 1 to 1 with student
- Safety Net intervention

*Question #4: How will we respond if students already know what we want students to learn?*

- Use higher level thinking questioning strategies
- Utilize transfer of learning opportunities through project based learning
- Parent extensions through math game program



**Continuous Improvement Process Plan  
Einstein Elementary CIP 2012-2013**

**Purpose:** The Continuous Improvement Process (CIP) plan provides opportunity for the school staff to reflect and analyze results from the previous year's SMART goals. The process uses the Planning, Learning, Implementation and Evaluation (PLIE) model, a Cycle of Inquiry, to improve learning for all students.

**Part 1: 2011-2012 Reflection Goals:** Due to DSS by October 12, 2012

**A. Data Summary, Reflection, and Analysis:**

<b>Class of 2020- current 5<sup>th</sup> graders</b>			
<b>2011-2012 SMART Goals</b>			
<b>Reading</b>	<b>Math</b>	<b>Writing</b>	
From 56.% to 61%	From 63% to 70%	From NA% to 70%	

<b>Results:</b>							
<b>Year</b>	<b>Reading</b>		<b>Math</b>		<b>Science</b>	<b>Writing</b>	
	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exceeds Proficient</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exceeds Proficient</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exceeds Proficient</b>
2012-4 <sup>th</sup>	44	31	24	42	NA	44	39
2011-3 <sup>rd</sup>	25	46	25	35	NA	NA	

<b>Class of 2021- current 4<sup>th</sup> graders</b>		
<b>2011-2012 SMART Goals:</b>		
<b>Reading</b>	<b>Math</b>	
60%	50%	

<b>Results:</b>						
<b>Year</b>	<b>Reading</b>		<b>Math</b>		<b>Science</b>	<b>Writing</b>
	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exceeds Proficient</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exceeds Proficient</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>
2012-3 <sup>rd</sup>	40	34	30	42	NA	NA

<b>Class of 2022- current 3<sup>rd</sup> graders</b>				
Year	EOY Reading DIBELS Benchmark	Math	Science	Writing
2012- 2 <sup>nd</sup>	67%	NA	NA	NA
2011- 1 <sup>st</sup>	75%	NA	NA	NA
2010- K	75%	NA	NA	NA

<b>Class of 2023- current 2<sup>nd</sup> graders</b>				
Year	EOY Reading DIBELS Benchmark	Math	Science	Writing
2012- 1 <sup>st</sup>	82%	NA	NA	NA
2011- K	86%	NA	NA	NA

<b>Class of 2024- current 1<sup>st</sup> graders</b>				
Year	EOY Reading DIBELS Benchmark	Math	Science	Writing
2012- K	76%	NA	NA	NA

### **School-wide Analysis of Multiple Measures**

Briefly explain school-wide systems used to improve student achievement in each of the following content areas:	
Reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety Net Redesign Committee researched best practices and modified SN service delivery model. New model included a focus on K-2 SN Literacy instruction during the school day and 3<sup>rd</sup> grade SN Literacy support before school. Students with the greatest needs were given grade level instruction with their General Ed teachers and a double dose of Literacy instruction with a SN teacher for 30 minutes to an hour depending on need. We also implemented Kindergarten SN Reading instruction for the first time.</li> <li>• Teachers implemented a Walk to Read model for a portion of literacy instruction in most grade levels allowing students to be taught in flexible skills groups for a portion of Literacy Instruction.</li> <li>• Teachers used scientifically researched based materials to teach reading</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress monitoring data was analyzed on a regular basis to adjust instructional groups and to provide intervention for students not previously served</li> <li>• The SN team met quarterly to reorganize SN groups based on student need and individual student data</li> <li>• SN, ELL, SPED and Gen Ed teams met quarterly to engage in Progress Monitoring meetings to discuss specific student needs</li> <li>• 8 Week Parent Education program was offered to Spanish speaking parents to provide instruction on how to support their students' literacy development among other things</li> <li>• 6 Literacy Events were held at the Redmond Library where families were served dinner, participated in a read aloud, and took a book home to keep.</li> <li>• K-1 Literacy Make and Take Night was held. Parents learned Literacy based games and activities designed to develop their child's literacy skills. Families also heard a keynote speech on literacy development from the author of <u>What Children Need to Learn to Read</u>, Michelle Vallene</li> <li>• Before-school ELL program for 4th-6th grade allowed ELL students to get 200 additional minutes of instruction a week in English</li> <li>• A Jump Start Program was offered for incoming kindergarten ELL students which allowed them to have a two-week orientation to school prior to the arrival of other students where early Literacy skills were taught among other things.</li> <li>• Certificated teachers offered homework support for students living in Homeless Shelters and Transitional Housing complexes once a week for 2 hours.</li> <li>• Extended School Year Program supported students needing additional support in Reading and Math during the Summer Months</li> <li>• Librarian created a "Book Mobile" and drove to several low-income neighborhoods several times during the summer so students could check books out.</li> <li>• Librarian opened the school library once a week during the summer so students could check books out.</li> <li>• An annual community meeting was held to conduct data analysis and gather recommendations for Strategic Planning</li> </ul>
Math:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety Net Redesign Committee researched best practices and modified SN service delivery model. The new model included a double dose of math instruction for students in grades 4-6 with push-in and pullout support during the school day and a triple dose of support in an after school program.</li> <li>• Teachers implemented a Walk to Math model in some grade levels allowing students to be taught in flexible skills groups for a portion of Math instruction.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Math MSP support was offered after school 3 days a week for some students from Jan-May</li> <li>• A Jump Start Program was offered for incoming kindergarten ELL students which allowed them to have a two-week orientation to school prior to the arrival of other students where early math skills were taught among other things.</li> <li>• Homework support was offered for students living in Homeless Shelters and Transitional Housing complexes once a week for 2 hours.</li> <li>• Extended School Year Program supported students needing additional support in Reading and Math during the Summer Months.</li> <li>• Teachers used scientifically researched based materials to teach math</li> <li>• Math Night was held with over 500 people in attendance. Families played math games that could be replicated at home to support math development.</li> <li>• Progress monitoring data was analyzed on a regular basis to adjust instructional groups and to provide intervention for students not previously served.</li> <li>• The SN team met quarterly to reorganize SN groups based on student need</li> <li>• SN, ELL, SPED and Gen Ed teams met quarterly to engage in Progress Monitoring meetings to discuss specific student needs</li> <li>• 8 Week Parent Education program was offered to Spanish speaking parents to provide instruction on how to support their students math skill development among other things</li> <li>• An annual community meeting was held to conduct data analysis and gather recommendations for Strategic Planning</li> </ul>
Writing:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Curriculum and Instructional Materials Audit was conducted in the area of writing</li> <li>• It was determined that improvements in writing instruction and material were a particular area of need for staff. A professional development partnership began with the University of Washington Center for Educational Leadership (CEL). CEL provided a consultant that worked with the principal to facilitate building wide professional development for all teachers and an intensive program that supported a smaller group of staff. The goal of the intensive group was to build capacity with a strong group of teachers that were used as models and trainers for other staff. The intensive group received direct instruction, had an opportunity to implement that instruction in their classrooms with coaching and feedback and they designed writing units of study around specific genres called for in the Common Core State Standards. All in-class coaching was videotaped and archived on the Portal for PD use by all staff. Teachers had between 50-120 hours of writing PD depending on their role during the 2011-2012 school year.</li> <li>• Staff began the implementation of PLCs after participating in the PLC conference in August 2011. PLC work was focused on writing instruction and</li> </ul>

	<p>supported the CEL PD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 Staff Participated in the 90/90/90 Conference learning extensively about the common characteristics of high poverty, high performing schools. A particular emphasis at the conference was placed on writing instruction. The new learning was shared with the larger staff upon our return. The concept of <i>Writing For Learning</i> was of particular importance to our staff as we had previously been only studying <i>Learning to Write</i> or the Process Approach to Writing. As we learned, both forms of writing are critical for our students and were implemented after this conference.</li> <li>• Staff participated in book studies facilitated by the principal around Writers Workshop that were supported by SPU for credit and CEUs.</li> <li>• Staff collaborated with grade level teams from Redmond Elementary around writing instruction.</li> </ul>
Science:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff used district material to effectively teach science to all grade levels</li> <li>• Science Night was held with over 500 people in attendance. Families participated in hands on demonstrations and activities that could be replicated at home to support science knowledge development.</li> <li>• Nature Vision workshops were held in classrooms at all grade levels multiple times during the year.</li> </ul>

**Sub-Group Analysis**

<p>Which school-wide sub-group/s creates opportunities for celebration or cause for concern (e.g. Gender, Ethnicity, ELL, Special Education, SES)? Please provide examples and explanations.</p>
<p>Understanding that poverty is now considered a more complex barrier for students to overcome than even language difficulties, we are encouraged that our students that received free or reduced price lunches met AYP in the 2010-2011 school year and were very close to meeting AMOs in the 2011-2012 school year. However, this is also an area of continued concern for us given the vast challenges of this subgroup. This subgroup includes students living in homeless shelters, transitional housing, and other low-income housing with many social, emotional, environment, and physical challenges.</p> <p>We are also very encouraged to have met AMOs in the Limited English Subgroup, the Hispanic Subgroup, and the Special Education Subgroup. Despite having met AMOs in the Special Education Subgroup this year, our three year average performance for Special Education did not meet AMO requirements and for this reason we are considered an Emerging School.</p> <p>As part of the Emerging School process developed by the state, Einstein will participate in a thorough Needs Assessment conducted by a team from the Puget Sound ESD, we will received extensive data on the performance of this subgroup, and we will develop a State Action Plan to meet the needs of this population.</p>



**B. Perception Data Summary, Reflection, and Analysis**

Year	Goal Area #1 From- To Percentage	Goal Area #2 From – To Percentage
2012	100% of teachers will agree completely or mostly that they receive regular feedback.	95% of staff will agree completely or mostly that they will collaborate with one another to plan what will be taught.
2011	Teachers receive regular feedback on how they are doing” will increase from 59% to 100% of staff responding Agree Completely or Agree Mostly.	“The staff works in teams across grade levels to help increase student learning” will increase from 72% to 90% of staff responding Agree Completely or Agree Mostly.
2010	Increase the total number of staff who believes all students can learn complex concepts from last year’s 75% total to 90% this year as measured by the Staff Nine Characteristics Survey.	None

**Analysis of Perception Data**

Why were these goal areas selected? What actions were taken to achieve these goals?
<p>The perception goals related to feedback and collaboration were chosen based on Nine Characteristics Data results and due to district mandate.</p> <p>Action steps taken to provide regular feedback to staff included full implementation of district ICed protocols, conducting very thorough teacher evaluations, and participation by the principal in monthly grade level PLC meetings.</p> <p>Action steps take to support teacher collaboration included principal facilitated PD in the area of PLCs, PD from CEL, developing a schedule that allowed for common planning time, providing teachers with staff meeting and LEAP time to meet with their PLCs, and providing release time for PLC teams to meet.</p>

**Part 2: Goals for 2012-13:** Due to DSS by November 16, 2012

**Performance Goals – Statements (Current year’s work)**

“Class of”	Reading		Math		Science	Writing
	From:	To:	From:	To:	Baseline	Baseline
2020- 5 <sup>th</sup>	75	85	65	75	80	NA
2021 -4 <sup>th</sup>	73	75	65	68	NA	70
2022- 3 <sup>rd</sup>	NA	60	NA	60	NA	NA
2023-2 <sup>nd</sup>	71	75	NA	NA	NA	NA
2024- 1 <sup>st</sup>	53	65	NA	NA	NA	NA
2025- K	0	75*	NA	NA	NA	NA

**Challenge Goal:** This goal is to increase the percentage of students exceeding standard (from 3 to 4) on the MSP in grades 3, 4, and 5 in a particular content area.

Grades 3-5: Identify content area	From	To
4 <sup>th</sup> Writing	NA	30%
5 <sup>th</sup> Reading	31%	41%

**Perception Goals:**

Year	Goal Area #1 From/To Percentage	Goal Area #2 From/To Percentage
2012-2013	From 77% to 95% of staff will agree completely or mostly that staff members work together to solve problems related to school issues.	From 82% to 95% of staff will agree completely or mostly that the school uses a system to obtain a variety of perspectives when making decisions.

**Process Summary**

Highlight building-wide strategies to meet goals in reading, math, science and writing:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety Net Support will focus on K-2 literacy instruction during the school day and 3rd grade SN literacy support before school. Students with the greatest needs will be given grade level instruction with their General Ed teachers and a double dose of Literacy instruction with a SN teacher for 30 minutes to an hour depending on need. We will also continue to provide a new Kindergarten SN Reading program this year. Students will receive a double dose of math instruction for students in grades 4-5 after school.</li> <li>• Teachers will continue to implement a “Walk To” model for a portion of literacy and math instruction in most grade levels allowing students to be taught in flexible skills groups for a portion of literacy and math Instruction.</li> </ul>

- Teachers will continue to use scientifically researched based materials to teach reading, math, writing, and science
- The SN team will meet quarterly to reorganize SN groups based on student need
- SN, ELL, SPED and Gen Ed teams will meet quarterly to engage in Progress Monitoring meetings to discuss specific student needs
- Math MSP support will be offered after school 3 days a week for students from Jan-May
- 6 Literacy Events will be held at the Redmond Library where families are served dinner, participate in a read aloud, and take a book home to keep.
- A K-1 Literacy Make and Take Night will be held. Parents will learn Literacy based games and activities designed to develop their child's literacy skills. Families will also listen to a keynote speech on Literacy Development.
- A before-school ELL program for 4th-6th grade will be held allowing ELL students to get 200 additional minutes of instruction a week in English
- A Jump Start Program for incoming kindergarten ELL students will be held allowing them to have a two-week orientation to school prior to the arrival of other students where early Literacy and Math skills are taught among other things.
- Homework support will be offered for students living in Homeless Shelters and Transitional Housing complexes once a week for 2 hours.
- An Extended School Year Program will be provided allowing students needing additional support in Reading and Math during the Summer Months five weeks of instruction.
- The librarian will open the school library once a week during the summer so students can check books out.
- Math Night will be held. Families will play math games that can be replicated at home to support math development.
- Staff will continue with a professional development partnership with the University of Washington Center for Educational Leadership (CEL). CEL will provide a consultant that will work with the principal to facilitate building wide professional development for all teachers and an intensive program that will support a smaller group of staff. The goal of the intensive group is to build capacity with a strong group of teachers that will be used as models and trainers for other staff. The intensive group will receive direct instruction, will have an opportunity to implement skills they've learned from that instruction in their classrooms with coaching and feedback. They will also design writing units of study around specific genres called for in the Common Core State Standards. Teachers will have over 120 hours of writing PD during the 2012-2013 school year.
- We will continue the implementation of PLCs. PLC work will focus on writing instruction and will support the CEL PD.
- 5 Staff will participate in the 90/90/90 Conference learning extensively about the common characteristics of high poverty, high performing schools. Those teachers will share their learning with the larger staff upon our return.
- 6 Staff will participate in the Data Teams Training learning extensively about how to use data to inform instructional decisions. Those teachers will share their learning with the larger staff upon completion of the program and will serve as support for grade level teams in their implementation of Data Team work during PLC time.
- Staff will participate in book studies facilitated by the principal around Writers Workshop that

will be supported by SPU for credit and CEUs.

- Staff will collaborate with grade level teams from Redmond Elementary around writing instruction.
- Science Night will be held. Families will participate in hands on demonstrations and activities that can be replicated at home to support science knowledge development.
- Nature Vision workshops will be held in classrooms at all grade levels multiple times during the year.

Highlight use of technology to improve student learning:

- Teachers will continue to use all provided district technology tools including Activboards, Data Dashboard, online subscriptions for enVision math, etc. and will provide opportunities for students to access technology at each grade level.

Highlight steps to involve of staff, students, parents, families, and community:

- An annual community meeting will be held for parents and other community stakeholders for the purpose of providing an opportunity for stakeholders to analyze data analysis and provide recommendations for Strategic Planning
- Parents will also serve on our Action Planning Team for our Emerging Status.
- We will hold several very successful parent and community events with over 500 families in attendance at each event. Each event will include opportunities for parents to learn activities they can replicate at home to support student learning.
- An 8 Week Parent Education program will be offered to Spanish speaking parents to provide instruction on how to support their students' Literacy and Math development among other things
- An 8 week Positive Discipline program will be offered to Spanish and English speaking parents to provide instruction on how to best support their children's social and emotional health
- Our PTSA has added a position of Parent Liaison for the Spanish speaking community. This parent does outreach within the Spanish speaking community. The goal is to increase the number Latino parent volunteers and to increase Latino parent engagement.
- We have developed a Spanish speaker phone tree to communicate information about school events in Spanish to families.

Highlight process for progress monitoring, describing what assessments you will use throughout the year:

- Regular progress monitoring of DIBELS, Read Well Unit Assessment and enVision Math Assessment data will be analyzed on a regular basis to adjust instructional groups and to provide intervention for students not previously served.
- Spring CDSA, MSP, EOY DIBELS, and Report card data is analyzed by staff for the purpose of reflection and modification of instructional practice, to identify staff professional development needs and to determine appropriate student placement for the coming school year.
- As part of our Emerging Status Action Planning, a thorough External Needs Assessment will be conducted by an outside agency to determine professional development needs for staff and to determine programmatic changes that need to be made in order to better serve our students.
- Also as part of our Emerging Status Action Planning, staff will participate in an in-depth survey

of staff through the 9 Characteristics of High Performing Schools, Student and *School Success Principles* and the instructional model your district has chosen. Data will be analyzed and action steps will be taken based on that data. Action steps will be included in the Action Plan.

- The Center for Educational Effectiveness will also be providing Einstein with an analysis of our school's sub-group performance in relationship to sub-group performance in schools across this state. Data will be analyzed and action steps will be taken based on that data. Action steps will be included in the Action Plan.

#### Highlight strategies to address the PLC questions #3 and #4:

- Regular progress monitoring of DIBELS, Read Well Unit Assessment and enVision Math Assessment data will be analyzed on a regular basis to adjust instructional groups and to provide intervention for students not previously served and challenge for students that are ready.
- Focus on K-2 SN Literacy instruction during the school day and 3rd grade SN Literacy support before school. Students with the greatest needs will be given grade level instruction with their General Ed teachers and a double dose of Literacy instruction with a SN teacher for 30 minutes to an hour depending on need. We will also continue to provide a new Kindergarten SN Reading program this year. Students will receive a double dose of math instruction for students in grades 4-5 after school.
- Teachers will continue to implement a "Walk To" model for a portion of literacy and math instruction in most grade levels allowing students to be taught in flexible skills groups for a portion of literacy and math Instruction.
- Teachers will continue to use scientifically researched based materials to teach reading, math, writing, and science
- The SN team will meet quarterly to reorganize SN groups based on student need
- SN, ELL, SPED and Gen Ed teams will meet quarterly to engage in Progress Monitoring meetings to discuss specific student needs
- Math MSP support will be offered after school 3 days a week for students from Jan-May
- 6 Literacy Events will be held at the Redmond Library where families are served dinner, participate in a read aloud, and take a book home to keep.
- A K-1 Literacy Make and Take Night will be held. Parents will learn Literacy based games and activities designed to develop their child's literacy skills. Families will also listen to a Keynote speech on Literacy Development.
- A before-school ELL program for 4th-6th grade will be held allowing ELL students to get 200 additional minutes of instruction a week in English
- A Jump Start Program for incoming kindergarten ELL students will be held allowing them to have a two-week orientation to school prior to the arrival of other students where early Literacy and Math skills are taught among other things.
- Homework support will be offered for students living in Homeless Shelters and Transitional Housing complexes once a week for 2 hours.
- An Extended School Year Program will be provided allowing students needing additional support in Reading and Math during the Summer Months five weeks of instruction.
- The librarian will open the school library once a week during the summer so students can check books out.

- We will continue the implementation of PLCs. PLC work will focused on writing instruction and will support the CEL PD.
- 6 Staff will participate in the Data Teams Training learning extensively about how to use data to inform instructional decisions. Those teachers will share their learning with the larger staff.
- Grade level teams will continue dialog/collaboration with other teachers in the RLC to plan challenge projects for each topic in the area of math to provide opportunities for high level math students to apply their mathematical knowledge in new ways as a means to enrich their math experience.



**Continuous Improvement Process Plan  
Mann Elementary CIP 2012-2013**

**Purpose:** The Continuous Improvement Process (CIP) plan provides opportunity for the school staff to reflect and analyze results from the previous year's SMART goals. The process uses the Planning, Learning, Implementation and Evaluation (PLIE) model, a Cycle of Inquiry, to improve learning for all students.

**Part 1: 2011-2012 Reflection Goals:** Due to DSS by October 12, 2012

**A. Data Summary, Reflection, and Analysis:**

<b>Class of 2020- current 5<sup>th</sup> graders</b>			
<b>2011-2012 SMART Goals</b>			
<b>Reading</b>	<b>Math</b>	<b>Writing</b>	
<b>95</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>90</b>	

<b>Results:</b>							
<b>Year</b>	<b>Reading</b>		<b>Math</b>		<b>Science</b>	<b>Writing</b>	
	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exceeds Proficient</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exceeds Proficient</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exceeds Proficient</b>
2012-4 <sup>th</sup>	22.2	70.7	23.2	67.1	NA	37.8	51.2
2011-3 <sup>rd</sup>	26.3	69.7	32.9	55.3	NA	NA	

<b>Class of 2021- current 4<sup>th</sup> graders</b>			
<b>2011-2012 SMART Goals:</b>			
<b>Reading</b>	<b>Math</b>		
<b>90</b>	<b>85</b>		

<b>Results:</b>						
<b>Year</b>	<b>Reading</b>		<b>Math</b>		<b>Science</b>	<b>Writing</b>
	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exceeds Proficient</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exceeds Proficient</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>
2012-3 <sup>rd</sup>	36.5	55.8	34.6	51.9	NA	NA



Class of 2022- current 3 <sup>rd</sup> graders				
Year	EOY Reading DIBELS Benchmark	Math	Science	Writing
2012- 2 <sup>nd</sup>	88	NA	NA	NA
2011- 1 <sup>st</sup>	90.48	NA	NA	NA
2010- K	96.83	NA	NA	NA

Class of 2023- current 2 <sup>nd</sup> graders				
Year	EOY Reading DIBELS Benchmark	Math	Science	Writing
2012- 1 <sup>st</sup>	89	NA	NA	NA
2011- K	96	NA	NA	NA

Class of 2024- current 1 <sup>st</sup> graders				
Year	EOY Reading DIBELS Benchmark	Math	Science	Writing
2012- K	82	NA	NA	NA

### School-wide Analysis of Multiple Measures

Briefly explain school-wide systems used to improve student achievement in each of the following content areas:	
Reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Regular PLC meetings</b></li> <li>• <b>Accelerated Reader</b></li> <li>• <b>STAR Reading</b></li> <li>• <b>Non-fiction and functional reading emphasis</b></li> <li>• <b>Vocabulary development</b></li> <li>• <b>Vertical Articulation Meetings</b></li> <li>• <b>Collaboration</b></li> <li>• <b>Read Naturally</b></li> <li>• <b>Safety Net</b></li> <li>• <b>Small group instruction</b></li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Nightly reading for homework</b></li> <li>• <b>Just right reading time in class</b></li> <li>• <b>Partner reading, Teacher read alouds</b></li> <li>• <b>Differentiation</b></li> <li>• <b>Flexible Groups</b></li> </ul>
Math:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Regular PLC meetings</b></li> <li>• <b>IXL</b></li> <li>• <b>Timed multiplication tests, Math Facts in a Flash, Knighting Ceremonies in 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grades</b></li> <li>• <b>Problem solving templates</b></li> <li>• <b>Vertical Articulation Meetings</b></li> <li>• <b>Collaboration</b></li> <li>• <b>Differentiation</b></li> <li>• <b>Nightly math homework</b></li> <li>• <b>Small group instruction</b></li> </ul>
Writing:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Regular PLC meetings</b></li> <li>• <b>Summary essays</b></li> <li>• <b>Expository and narrative emphasis at 4<sup>th</sup> grade</b></li> <li>• <b>Organization templates</b></li> <li>• <b>6 trait writing process</b></li> <li>• <b>Units of Study</b></li> <li>• <b>Step up to Writing</b></li> <li>• <b>Writer's Workshop</b></li> <li>• <b>Using Mentor texts</b></li> <li>• <b>Journals</b></li> <li>• <b>Partner Shares</b></li> <li>• <b>Rubrics and checklists</b></li> </ul>
Science:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Regular PLC meetings</b></li> <li>• <b>Collaboration</b></li> <li>• <b>Differentiation</b></li> </ul>

### Sub-Group Analysis

Which school-wide sub-group/s creates opportunities for celebration or cause for concern (e.g. Gender, Ethnicity, ELL, Special Education, SES)? Please provide examples and explanations.
<p><b>4<sup>th</sup> grade:</b> Both boys and girls within reading and math, 2/3 of each sub group achieved a level 4.</p> <p>Reading: Boys 68.9% Girls 75% Math: Boys 71% Girls 63%</p> <p>Writing is an area of concern after reviewing the discrepancy between boy and girl achievement.</p> <p>Writing scores are a combination of narrative and expository essays.</p>

- Level 4: Boys 46% Girls 58%
- Level 3: Boys 40% Girls 36%
- Level 2: Boys 13% Girls 2%.
- These percentages reflect that 6 out of 45 boys scored at level 2 and 1 out of 36 girls scored at a level 2.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Grade:** 89% of students were at benchmark as reflected by the EOY Dibels scores.

Reading: Boys 91% at benchmark Girls 87% at benchmark

Reading is an area of concern based on BOY oral fluency assessment and a second grade placement test (comprehension/phonics).

**Special Education:**

3<sup>rd</sup> Grade:

1 student on an IEP. He passed Math, which was an IEP area for him. This was a big cause for celebration as he is a student with autism who has a lot of difficulty focusing and processing language-based math problems. He was 365 in Reading, which is a very difficult area for him and he continues to receive intensive services.

4<sup>th</sup> Grade:

4 students on IEPs: 3 passes in Reading, 2 passes in Math, 2 passes in Writing. One student who passed in the area of Reading receives services in that area, and she has made tremendous growth in that area. Again, a great cause for celebration! We will be re-evaluating her next month and assessing whether she needs to continue to receive services in this area.

5<sup>th</sup> grade:

7 students on IEPs: 3 passes in Reading, 0 passes in Math, 2 passes in Science. One student who passed in Reading had Reading as an IEP area. He passed with a borderline score of 400, and since he is moving to the middle school level, he will benefit from continued Special Education services to strengthen his skills.

6<sup>th</sup> grade:

5 students on IEPs: 2 passes in Reading, 2 passes in Math. One student who passed in Math has Math as an area of SDI. He is currently in the re-evaluation process to ascertain whether he needs continued services. One student who passed in Reading has SDI in Reading. She has made outstanding progress and may be re-evaluated at the middle school level if she continues to show confidence in the general ed. curriculum.

**B. Perception Data Summary, Reflection, and Analysis**

Year	Goal Area #1 From- To Percentage	Goal Area #2 From – To Percentage
2012	All teachers will participate in a professional learning Community and will plan together (from 93% to 100%), review student data together (from 93% to 100%), provide feedback to one another (from 86% to 100%) and work across grade levels together (from 83% to 100%) as measured by increasing the positive responses on the Nine Characteristics of Effective Schools Survey on item #s 26, 27 and 44.	All teachers will receive feedback on how they are doing from peers and administration from 93% to 100% as measured by increasing the positive responses on the Nine Characteristics of Effective Schools Survey on item # 37.
2011		
2010	The collaborative teams at Mann will meet on a regular basis to plan lessons, common assessments, and to reflect on student progress throughout the 2009-2010 school year as measured by meeting notes kept on OneNote, lesson plans and common assessments developed and implemented.	

**Analysis of Perception Data**

Why were these goal areas selected? What actions were taken to achieve these goals?
<p>Why were these goal areas selected?            These goals were selected based on the results of the Nine Characteristics of Effective Schools Survey given every spring. The results are analyzed by staff and we use our Decision Making Model to come up with the final goal.</p> <p>What actions were taken to Achieve these goals?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We send a team of teachers to the PLC Summit every year</li> <li>• We have set aside regular time to work together as PLCs</li> <li>• We have begun having Vertical Articulation meetings where one grade level will meet with the grade level above or below them to discuss curriculum and/or student articulation.</li> <li>• Some staff members have begun observing one another.</li> <li>• Administrative observations occur on a random and scheduled basis. Feedback is offered via formal and informal conversations, e-mails and through evaluations.</li> <li>• Common assessments are being used at each grade level in most content areas.</li> <li>• Data and anecdotal notes are kept on a OneNote filing system.</li> </ul>

**Part 2: Goals for 2012-13:** Due to DSS by November 16, 2012

**Performance Goals – Statements (Current year’s work)**

“Class of”	Reading		Math		Science	Writing
	From:	To:	From:	To:	Baseline	Baseline
2020- 5 <sup>th</sup>	90.1	94	89	92	From: 91.6 To: 92	NA
2021 -4 <sup>th</sup>	93.8	95	91.4	93	NA	From: 90.1 To: 92
2022- 3 <sup>rd</sup>	NA	93	NA	88	NA	NA
2023-2 <sup>nd</sup>	89	90	NA	NA	NA	NA
2024- 1 <sup>st</sup>	85	85	NA	NA	NA	NA
2025- K	85	85	NA	NA	NA	NA

**Challenge Goal:** This goal is to increase the percentage of students exceeding standard (from 3 to 4) on the MSP in grades 3, 4, and 5 in a particular content area.

Grades 3-5: Identify content area	From	To
5 <sup>th</sup> : Math	67	75
4 <sup>th</sup> : Writing	51.9	60
3 <sup>rd</sup> : Math	51.9	60

**Perception Goals:**

Year	Goal Area #1 From/To Percentage	Goal Area #2 From/To Percentage
2012-2013	<p>All teachers will participate in a professional learning community and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work across grade levels (question #26) from 88%</li> <li>• Plan together (question #27) from 100%</li> </ul> <p>to 100% as measured by increasing or maintaining responses on the 2013 Nine Characteristics of Effective School Survey</p>	<p>All teachers will participate in a professional learning community and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Express ideas and opinions with one another to work toward consensus (question #59) from 96%</li> </ul> <p>to 100% as measured by increasing or maintaining responses on the 2013 Nine Characteristics of Effective School Survey.</p>

## Process Summary

### Highlight building-wide strategies to meet goals in reading, math, science and writing:

#### Reading:

- PLC evaluation of common assessments and student learning
- Novel studies for choice books
- Focus on reading strategies
- AR goal setting
- Combination of fiction and nonfiction instruction
- Functional reading instruction.

#### Math:

- PLC evaluation of common assessments and student learning
- CDSAs
- Pose the problem flip charts
- IXL
- enVision enrichment
- Math games
- Timed tests
- Math Facts in a Flash
- Math Fair

#### Science:

- PLC evaluation of common assessments and student learning
- Scientific Investigation Format Practice
- Authentic Work/Outdoor learning, Application
- CDSAs

#### Writing:

- PLC evaluation of common assessments and student learning
- CDSAs
- Units of Study
- Step Up to Writing
- 6 Traits
- Conventions emphasized in student writing
- Inventive spelling at primary grades
- Emphasis on narrative (small moments, recounts), friendly letters, and summaries in grade 2

### Highlight use of technology to improve student learning:

- Netbook use for power point, research projects and flip chart preparation
- Voting egg flip charts for practice tests and reading comprehension
- Web-based programs like IXL and AR
- Word processing for editing essays
- Beginning keyboarding using Type to Learn 4
- Basic PowerPoint

Highlight steps to involve of staff, students, parents, families, and community:

- Parent volunteers for tutoring
- Lesson assistance
- Nature Vision & King County lessons
- City of Redmond support for outdoor learning
- Web based programs such as IXL and Renaissance Place allowed students home access as well as their parents.
- Skyward's online report card
- Goal setting conferences with students leading the conference to explain reading, writing, and math goals to their parents.
- Regular classroom newsletters and/or conversation starters
- Math Fair
- Regular newsletters from teachers and weekly school-wide
- Student recognition program

Highlight process for progress monitoring, describing what assessments you will use throughout the year:

**5<sup>th</sup> grade team:**

- Assessments for all core subjects
- Scheduled timelines for delivery & grading to share at PLC meetings throughout the year.
- MSP

**4<sup>th</sup> grade team:**

- Writing CDSA's: fall, winter, and spring
- Envision math (formative and summative assessments).
- Science CDSA's
- Common assessments
- MSP

**3<sup>rd</sup> grade team:**

- Conferring with students about work
- CDSAs for science, math, writing
- Running records in reading
- Quick checks in math

**2<sup>nd</sup> grade team:**

- Writing CDSA's: fall, winter, and spring
- Envision math (formative and summative assessments).
- Science CDSA's
- Teacher created common assessments.
- DIBELS and progress monitor students at risk

**1<sup>st</sup> grade team:**

- Reading Scott Foresman Assessments in Oral Fluency, Comprehension, Phonics, & Phonemic Awareness / Read Well Oral Fluency
- Teacher created common assessments in Reading and Writing

- DIBELS and progress monitoring for students at risk
- Writing CDSA's: fall, winter, and spring
- Envision math (formative and summative assessments)
- Math CDSA's
- Science CDSA's
- Social Studies CDSA and TCI End of Unit Tests

**K grade team:**

- Writing CDSA's: fall, winter, and spring
- Envision math (formative and summative assessments).
- Science CDSA's
- Teacher created common assessments such as Tri Fold Assessment
- DIBELS and progress monitor students at risk

Highlight strategies to address the PLC questions #3 and #4:

**5<sup>th</sup> Grade:**

- Implement 5<sup>th</sup> grade math differentiation chart developed last year.
- Brainstorm ideas for differentiation in science and reading approaches if needed this year.

**4<sup>th</sup> Grade:**

- Question 3. When students do not understand concepts, strategies that are used include: small group instruction, re-teaching, individual instruction, adapted assignments, frequent check-ins.
- Question 4. When students already understand a concept, strategies include: provided enrichment and extension, and opportunities for extended learning (application).

**3<sup>rd</sup> Grade:**

- Flexible groups in math and reading
- Address individual needs with reteaching and enrichment

**2<sup>nd</sup> Grade:**

- Question 3. When students do not understand concepts, strategies that are used include: small group instruction, re-teaching, individual instruction, adapted assignments, and frequent check-ins.
- Question 4. When students already understand a concept, strategies include: provided enrichment and extension, and opportunities for extended learning.

**1<sup>st</sup> Grade:**

- Question 3: Meet as a grade level team to plan or discuss reading lessons and common assessments together. Discuss and compare student assessment results. Identify students who may need more support. Implement interventions: Safety Net, parent volunteers, and high school helpers, one on one help and small groups, remediation activities.
- Question 4: Focusing on reading the higher group will be challenged with 2nd grade Read Well and Accelerated Reader, and Read Naturally. In math we have enrichment homework that goes home every night, IXL, and math games.



**Kindergarten:**

- Question 3. When students do not understand concepts, strategies that are used include: small group instruction, re-teaching, individual instruction, adapted assignments, and frequent check-ins.
- Question 4. When students already understand a concept, strategies include: provided enrichment and extension, and opportunities for extended learning.



## Continuous Improvement Process Plan Redmond Elementary CIP 2012-2013

Purpose: The Continuous Improvement Process (CIP) plan provides opportunity for the school staff to reflect and analyze results from the previous year's SMART goals. The process uses the Planning, Learning, Implementation and Evaluation (PLIE) model, a Cycle of Inquiry, to improve learning for all students.

### Part 1: 2011-2012 Reflection Goals:

Data Summary, Reflection, and Analysis:

#### Class of 2020- current 5<sup>th</sup> graders

2011-2012 SMART Goals		
Reading	Math	Writing
85%	64%	80%

Results:							
Year	Reading		Math		Science	Writing	
	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	NA	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient
2012-4 <sup>th</sup>	20%	49.1%	23.2%	48.2%	NA	29.1%	30.9%
2011-3 <sup>rd</sup>	23.2%	57.1%	19.6%	33.9%	NA	NA	

#### Class of 2021- current 4<sup>th</sup> graders

2011-2012 SMART Goals:	
Reading	Math
75%	75%

Results:						
Year	Reading		Math		Science	Writing
	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	NA	NA
2012-3 <sup>rd</sup>	28.9%	46.75	24.4%	51.1%	NA	NA

**Class of 2022- current 3<sup>rd</sup> graders**

Year	EOY Reading DIBELS Benchmark	Math	Science	Writing
2012- 2 <sup>nd</sup>	80%	NA	NA	NA
2011- 1 <sup>st</sup>	86%	NA	NA	NA
2010- K	76%	NA	NA	NA

**Class of 2023- current 2<sup>nd</sup> graders**

Year	EOY Reading DIBELS Benchmark	Math	Science	Writing
2012- 1 <sup>st</sup>	81%	NA	NA	NA
2011- K	87%	NA	NA	NA

**Class of 2024- current 1<sup>st</sup> graders**

Year	EOY Reading DIBELS Benchmark	Math	Science	Writing
2012- K	74%	NA	NA	NA

While attentive to all academic subjects, our continued focus was in the area of math. The Safety Net teachers provided support to Level 1 and 2 students before school in carefully planned individualized sessions emphasizing pre and post teaching of classroom instruction. During the school day, both pull-out and push-in classroom models were used K-6, with progress monitoring to measure student progress. Summative and formative assessments and trend data was analyzed throughout the year to make adjustments to programs to meet the areas of student weaknesses. The entire staff collaborated on student instructional strategies, programs, and professional development. Students also attended extended day classes for homework support, parents conferred with Safety Net teachers regarding their students, and parent education sessions in mathematics were held for students and parents to learn math concepts and computation strategies. This focus in our math program, instruction, and support were reflected in the 2012 MSP scores.

MSP results reflected overall school performance is above that of the state in the majority of categories. Examination of the scores for the same cohort group show increases from the prior year for all grades in all areas of assessment with the exception of 4<sup>th</sup> grade reading. This may be due to the decrease in reading support for Level 1 and 2 students by Safety Net teachers who spent greater time in the area of math. Trend data comparisons of different groups of students reflect a dramatic increase in math scores from 1-22% from the previous years to 71-77%. There was an 11% increase in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade science scores over the past year. There were some minor decreases across the grades 3 and 4 and increases in grades 5 and 6. Writing showed a decrease over the past year by 10%. This is a comparison of two different groups of students; however the implementation of a new writing curriculum and instructional strategies that took a period of time for use with fidelity may have affected the outcome.

### School-wide Analysis of Multiple Measures

Briefly explain school-wide systems used to improve student achievement in each of the following content areas:	
Reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Double dipping by Safety Net teachers</li> <li>• Cross-grade level group instruction</li> <li>• Flexible groupings – reviewed weekly and modified based on student achievement data</li> <li>• Progress Monitoring of level 1 &amp; 2 students every 2<sup>nd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> week</li> <li>• Collaboration of Safety Net, Special Education, ELL and Gen Ed staff regarding instruction/progress of students</li> <li>• Grade 4-5 Lunchtime homework support</li> <li>• After school homework clubs grades K-6</li> <li>• Collaboration with Boys and Girls Club extended day program homework session</li> <li>• Hawks Can Read: Grades K-1 with Grades 5-6 student pairings</li> <li>• Community volunteers work 1-1 with students using <i>Read Naturally</i> program</li> <li>• Reading With Rover Program</li> <li>• Once a month Donuts for Dad, Muffins for Mom Read to child event in library</li> </ul>
Math:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Before school Safety Net Math Program --- pre-teaching, re-teaching classroom enVision lessons and IXL for level 1 &amp; 2 students</li> <li>• Community volunteers support classroom lessons in Grade 1</li> <li>• Push-in /pull-out Safety Net support in Grades 2-6</li> <li>• Use of MDIS curriculum in Grades 3-6</li> <li>• Grade 3-6 Flexible groupings- reviewed weekly and modified based on student achievement data</li> <li>• Safety Net Parent/Child Math Workshops: 2 evenings: K-2 and Grades 3-6</li> <li>• Monthly Math Challenge: Grades K-6</li> <li>• PTSA Mathmagical Program</li> <li>• After school Math Clubs: Grades K-6</li> </ul>

Writing:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Writer’s Workshop Center for Education Leadership Classroom embedded professional development for classroom, sped, Safety Net, and staff</li> <li>• Focus on consistent use of best teaching practices and units across grade levels</li> <li>• Teacher collaboration in the designing of writing of units of study</li> <li>• Grade level collegial scoring of CDSA’s</li> </ul>
Science:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data analysis of previous MSP year strand data and adjustments in instructional strategies in teaching science units based on assessment data</li> <li>• PTSA sponsored Science Night</li> </ul>

### Sub-Group Analysis

Which school-wide sub-group/s creates opportunities for celebration or cause for concern (e.g. Gender, Ethnicity, ELL, Special Education, SES)? Please provide examples and explanations.
<p><b><u>Celebrations:</u></b></p> <p>Academic Achievement Awards – Grades K-6  Public Display of Student Quality Work – Rotating weekly classroom displays  Increased MSP math scores 3-6: These are “same cohort” scores.  3<sup>rd</sup> Grade: 76%  4<sup>th</sup> Grade: 53.6%-71.4%  5<sup>th</sup> Grade: 53.3%-74.1%  6<sup>th</sup> Grade: 52.3%-77%</p> <p><b>Class of 2019 in area of math:</b> 53.3% in 2011 – 74.1% in 2012:  4 Level 1 students moved to Level 3  7 Level 1 students moved to Level 2  4 Level 2 students moved to Level 3  5 Level 3 students moved to Level 4  Increase in same cohort MSP scores in reading for Class of 2019 (5<sup>th</sup> grade)  Writing celebrations in classrooms and across grade levels at completion of units of study</p> <p><b><u>Causes of concern:</u></b></p> <p>Decrease in MSP 2012 writing scores at 4<sup>th</sup> grade.  Decrease in MSP 2012 reading scores at 3<sup>th</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> grades.  Mobility – Number of Level 1 and 2 students that are new to the school  (2012-13: 35% of 1<sup>st</sup> grade students are new to the school;  50% of Safety Net qualified students in 1<sup>st</sup> grade are new to school; 30% in 2<sup>nd</sup> grade are new to the school.)  Kindergarten enrolled students without early childhood learning experiences  McKinney-Veto Act students (2012 fall: 8)  Parental issues: poverty, illiteracy, ELL</p>

### Perception Data Summary, Reflection, and Analysis

Year	Goal Area #1 From- To Percentage	Goal Area #2 From – To Percentage
2012	#29) Staff members <i>trust</i> one another as demonstrated by an increase in the percentage of staff that agrees mostly and completely from 74% to 85%. We made a gain from 58% to 74% this past year with focus on collaboration, conversations, and trust-building activities.	# 44) Staff <i>provide feedback</i> to each other to help <i>improve instructional practices</i> as demonstrated by an increase in staff that agree mostly and completely from 70% to 82%. The prior year was a gain from 64% to 70% in this category. Increased scores are based on collaboration focus and work with CEL in classroom embedded professional development.
2011	#29) All school personnel build trust with one another. Move the 35% in the Agree Slightly category to the 58% in the Agree Mostly and Agree Completely categories.	#16) Receive <i>support and training</i> for behavior and academic challenges for low performing students. Increase from 73% to 80% in the Agree Mostly and Agree Completely categories.
2010	SMART Goal: By June 2011 we will increase the percentage of staff who believes that teachers provide feedback to each other to help improve instructional practice from 69% to 80% that agree mostly and completely combined.	

### Analysis of Perception Data

Why were these goal areas selected? What actions were taken to achieve these goals?
<p>The OSPI Nine Characteristics Survey was given to all staff in the Spring of 2012. This Fall a collaborative team consisting of teachers evaluated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The results of 2012 CIP goals indicate the need to continue to build/define trust among staff (74% agree mostly/completely), celebrate completion of the support and training goal (over 90% agree mostly/completely), and continue to work on using teacher feedback to improve instructional practices (70% agree mostly/completely)</li> <li>• Priorities for the coming year</li> <li>• Strategies to improve trust among staff-teambuilding activities, defining trust</li> <li>• Strategies to improve the frequency and use feedback to inform instruction-build in informal opportunities to observe fellow teachers and other staff</li> </ul>

**Part 2: Goals for 2012-13:** Due to DSS by November 16, 2012

**A. Performance Goals – Statements (Current year’s work) These are cohort scores comparing same groups of students from one year to next.**

“Class of”	Reading		Math		Science	Writing
	From:	To:	From:	To:	Baseline	Baseline
2020- 5 <sup>th</sup>	69.1%	71%	71.4%	74%	70%	NA
2021 -4 <sup>th</sup>	76%	82%	76%	80%	NA	
2022- 3 <sup>rd</sup>	NA	78%	NA	78%	NA	NA
2023-2 <sup>nd</sup>	79%	88%	NA	NA	NA	NA
2024- 1 <sup>st</sup>	54%	80%	NA	NA	NA	NA
2025- K	78%	80%	NA	NA	NA	NA

**Challenge Goal:**

This goal is to increase the percentage of students exceeding standard on the MSP in grades 3, 4, and 5 in a particular content area.

Grades 3-5: Identify content area	From	To
What is a challenge for your grade level: 3 <sup>rd</sup> - 51% of third graders will achieve a Level 4 in math.	<b>NA</b>	<b>51%</b>
4 <sup>th</sup> - Move the number of Level 4 Math students	<b>51%</b>	<b>55%</b>
5 <sup>th</sup> - Move number of Level 4 Science students	<b>56%</b>	<b>66%</b>

**Perception Goals: This is already completed but needs to be copied in here.**

Year	Goal Area #1 From/To Percentage	Goal Area #2 From/To Percentage
2012-2013	#29) Staff members <i>trust</i> one another as demonstrated by an increase in the percentage of staff that agrees mostly and completely from 74% to 85%.	# 44) Staff <i>provide feedback</i> to each other to help <i>improve instructional practices</i> as demonstrated by an increase in staff that agree mostly and completely from 70% to 82%.



## Process Summary

Highlight building-wide strategies to meet goals in reading, math, science and writing:

### School-wide:

**Reading:** Flexible grouping with Safety Net support; Reading Workshop with individualized text and conferring; students receiving cross-grade-level Safety Net support; state-assessment-based problem solving and MSP practice.

**Math:** Emphasis on problem solving; flexible groups; Safety Net push-in and pull-out support; state-assessment-based problem solving and MSP practice weekly; nightly homework with fact practice.

**Writing:** Writing workshop using CEL partnership resources, materials, process format

### Grade level:

Kgtn. Reading – small flexible reading groups, ReadWell: small group & whole class, Early Reading Intervention, Headsprout

Kgtn. Writing – writers workshop, CEL teaching strategies, collaboration with teammates,

Kgtn. Math – Envision, volunteers, SN support, supplemental manipulative practice

Kgtn. Science - Foss Science Kits, non-fiction read-alouds/discussions

1<sup>st</sup> grade: Reading - nonfiction reading through Scholastic News/map skills, Oral mentor texts/read-alouds, Hawks can read buddy reading w/ 4<sup>th</sup> grade mentors, Flexible reading groups, Volunteer tutoring

1<sup>st</sup> grade: Writing - Weekly spelling test, Penmanship and SpellWell phonics program, Procedural Science journal writing

1<sup>st</sup> grade: Math - Practice and enrichment homework, Enrichment class lessons, Xtra Math website

2<sup>nd</sup> grade: Reading – flexible reading groups with SN support, AR comprehension data, Read Naturally, volunteers,

2<sup>nd</sup> grade: Math – Envision, in-class coaching with timely feedback, SN support and volunteers

2<sup>nd</sup> grade: Writing – writers workshop, CEL teaching strategies, monthly units of study, science lab reports

3<sup>rd</sup> grade: Reading – Reader’s workshop model, Lucy Calkins Reading Workshop aligned with the common core, SN support with small groups, Words Their Way phonics work at developmental levels, MSP practice with released items

3<sup>rd</sup> grade: Math – Envision, SN support with small group and in class, Envision computer games, specific skill homework

3<sup>rd</sup> grade: Writing – focused writing time, CEL strategies, graphic organizers,

4<sup>th</sup> grade: Math – Use Envisions work created at October LEAP workshop with high achievers. Use Math 4 Today

4<sup>th</sup> grade: Writing – CEL and Writer’s Workshop

4<sup>th</sup> grade: Reading- Reading Workshop  
Comprehension Toolkit

5<sup>th</sup> grade: Math – Use Sunshine Math, Think Tank, the enrichment work we created at the Oct. LEAP, put advanced students on the computer for Envision units, work with 5/6 Quest teacher;

5<sup>th</sup> grade Writing - CEL, Reading, Science

5<sup>th</sup> grade Science - look at previous year's MSP data by strand and breaking up areas that need work. Do more systems work. Use release items (MSP/WASL) to give students extra practice

5<sup>th</sup> grade Reading - S. Harvey Comprehension Tool Kit

Highlight use of technology to improve student learning:

- Math: Online EnVision flip charts, games, and other materials; MSP practice in the Spring, IXL online math practice before school program
- Reading: A.R. quizzes on netbooks; MSP practice in the Spring
- Writing: Word-processing as a publishing tool; research for informational writing Unit of Study

Highlight steps to involve of staff, students, parents, families, and community:

- Programs within school and with the larger community:
- Partnerships with CEL-UW in the area of writing and the UW Department of Education Second Steps Study, Roots of Empathy program supported by the ESD, Safety Net support (both push-in and pull-out) for reading and math; ELL support for second language learners; Youth Eastside Services, community tutors through PTSA, Lunch Buddy Program, Redmond High School, and LINKS. Other collaborations include our Neighborhood Schoolhouse sponsored extended day classes and student/family/parent activities.

Highlight process for progress monitoring, describing what assessments you will use throughout the year:

Safety Net teachers will Progress Monitor students who scored intensive on the DIBELS every two weeks and strategic students every four weeks. Other assessments include Read Well weekly reading group assessments, daily math checks, and Read Naturally readings/timings for 2<sup>nd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> graders who need the most help with fluency. Second Step study data is collected by UW. Student performance data is studied by classroom teachers and specialists.

Highlight strategies to address the PLC questions #3 and #4:

- Question 3: Student progress is consistently monitored, followed by changes in reading or math small groups to meet student academic needs. This includes pre-teaching and re-teaching strategies, additional instructional time, collaboration with classroom teachers and specialists.
- Question 4: When students have mastered skills, enrichment opportunities are used. We use level 4 math lessons such as those created by the Redmond Learning Community, Readers and Writers Workshop, and teacher-designed extensions to curriculum.



**Continuous Improvement Process Plan  
Rockwell Elementary CIP 2012-2013**

**Purpose:** The Continuous Improvement Process (CIP) plan provides opportunity for the school staff to reflect and analyze results from the previous year's SMART goals. The process uses the Planning, Learning, Implementation and Evaluation (PLIE) model, a Cycle of Inquiry, to improve learning for all students.

**Part 1: 2011-2012 Reflection Goals:** Due to DSS by October 12, 2012

**A. Data Summary, Reflection, and Analysis:**

<b>Class of 2020- current 5<sup>th</sup> graders</b>			
<b>2011-2012 SMART Goals</b>			
<b>Reading</b>	<b>Math</b>	<b>Writing</b>	
<b>85% to 90% at or above standard</b>	<b>85% to 90% at or above standard</b>	<b>75% to 88% at or above standard</b>	

<b>Results:</b>							
<b>Year</b>	<b>Reading</b>		<b>Math</b>		<b>Science</b>	<b>Writing</b>	
	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exceeds Proficient</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exceeds Proficient</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exceeds Proficient</b>
2012-4 <sup>th</sup>	34	51.75	23.25	66.5	NA	33.25	53.75
2011-3 <sup>rd</sup>	28.5	68.75	31.75	49	NA	NA	

<b>Class of 2021- current 4<sup>th</sup> graders</b>		
<b>2011-2012 SMART Goals:</b>		
<b>Reading</b>	<b>Math</b>	
<b>73% to 90% at or above standard</b>	<b>75% to 88% at or above standard</b>	

<b>Results:</b>						
<b>Year</b>	<b>Reading</b>		<b>Math</b>		<b>Science</b>	<b>Writing</b>
	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exceeds Proficient</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exceeds Proficient</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>
2012-3 <sup>rd</sup>	27%	74%	29%	69%	NA	NA

<b>Class of 2022- current 3<sup>rd</sup> graders</b>				
Year	EOY Reading DIBELS Benchmark	Math	Science	Writing
2012- 2 <sup>nd</sup>	92%	NA	NA	NA
2011- 1 <sup>st</sup>	94%	NA	NA	NA
2010- K	90%	NA	NA	NA

<b>Class of 2023- current 2<sup>nd</sup> graders</b>				
Year	EOY Reading DIBELS Benchmark	Math	Science	Writing
2012- 1 <sup>st</sup>	91%	NA	NA	NA
2011- K	86%	NA	NA	NA

<b>Class of 2024- current 1<sup>st</sup> graders</b>				
Year	EOY Reading DIBELS Benchmark	Math	Science	Writing
2012- K	90%	NA	NA	NA

### **School-wide Analysis of Multiple Measures**

Briefly explain school-wide systems used to improve student achievement in each of the following content areas:	
Reading:	<b>ELL Support, Safety Net, Special Education, Reader's and Writer's Workshop, Leveled Books, 1:1 Support, Teacher Peer Observation, Use of Activboard Technology and netbooks</b>
Math:	<b>ELL Support, Safety Net, Special Education, Parent Volunteers, Differentiated Instruction, School-wide CIP goals targeting problem solving in pictures, numbers, and words; Teacher Peer Observation, Use of ActivBoard Technology and</b>

	<b>netbooks, IXL Math</b>
Writing:	<b>ELL Support, Special Education, Use of ActivBoard Technology and netbooks</b>
Science:	<b>ELL, Science Van, use of ActivBoard Technology and netbooks</b>

### Sub-Group Analysis

Which school-wide sub-group/s creates opportunities for celebration or cause for concern (e.g. Gender, Ethnicity, ELL, Special Education, SES)? Please provide examples and explanations.
Rockwell has many causes for celebration in terms of the success of our students on the MSP. Students in every racial and gender sub-group identified met or exceeded proficiency goals: 89.7% of students met or exceeded standard in Reading, and 89.5% of all students met or exceeded standard in Math. Our low-income population also posted high achievement levels, with 80.8% at or above standard in Reading, and 77.8% at or above standard in Math. The only identified sub-group who did not meet their target was our students in Special Education, where 40% of students met or exceeded standard in Math and Reading. We will continue to provide rigorous, individually designed instruction for these students in an effort to close that achievement gap.

### B. Perception Data Summary, Reflection, and Analysis

Year	Goal Area #1 From- To Percentage	Goal Area #2 From – To Percentage
2012	Q42 Teachers receive regular feedback on how they are doing 72% to 80%	Q26 The staff works in teams across grade levels to help increase student learning 75% to 80%
2011	Q42 Teachers receive regular feedback on how they are doing	Q15(?) All students are consistently challenged by rigorous curriculum
2010	Not available	Not Available

### Analysis of Perception Data

Why were these goal areas selected? What actions were taken to achieve these goals?
The entire Redmond Learning Community selected perception goals in the area of providing feedback to teachers as it became apparent that teachers required regular feedback to continually improve their practice. All principals in the Redmond Learning Community worked together to support one another in improving in this goal area, and as sufficient improvement was not evident on the perception goals survey after one year, this goal was continued into a second year. Last year was my first year at Rockwell, and I worked with teachers to identify exactly what constituted “regular feedback” – discussing options including written notes, emails, or face to face conversations. We also discussed frequency. I then visited classrooms

regularly for 15 to thirty minutes, gathering observations and notes and leaving teachers a note or an email noting observations and questions.

Last year, we also selected question 26 as an area of focus, as teachers felt that while they were able to function well as professional learning communities within their grade levels, they wanted to be able to align practices with teacher peers in other grade levels. We identified interests as a whole group – for example, literacy needs and instruction K-5, or differentiation in math – and invited teachers to observe their peers in action, debriefing and using these observations as tools for self-reflection. Additionally, teachers met with the teachers from the grade levels preceding and following them to identify the most critical skills students needed to succeed at each grade level. Teachers then used this information and the assessment data on their current students to target instruction and interventions as needed.

**Part 2: Goals for 2012-13:** Due to DSS by November 16, 2012

**Performance Goals – Statements (Current year’s work)**

“Class of”	Reading		Math		Science	Writing
	From:	To:	From:	To:	Baseline	Baseline
2020- 5 <sup>th</sup>	90%	92%	91%	93%	85%	NA
2021 -4 <sup>th</sup>	92%	94%	89%	92%	NA	88%
2022- 3 <sup>rd</sup>	NA	80%	NA	87%	NA	NA
2023-2 <sup>nd</sup>	88%	93%	NA	NA	NA	NA
2024- 1 <sup>st</sup>	89%	93%	NA	NA	NA	NA
2025- K	86%	94%	NA	NA	NA	NA

**Challenge Goal:** This goal is to increase the percentage of students exceeding standard (from 3 to 4) on the MSP in grades 3, 4, and 5 in a particular content area.

Grades 3-5: Identify content area	From	To
2012 MSP Data: Math	65.8%	70%

**Perception Goals:**

Year	Goal Area #1 From/To Percentage	Goal Area #2 From/To Percentage
2012-2013	Q47 – Staff Members get help in the areas they need to improve. From 64.7% to 80%	Q56 – Students respect those who are different from them. From 82.36% to 90%

## Process Summary

### Highlight building-wide strategies to meet goals in reading, math, science and writing:

- 1:1 instruction – At times we identify students in need of individual instructional support. We target specific gaps or misunderstandings in order to help these students access the general curriculum. This is used in all core content areas (Reading, Writing, Math, and Science).
- Targeted small group instruction – In Math, Reading, and Writing, teachers use formative assessment data to determine students' levels of performance, and then group students according to need. Groups are fluid and respond to the changing strengths and needs of the students.
- Differentiated instruction/practice – Using our knowledge about students' different learning styles and needs, students have the opportunity to access their curriculum and present their learning in diverse ways: through use of technology, individual practice on netbooks, and through remediation or transfer of learning activities as appropriate. This is done in all core content areas.
- Integrated themes and lessons – Where possible and appropriate, student learning crosses multiple content areas: for example, researching, writing and presenting on the life cycle of the moth, or gathering data and writing about weather observations. The learning students are doing in each content area supports learning from other disciplines.
- Safety Net – Students who do not meet proficiency standards on the MSP or on the DIBELS reading assessment are eligible for targeted support and instruction in the areas of Math and Reading.
- Special Education – Students with identified learning disabilities or other qualifying needs receive specially designed instruction in their areas of need, including Reading (decoding and comprehension), Writing, Mathematics (Calculation and Reasoning) and other qualifying area.
- ELL support – Qualifying students receive instruction and support using the district adopted curriculum to support skill and strategy development
- Conferencing – Teachers use student work to guide short conferences and provide individual support in students' individual areas of focus. These are used in Reading, Writing, and Math.

### Highlight use of technology to improve student learning:

- Online curriculum (enVision) – Our district adopted math curriculum includes an online portion that is used across grade levels.
- IXL – Supported by a grant from our PTA, students receive extra practice in Math facts and skills practice at their individual levels.
- FOSS Web – FOSS Science kits are supported by an online site that includes resources and extra activities.
- MS Office Programs – Students are instructed and begin to use, as early as kindergarten, in programs such as PowerPoint, Word, and Excel spreadsheets.
- Activboard flipcharts – In all grade levels and subjects, teachers create and use interactive flipcharts to engage and instruct students in all content areas.



- Use of netbooks – students in all grade levels use netbooks daily to access online curriculum, word process, and remediate and reinforce classroom instruction.
- Starfall – Primary grades use Starfall, a web application, to reinforce reading concepts.

Highlight steps to involve of staff, students, parents, families, and community:

- HAIKU – many staff are enrolling in additional training in HAIKU to maintain an interactive classroom website.
- Online curriculum – FOSS Web, EnVision, and many other district adopted curricula maintain web applications used in instruction and assessment.
- IXL – IXL is an additional, PTA funded math application for students, accessible from home.
- [www.mathinaction.org](http://www.mathinaction.org) is another PTA funded math enrichment program that allows students to enrich their math learning from home.
- Progress reports are shared with parents regularly, highlighting strengths and challenges for each student.
- Skyward is an easy online management tool that allows parents to track students’ work completion and achievement.
- Parent volunteers are present in our classrooms every day as literacy volunteers, art docents, and otherwise supporting instruction.
- Email and parent newsletters, and the Beagle Bugle regularly keep parents informed and engaged in school activities.
- PTA General Membership Meetings – School and PTA have been working together to increase attendance at PTA general membership meetings, including “all-calling” and providing incentives to attend.

Highlight process for progress monitoring, describing what assessments you will use throughout the year:

- CDSAs – Common District Summative Assessment provide progress monitoring at key checkpoints throughout the year.
- DIBELS Next – Administered three times a year in grades K-2 provides specific information regarding students’ reading performance. This also drives eligibility for Safety Net services.
- Formative assessments – Grade level teams are working to develop and administer formative assessments throughout the year, gauging students’ progress of essential understandings to shape further instruction.
- Topic/Chapter tests – District adopted curriculum provide embedded assessments, such as the math “quick checks” which determine instructional paths from that point on.

Highlight strategies to address the PLC questions #3 and #4:

- Differentiation of assignments – Many learning activities offer choices for students; these choices allow them to access their learning in the way they are most likely to be successful. Key learnings are identified but the delivery and assessment methods differ depending on students’ needs.
- Development of Level 4/Transfer of Learning Math activities – Teachers have been working together across the Redmond Learning Community to develop Level 4/Transfer of Learning activities for students who are already proficient in specific learning targets.

- Formative assessments to identify and address gaps in understanding – Formative assessments are developed and used by teachers as they gauge students' standing in the achieving essential skills and understandings.
- Leveled reading groups – students are instructed at their own instructional level, getting reinforcement of basic skills or extension activities as their needs dictate.



**Continuous Improvement Process Plan  
Rosa Parks Elementary CIP 2012-2013**

**Purpose:** The Continuous Improvement Process (CIP) plan provides opportunity for the school staff to reflect and analyze results from the previous year's SMART goals. The process uses the Planning, Learning, Implementation and Evaluation (PLIE) model, a Cycle of Inquiry, to improve learning for all students.

**Part 1: 2011-2012 Reflection Goals:** Due to DSS by October 12, 2012

**A. Data Summary, Reflection, and Analysis:**

<u>Class of 2020- current 5<sup>th</sup> graders</u>			
2011-2012 SMART Goals			
Reading	Math	Writing	
90	90	89	

Results:							
Year	Reading		Math		Science	Writing	
	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	NA	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient
2012-4 <sup>th</sup>	42.2	47.8	30	57.8	NA	43.3	46.7
2011-3 <sup>rd</sup>	26.4	65.5	28.7	58.6	NA	NA	

<u>Class of 2021- current 4<sup>th</sup> graders</u>			
2011-2012 SMART Goals:			
Reading	Math		
92	88		

Results:						
Year	Reading		Math		Science	Writing
	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	NA	NA
2012-3 <sup>rd</sup>	33.8	61.5	30	63.1	NA	NA

<b>Class of 2022- current 3<sup>rd</sup> graders</b>				
Year	EOY Reading DIBELS Benchmark	Math	Science	Writing
2012- 2 <sup>nd</sup>	96	NA	NA	NA
2011- 1 <sup>st</sup>	97	NA	NA	NA
2010- K	96	NA	NA	NA

<b>Class of 2023- current 2<sup>nd</sup> graders</b>				
Year	EOY Reading DIBELS Benchmark	Math	Science	Writing
2012- 1 <sup>st</sup>	95	NA	NA	NA
2011- K	94	NA	NA	NA

<b>Class of 2024- current 1<sup>st</sup> graders</b>				
Year	EOY Reading DIBELS Benchmark	Math	Science	Writing
2012- K	98	NA	NA	NA

### **School-wide Analysis of Multiple Measures**

Briefly explain school-wide systems used to improve student achievement in each of the following content areas:	
Reading:	<b>Safety Net, RR, Monthly Review of data, team planning, AR, Battle of Books</b>
Math:	<b>Math Adventures, RR, Parent tutors, monthly review of data, team planning</b>
Writing:	<b>Book study, 1<sup>st</sup> grade agreement on strategies, Specialist included in curriculum, Monthly review of data, team planning</b>
Science:	<b>Science Fair, team planning, tight lessons on science write ups</b>

### Sub-Group Analysis

Which school-wide sub-group/s creates opportunities for celebration or cause for concern (e.g. Gender, Ethnicity, ELL, Special Education, SES)? Please provide examples and explanations.

More than half of special education students met standard in grades 3, 4 and significantly higher percentage met standard in fifth. Reading scores are strong for all ethnic groups in grades 3, 4 and 5. Math scores are strong for all ethnic groups in grades 4 and 5. Grade 3 math demonstrated significant lower math scores for one ethnic population. Females are stronger in grades 4 and 5. Males higher in third grade math. The CIP focus for grade levels improved from previous year: third grade problem solving, fourth grade writing and fifth grade numbers and operations.

### B. Perception Data Summary, Reflection, and Analysis Agree Mostly, Completely

Year	Goal Area #1 From- To Percentage	Goal Area #2 From – To Percentage
2012	87.2	85
2011	76.6	71.2
2010	71	85

### Analysis of Perception Data

Why were these goal areas selected? What actions were taken to achieve these goals?

These goals were selected based on the change from 2010 and 2011. They were the highest area of concern for staff as well as a good match for our identified LEAP work for 2011-2012 school year.

Actions included: three LEAP sessions devoted to cross grade level sharing, monthly data sharing meetings with administrator and grade level teams, strategies of response for Levels identified, individual students discussed each month, two staff meetings full agenda was data interpretation, some grade levels took planning days together to create units in response to data.

Modules for designing tests were used to train staff, agreements with standards with team and scoring papers together/rubrics/how to use Skyward system; use of enVision tools to bridge home/school, book study on reading strategies for primary and purchased curriculum to supplement reading instruction.

Teachers presented at staff meetings, did comprehensive Interest Statement protocol and used to make school decisions.

**Part 2: Goals for 2012-13:** Due to DSS by November 16, 2012

**Performance Goals – Statements (Current year’s work)**

“Class of”	Reading		Math		Science	Writing
	From:	To:	From:	To:	Baseline	Baseline
2020- 5 <sup>th</sup>	90	91	87.8	89	88	NA
2021 -4 <sup>th</sup>	95.3	95	93.1	95	NA	90
2022- 3 <sup>rd</sup>	NA	94	NA	90	NA	NA
2023-2 <sup>nd</sup>	86	95	NA	NA	NA	NA
2024- 1 <sup>st</sup>	98	98	NA	NA	NA	NA
2025- K	92.5	95	NA	NA	NA	NA

**Challenge Goal:** This goal is to increase the percentage of students exceeding standard (from 3 to 4) on the MSP in grades 3, 4, and 5 in a particular content area.

Grades 3-5: Identify content area	From	To
Third Grade: Math	63	68
Fourth Grade: Math	57	62
Fifth Grade: Math	52	57

**Perception Goals:**

Year	Goal Area #1 From/To Percentage	Goal Area #2 From/To Percentage
2012-2013	Cross Grade Level Teams 78% to 95%	Get Performance Feedback from Peers 61% to 75%

**Process Summary**

Highlight building-wide strategies to meet goals in reading, math, science and writing:

**Reading**

- Daily 5
- Reading Workshop
- Comprehension Instruction- Debbie Miller
- Guided reading groups
- Word Work
- Direction instruction
- Phonics
- Headsprout
- Cross grade level reflections on student progress

- Read Naturally Analysis of text
- Modeling specific comprehension strategies, mini lessons
- Intentional reading strategy instruction within non-fiction text
- Intentional reading strategy instruction across content areas
- AR/STAR
- RLC work
- Step Up to Writing
- Drama class

### **Math**

- Math Adventures
- IXL
- Small group instruction
- Manipulatives
- Leveled, differentiated math groups
- Level 4 enrichment math opportunities
- Increased guided math practice with Level 1 and Level 2 learners
- Consistent formative assessment to drive math instruction
- Intentional focus on problem solving strategies
- Lunch tutoring (Fifth grade)
- Weekly differentiated instruction, parent leaders (Fifth grade)
- Team planning and reflection on student progress and next step

### **Science:**

- Intentional instruction of scientific process
- Nature Vision extensions (hands-on, experiential)
- Encouraging inquiry process
- Discussing variables in all lessons
- Infusing the arts
- Science Fair
- Journals

### **Writing:**

- Lucy Calkins Units of Study
- Writing Workshop
- Conferencing
- Modeled writing
- Shared writing
- Brainstorming topics
- Writing to prompts



- Six traits
- Specific strategy instruction
- Using various curricular resources
- Peer editing
- Drama class/performances of prose

Highlight use of technology to improve student learning:.

- Headsprout
- Pebble Go
- Star Fall
- IXL
- Xtra Math
- Envision
- Foss Web
- Microsoft Word
- Flipcharts
- Discovery Education
- Type to Learn
- Dance Mat Typing
- Student Portal
- PowerPoint
- Haiku
- Netbooks
- AR/STAR reader
- ActiVotes
- ActivBoard
- Skyward to monitor progress

Highlight steps to involve of staff, students, parents, families, and community:

**Parents/Families:**

- Weekly Newsletters
- Parent Volunteers
- Haiku
- Conferences
- Class Productions
- Educate parents on learning targets; rubrics
- Art Smart
- Math Adventures

- Science Fair
- Chess
- Assemblies
- Nature Vision
- Parent Volunteers
- Parent presentation on careers

**Staff:**

- Twice monthly team meetings for data review/response
- Teacher created fifth grade math lessons for weekly parent led mini- lessons
- Monthly meeting with administrator to review individual/group student data
- LEAP modules
- Teacher led in-service
- Staff meeting presentations concerning lessons, strategies
- Specialists assigned to grade level teams to assist with CIP goals

**Students:**

- Student created rubrics
- Student selection of projects
- Buddy groups
- Haiku
- Celebration of learning events
- Integration of the arts

**Community:**

- Sharing of careers
- Community outreach for service (beautification, Sparrow Club)
- Three school productions

Highlight process for progress monitoring, describing what assessments you will use throughout the year

- DIBELS
- Running Records/QRI
- Journal
- CDSA Writing Prompt
- Monthly Writing Prompts
- Reading Conferences
- Star and Accelerated Reading tests
- Read Naturally
- Envision Quick Checks, add Level 4 questions
- Envision Topic Tests
- Envision Performance Assessments

- CDSA as required for subjects
- Create scoring guides for TCI
- Use of summative assessments to determine level of understanding at the conclusion of a unit and next steps for future instruction
- Team meetings to talk about student progress and to share strategies

Highlight strategies to address the PLC questions #3 and #4

**Question 3:**

- Small group instruction
- Tutoring
- Re-teaching
- Using a different mode of instruction
- Consult colleagues for new ideas
- Extra home practice
- Monthly review of data with team and administrator
- Resources available on Haiku for parents/students
- Communicate with parents student progress regularly

**Question 4:**

- Enrichment activities
- Performance grouping
- Projects (RLC)
- Integration between subject areas – look at relationships between operations; pull into Social Studies (geography – miles)
- Small group challenges
- Math Olympiad



**Continuous Improvement Process Plan  
Wilder Elementary CIP 2012-2013**

**Purpose:** The Continuous Improvement Process (CIP) plan provides opportunity for the school staff to reflect and analyze results from the previous year's SMART goals. The process uses the Planning, Learning, Implementation and Evaluation (PLIE) model, a Cycle of Inquiry, to improve learning for all students.

**Part 1: 2011-2012 Reflection Goals:** Due to DSS by October 12, 2012

**A. Data Summary, Reflection, and Analysis:**

<b>Class of 2020- current 5<sup>th</sup> graders</b>			
<b>2011-2012 SMART Goals</b>			
<b>Reading</b>	<b>Math</b>	<b>Writing</b>	
<b>95%</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>80%</b>	

<b>Results:</b>							
<b>Year</b>	<b>Reading</b>		<b>Math</b>		<b>Science</b>	<b>Writing</b>	
	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exceeds Proficient</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exceeds Proficient</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exceeds Proficient</b>
2012-4 <sup>th</sup>	56%	38%	33%	54%	NA	40%	54%
2011-3 <sup>rd</sup>	24%	70%	46%	29%	NA	NA	

<b>Class of 2021- current 4<sup>th</sup> graders</b>		
<b>2011-2012 SMART Goals:</b>		
<b>Reading</b>	<b>Math</b>	
<b>75%</b>	<b>70%</b>	

<b>Results:</b>						
<b>Year</b>	<b>Reading</b>		<b>Math</b>		<b>Science</b>	<b>Writing</b>
	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exceeds Proficient</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exceeds Proficient</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>
2012-3 <sup>rd</sup>	39%	58%	50%	35%	NA	NA

<b>Class of 2022- current 3<sup>rd</sup> graders</b>				
Year	EOY Reading DIBELS Benchmark	Math	Science	Writing
2012- 2 <sup>nd</sup>	78%	NA	NA	NA
2011- 1 <sup>st</sup>	86%	NA	NA	NA
2010- K	89%	NA	NA	NA

<b>Class of 2023- current 2<sup>nd</sup> graders</b>				
Year	EOY Reading DIBELS Benchmark	Math	Science	Writing
2012- 1 <sup>st</sup>	82%	NA	NA	NA
2011- K	73%	NA	NA	NA

<b>Class of 2024- current 1<sup>st</sup> graders</b>				
Year	EOY Reading DIBELS Benchmark	Math	Science	Writing
2012- K	92%	NA	NA	NA

**School-wide Analysis of Multiple Measures**

Briefly explain school-wide systems used to improve student achievement in each of the following content areas:	
Reading:	We utilize district curriculum and Safety Net resources to help students demonstrate proficiency or better for grade level power standards. Any students not proficient on the Reading MSP are enrolled in a before school support program designed to help them demonstrate reading proficiency.
Math:	We utilize district curriculum to teach students skills and concepts in accordance with grade level power standards. Any students not proficient on the Math MSP are

	enrolled in a before school support program designed to help them demonstrate math proficiency in deficit strands.
Writing:	District writing assessments and grade level power standards are used to teach students grade specific forms of writing.
Science:	Two years ago our science scores were at 55% proficiency. We formed a science content team (vertical) to provide k-6 over site of our science instruction. This team worked to bring awareness to grade level responsibilities for teaching the different steps of the scientific process. The content team also worked with our 5 <sup>th</sup> grade team to create more opportunities to practice explaining the scientific process in writing. We're pleased to see our science scores just two years later reach a 90% proficiency.

### Sub-Group Analysis

Which school-wide sub-group/s creates opportunities for celebration or cause for concern (e.g. Gender, Ethnicity, ELL, Special Education, SES)? Please provide examples and explanations.
A big focus for us this past year was a sub group of our IEP students. Several of our IEP students were clumped in a 4 <sup>th</sup> grade cohort group. We made a decision to add staffing to 4 <sup>th</sup> grade to decrease class size, which had the effect of increasing class sizes in 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> grade. Smaller class sizes allowed for more differentiated math instruction and better coordination with Resource Room support. We were pleased to see 12% of growth on our MSP math scores for this cohort group.

### B. Perception Data Summary, Reflection, and Analysis

Year	Goal Area #1 From- To Percentage	Goal Area #2 From – To Percentage
2012	<p>Characteristic 1: Vision-100% of staff will have an “agree mostly” or “agree completely” response when asked if they have a “clear understanding of what the school is trying to achieve. Staff share a common understanding of what the school want to achieve.”</p> <p>We reached our goal of 100% agree mostly or agree completely. We spent quite a bit of time using the three pillars poster in our staff meetings as well as a strong focus on assessment.</p>	<p>Characteristic 6: Monitoring of Teaching and Learning-100% of teachers will have an “agree mostly” or “agree completely” response when asked if they receive “regular feedback on how they are doing.”</p> <p>We did not meet our goal of 100% agree mostly or agree completely. 87% of staff agreed mostly or agreed completely. We had two staff members agree slightly. Not sure why 2 staff members chose agree slightly.</p>
2011	17% of staff agree slightly that staff work in teams across grade levels to help	33% of staff agree slightly that staff provide feedback to each other to help

	<p>increase student learning based on Spring 2010 Perception data. We'd like to see this reduced to 0%, as measured by the Spring 2011 Perception Survey and our "Agree mostly" and "Agreed completely" increased by 17%.</p> <p>Eight staff members took the survey this year out of about 30. I did not feel that this was a large enough n group to be statistically valid.</p>	<p>improve instructional practice, as based on Spring 2010 Perception data. We'd like to see this reduced to 0%, as measured by the Spring 2011 Perception Survey and our "Agree mostly" and "Agree completely" increased by 33%.</p> <p>Eight staff members took the survey this year out of about 30. I did not feel that this was a large enough n group to be statistically valid.</p>
2010	Had difficulty finding this information.	N/A-only one goal was required that year.

### Analysis of Perception Data

Why were these goal areas selected? What actions were taken to achieve these goals?
We chose these goals in the fall of 2010 and 2011 because these were our lowest areas on the 9 characteristic surveys. The introduction of the ICED protocol and the three pillars documents were our main interventions.



**Part 2: Goals for 2012-13:** Due to DSS by November 16, 2012

**Performance Goals – Statements (Current year’s work)**

“Class of”	Reading		Math		Science	Writing
	From:	To:	From:	To:	Baseline	Baseline
2020- 5 <sup>th</sup>	94%	90%	88%	85%	85%	NA
2021 -4 <sup>th</sup>	90%	90%	86%	82%	NA	80%
2022- 3 <sup>rd</sup>	NA	80%	NA	85%	NA	NA
2023-2 <sup>nd</sup>	85%	90%	NA	NA	NA	NA
2024- 1 <sup>st</sup>	81%	90%	NA	NA	NA	NA
2025- K	81%	85%	NA	NA	NA	NA

**Challenge Goal:** This goal is to increase the percentage of students exceeding standard (from 3 to 4) on the MSP in grades 3, 4, and 5 in a particular content area.

Grades 3-5: Identify content area	From	To
Math – Current 4 <sup>th</sup> Grade	29% ( Level 4)	40% (level 4)

**Perception Goals:**

Year	Goal Area #1 From/To Percentage	Goal Area #2 From/To Percentage
2012-2013	Q 26 “Staff works in teams across grade levels to help increase student learning”. From 52% agreeing mostly or completely to 100% agreeing mostly or completely.	Q 27 “Staff routinely work together to plan what is taught”. From 82% agreeing mostly or completely to 100% agreeing mostly or completely.

**Process Summary**

Highlight building-wide strategies to meet goals in reading, math, science and writing:
We will be adding IXL math as a resource to build fluency in mathematics. As a staff we felt our students were lacking in numeration skills. We will continue to use district curriculum, Safety Net and Resource Room programs as our main means to achieving our goals. As a part of our instructional program we will continue to strengthen our assessment of student learning and use results to guide further instruction and growth toward district Powerstandards. Our PTSA granted funds to operate our MSP support classes again for students that were not proficient

on the Spring 2012 MSP in Math or Reading (or both).
Highlight use of technology to improve student learning:
Teachers utilize Front Row in each classroom. Active Boards are utilized in a variety of seamless activities as a part of daily instruction, as are Avervision. Netbooks continue to be used in a variety of ways for student learning, at the remediation level and enrichment level. Our Resource Room utilizes Aims Web for instruction, which is a part of the EMS Resource Room program.
Highlight steps to involve of staff, students, parents, families, and community:
Staff members are used to set and monitor goals throughout the year. Students set personal goals at our goal setting conferences and monitor their progress throughout the year. Our greater community will receive the school annual newsletter which highlights our work on academic goals from last year. Goals for this year are published in school newsletters.
Highlight process for progress monitoring, describing what assessments you will use throughout the year:
Staff will use district mandated CDSA's to dipstick student progress in content areas. In addition writing prompts, curriculum and classroom based assessments will be used for assessment purposes. Teachers will participate in Assessment Models during LEAP Wednesdays.
Highlight strategies to address the PLC questions #3 and #4:
We participate in an RLC workshop in October in which teachers were shown a template in which to create Level 4 enrichment activities. Staff agreed to implement one idea from this activity. Staff will use LEAP Wednesdays to create activities appropriate in answering Q4 "How will we respond when some students already know it?"

Wilder Elementary AMO Targets

Building	Subgroup Name	Subject	Baseline CE Total Tested Not Tested	Baseline CE Number Met	Baseline CE Percent Met	Target 2012	Target 2013	Target 2014	Target 2015	Target 2016	Target 2017	Increment
WILDER ELEMENTARY	All	math	295	264	89.492	90.4	91.2	92.1	93.0	93.9	94.7	0.9
WILDER ELEMENTARY	All	reading	295	278	94.237	94.7	95.2	95.7	96.2	96.6	97.1	0.5
WILDER ELEMENTARY	American Indian	math										
WILDER ELEMENTARY	American Indian	reading										
WILDER ELEMENTARY	Asian	math	34	32	94.118	94.6	95.1	95.6	96.1	96.6	97.1	0.5
WILDER ELEMENTARY	Asian	reading	34	32	94.118	94.6	95.1	95.6	96.1	96.6	97.1	0.5
WILDER ELEMENTARY	Black	math										
WILDER ELEMENTARY	Black	reading										
WILDER ELEMENTARY	Hispanic	math										
WILDER ELEMENTARY	Hispanic	reading										
WILDER ELEMENTARY	White	math	225	196	87.111	88.2	89.3	90.3	91.4	92.5	93.6	1.1
WILDER ELEMENTARY	White	reading	225	213	94.667	95.1	95.6	96.0	96.4	96.9	97.3	0.4
WILDER ELEMENTARY	Limited English	math										
WILDER ELEMENTARY	Limited English	reading										
WILDER ELEMENTARY	Special Education	math	25	15	60.000	63.3	66.7	70.0	73.3	76.7	80.0	3.3
WILDER ELEMENTARY	Special Education	reading	25	18	72.000	74.3	76.7	79.0	81.3	83.7	86.0	2.3
WILDER ELEMENTARY	Low Income	math										
WILDER ELEMENTARY	Low Income	reading										
WILDER ELEMENTARY	Pacific Islander	math										
WILDER ELEMENTARY	Pacific Islander	reading										
WILDER ELEMENTARY	Two or More Races	math	26	26	100.000	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0
WILDER ELEMENTARY	Two or More Races	reading	26	24	92.308	92.9	93.6	94.2	94.9	95.5	96.2	0.6

**Continuous Improvement Process Plan  
Evergreen Middle School CIP 2012-2013**

**Purpose:** The Continuous Improvement Process (CIP) plan provides opportunity for the school staff to reflect and analyze results from the previous year’s SMART goals. The process uses the Planning, Learning, Implementation and Evaluation (PLIE) model, a Cycle of Inquiry, to improve learning for all students.

**Part 1: 2011-2012 Reflection Goals:** Due to DSS by October 12, 2012

**A. Data Summary, Reflection, and Analysis**

<u>Class of 2017- current 8<sup>th</sup> graders</u>			
2011-2012 Smart Goals			
Reading	Math	Writing	
Individual Department SMART Goals	Individual Department SMART Goals	Individual Department SMART Goals	

**\*Note:** Need to give # or %

Results:								
Year	Reading		Math		Science		Writing	
	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient
2012-7 <sup>th</sup>	21%	64%	29%	57%	NA		45%	44%
2011-6 <sup>th</sup>	40%	48%	37%	47%	NA		NA	
2010-5 <sup>th</sup>	21%	64%	39%	36%	44%	18%	NA	

**\*Note:** Pulled from Current Data Dashboard – Three Year Look Back feature.

<b>Class of 2018- current 7<sup>th</sup> graders</b>		
<b>2011-2012 SMART Goals*</b>		
<b>Reading</b>	<b>Math</b>	
<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	
<b>*In the transition year to Middle Schools, 7<sup>th</sup> graders will not have SMART goals listed</b>		

<b>Results:</b>								
Year	Reading		Math		Science		Writing	
	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient
2012-6 <sup>th</sup>	40%	48%	37%	45%	NA		NA	
2011-5 <sup>th</sup>	25%	56%	41%	40%	34%	47%	NA	
2010-4 <sup>th</sup>	39%	46%	38%	40%	NA		38%	41%

<b>Class of 2019- current 6<sup>th</sup> graders</b>			
<b>Goals 2011-2012 SMART Goals*</b>			
<b>Reading</b>	<b>Math</b>	<b>Science</b>	
<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	
<b>*In the transition year to Middle Schools, 6<sup>th</sup> graders will not have SMART goals listed</b>			

<b>Results:</b>								
Year	Reading		Math		Science		Writing	
	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient
2012-5 <sup>th</sup>	23%	60%	37%	51%	26%	58%	NA	
2011-4 <sup>th</sup>	43%	45%	25%	61%	NA		42%	45%
2010-3 <sup>rd</sup>	24%	68%	43%	34%	NA		NA	

### School-wide Analysis of Multiple Measures

Briefly explain school-wide systems used to improve student achievement in each of the following content areas:	
Reading:	The LA/SS department focused on improving critical thinking, comprehension and informational text MSP scores for 7 <sup>th</sup> & 8 <sup>th</sup> graders. They used a variety of strategies including Bloom's Taxonomy questioning, Super Six Reading Strategies, Socratic Seminars, summary and reflective writing. Safety Net classes were provided to support struggling learners with additional support. Special Education staff contributed by using the Inside curriculum and teaching leveled novels to improve reading comprehension and fluency while engaging the students. Classroom-based measurements were administered weekly to track progress. Science, Elective and PE/Health teachers provided a broad list of reading tasks throughout the year that support both content and reading instruction.
Math:	The Math department collaborated deeply thanks to a Microsoft grant that allowed them to dig into their content standards, develop formative, summative and leveled assessments, and create lessons that used a variety of teaching and engagement strategies. They used weekly IXL assignments linked to specific targeted standards. Safety Net classes were provided to support struggling learners with additional support and time to complete their IXL work. The Homework Lunch (HoWL) Program was used for students needing extra time in the school day. Special Education staff used the Carnegie Learning curriculum to differentiate instruction, give student immediate feedback and help with skill building. Classroom-based measurements were administered weekly to track progress and yearly pre/post assessments were given to track growth. Elective teachers used a combination of geometry, measurement, fractions, proportion, and ratio in their content areas to support math across the curriculum. PE/Health teachers also engaged students with data collection and graphing in connection to the President's Physical Fitness test.
Writing:	The LA/SS department sought to improve student performance on both expository and persuasive writing by teaching the 6+1 Traits of Writing, research techniques, critical thinking strategies (Bloom's Taxonomy), using district rubrics and leading students through a reflection process. They tracked student progress through use of the online writing program, MyAccess.com, and the creation of writing portfolios. Special Education staff used the Step up to Writing curriculum for help with organization in the writing process. Quarterly essays were assigned to teach and evaluate the writing process and the traits of strong writing. Classroom-based measurements were administered weekly to track progress. Elective and PE/Health teachers taught a wide array of styles, formats and prompts including research, narratives, self-reflection, personal goals and summary.
Science:	The Science department used strategies to improve concept understanding through varied readings, training in Cornell notes and analysis of science in the news. They provided students with many counter-examples and multiple exposures to replace their misconceptions with a correct understanding of a given concept. They also used pre and post assessments to track the growth of their students. Elective teachers offered numerous examples of science in different content areas such as the technology behind robot construction, an artistic study of plants & insects, hazardous materials in the woodshop and chemical reactions created through mixing different ingredients in food preparation.

### Sub-Group Analysis

Which school-wide sub-group/s creates opportunities for celebration or cause for concern (e.g. Gender, Ethnicity, ELL, Special Education, SES)? Please provide examples and explanations.

**Celebration:** 16/18 Hispanic students in 8<sup>th</sup> grade passed the Science MSP. Given struggles in other statewide tests, Science teachers felt this was noteworthy. Special Education students in 7<sup>th</sup> grade, who had been at Level 2 in reading and writing in 6<sup>th</sup> grade, showed growth on their most recent test. This helped contribute to last year's 7<sup>th</sup> graders scoring higher on all three MSP tests than any other cohort in Evergreen history.

**Concerns:** Science teachers found that 23/25 students who did not pass the 8<sup>th</sup> grade Science MSP were labeled as low SES. Special Education teachers found that Level 1 students in Special Education continue to struggle despite gains made in CBMs. Elective teachers feel that low SES transcends gender, ethnicity, ELL, Special Education and is a major cause for concern.

### B. Perception Data Summary Reflection and Analysis

Year	Goal Area #1 From- To Percentage	Goal Area #2 From – To Percentage
2012	Q42: Teachers receive regular feedback on how they are doing. Combined scores of “agree mostly” and “agree completely” will increase by 5%  81%	Q56: Students respect those who are different from them. Combined scores of “agree mostly” and “agree completely” will increase by 5%  90%
2011	83%	81%
2010	NA	NA

### Analysis of Perception Data

Why were these goal areas selected? What actions were taken to achieve these goals?

**Goal 1:** Continued goal area for RLC administration. Importance stressed of being in classrooms and giving teachers feedback about their instruction and student learning. Data shows that drop in percentage due to one less person marking “agreed”. Administration had a full plate with reconfiguration issues and meetings out of the building causing less time to be spent in classrooms.

**Goal 2:** Goal selected to mirror beliefs that a positive school culture is one where all students feel respected and valued. Staff feels that the increased percentage is related to the hard work of the WEB (Where Everyone Belongs) Team, anti-bullying efforts, strong student leadership activities, and constant reinforcement and intentional modeling from adult staff members. These efforts help students feel heard, safe and valued. There is still an opportunity to grow as some staff reflect that “exclusion” pressures may exist within friendship groups out of sight of staff observation.

**Part 2: Goals for 2012-13:** Due to DSS by November 16, 2012

**Performance Goals – statements (Current year’s work)**

"Class of"	Reading		Math		Science		Writing	
	From:	To:	From:	To:	From:	To:	From:	To:
2017- 8 <sup>th</sup>	80%	88%	79%	81%	2010 MSP 63%	71%	NA	
2018 -7 <sup>th</sup>	80%	86%	74%	76%	NA		2010 MSP 79%	83%
2019- 6 <sup>th</sup>	81%	85%	82%	84%	NA		NA	

**\*Data from Data Dashboard – Current View (2010 Data from Three Year Look-back Report) - Note: AMO (Annual Measureable Objectives) announcement related to NCLB waiver.**

**Challenge Goal:**

This goal is to increase the percentage of students exceeding standard on the MSP in grades 6, 7, and 8 in a particular content area.

Grades 6-8: Identify content area	From	To
Reading: Critical Thinking	2018- 84.1% @ Lvl3 + Lvl4 2019- 84% @Lvl3 + Lvl 4	2018- 86.1% @ Lvl3 + Lvl4 2019- 86% @ Lvl3 + Lvl4
Science:	2017- 18% @ Level 4	2017- 20% @ Level 4
Math:	2017- 53% @ Level 4 2018- 41% @ Level 4 2019- 48% @ Level 4	2017- 55% @ Level 4 2018- 43% @ Level 4 2019- 50% @ Level 4

**Perception Goals:**

Year	Goal Area #1 From/To Percentage	Goal Area #2 From/To Percentage
2012-2013 (BLT Approve)	(LA/SS) Q42: 81% to 85% (Sci) Q42: 47% to 49% Agree Mostly (Math) Q44: 21.8% to 15% Agree Slightly (Fit) Q28: 88% to 95% Agree Mostly and Agree Completely	(LA/SS) Q56: 90% to 100% (Sci) Q56: 18% to 21% Agree Mostly (Fit) Q14: 85% to 95% Agree Mostly and Agree Completely



## Process Summary

Highlight building-wide strategies to meet goals in reading, math, science and writing:

**Reading** – The teaching staff will be working with students to improve their comprehension of instructional texts, use a variety of reading sources and develop content-specific vocabulary understanding. The Science, Fitness/Health and LA/SS departments will be training students in guided note-taking strategies, such as Cornell and Active Reading notes to break down the texts and related materials. The Math, Science and LA/SS departments will teach students to read questions and directions carefully to find pertinent information, how to summarize longer texts, and how to research content-specific topics and prepare citations in MLA format. The LA/SS department will also be teaching students about the Super Six Reading Strategies, and offering different opportunities to present their information through read-alouds and Socratic Seminars in class. Special Education staff will provide weekly assessments to identify strengths/weaknesses and monitor progress. They will also modify the curriculum and instructional settings to match abilities and students' needs.

**Writing** – The teaching staff will be supporting our students' growth in the writing process and to apply the 6+1 traits of writing to their work. The LA/SS department uses Step-Up to Writing and MyAccess.com to teach and evaluate student writing across multiple modes, purposes and styles. The Science department uses third person extensively to focus on procedural and expository writing. The Math department is focusing on having students elaborate, use specifics, and to support their evidence in explanations. Health and Fitness teachers help students breakdown vocabulary words for comprehension and application in their own writing and assessments. Special Education staff will provide weekly assessments to identify strengths/weaknesses and monitor progress. They will also modify the curriculum and instructional settings to match abilities and students' needs.

**Math** – The teaching staff will be helping students develop their mathematic skills throughout the school day in a variety of applications. The Math department will be focusing on the standards with consistent assessment, immediate interventions and use of applications like IXL, Math TV and Khan Academy to support their teaching. The Science department directly teaches measurement skills, the metric system, and conversions between units. The Math, Science, LA/SS, Health/Fitness and Elective departments all teach some portion of graphing, averaging, and percentages to support student learning in math and for basic content area understanding. Special Education staff will provide weekly assessments to identify strengths/weaknesses and monitor progress. They will also modify the curriculum and instructional settings to match abilities and students' needs.

**Science** – The Science Department will be teaching the district-adopted curriculum, as represented in the developed proficiency scales. The specific focus this year is converting proficiency scales into student-friendly rubrics where students collect and analyze their own work. The Math department will teach students inductive reasoning and to display information in graphs, tables and equations. Work will also cover formulas and drawing conclusions from a data display. There will be cross-over vocabulary in Math, LA/SS and Health and Fitness classes related to life science, the human body, Plate Tectonics, Inventions, Geography and Geology. Special Education staff will provide weekly assessments to identify strengths/weaknesses and monitor progress. They will also modify the curriculum and instructional settings to match abilities and students' needs.

**Highlight use of technology to improve student learning:**

Technology will be used throughout EMS to communicate, teach and assess student learning with attention to engaging and inspiring each child. Student Laptops and Haiku are dynamic additions to our current repertoire that includes StandardScore, ActivBoards, ActiVotes, document cameras, and Microsoft applications that are used frequently by teachers across curriculums. Haiku's practice tests and assignments give kids instant feedback and teachers formative assessments for learning. Discussion boards allow students to do online research, summarize information and interact safely with each other. Students can access documents, presentations, challenge problems and selected online video support such as Khan Academy and MathTV. The Math department has purchased IXL as an additional support for instruction and frequent formative assessment. The LA/SS department will continue the use of MyAccess for writing/revising and TCI History Alive, United Streaming, Classzone.com and research databases via the LWSD website for research and homework help. Special Education uses assistive technology such as Co-Writer, Cognitive Tutor, IXL and Spelling City to support students and their individualized needs.

**Highlight steps to involve of staff, students, parents, families, and community:**

The Evergreen staff will use a wide range of strategies for involving and including all stakeholders. Our ability to use technology, such as Haiku, StandardScore, Skyward Message Center and email, for communicating student progress, curriculum support, school activities and events creates a powerful tool that quickly and effectively links staff, students and parents. Through the PTSA, our weekly newsletter Eagle Express, and individual teacher e-newsletters, we are able to recruit and coordinate parent volunteers (for classroom support, health room assistance, and ASB activities) and post relevant dates, events and information sheets about our curriculum, such as the CMP curriculum and student leadership initiatives. Special Education teachers have access to content area teachers Haiku and StandardScore information and use this access to collaborate with parents on individual student progress, provide quarterly IEP updates and have classroom-based measurement conferences with students. We have started communication this year with our staff and parent community to find additional ways to utilize the powerful resource of our volunteers.

**Highlight process for progress monitoring, describing what assessments you will use throughout the year:**

Evergreen is coming off of a year with professional development focused on building formative assessments using quizzes, exit questions, thumb responses, secret ballot, and whiteboard strategies. As we prepare for standards-based grading in 2013-2014, proficiency scales will be used alongside Power Standards to design assessments. In Math, teachers will be using a common scoring rubric. LA/SS teachers will use MyAccess for writing portfolios and conduct state-mandated Classroom Based Assessments. Technology will be infused in the use of ActiVotes and Haiku quizzes, summative assessments, and Data Dashboard that allow students and teachers to analyze work more quickly and effectively. Grade level meetings are held every month to discuss students of concern and collaborate on strategies and interventions for supporting learning. Special Education staff will be conducting weekly assessments to identify strengths and weaknesses through the AIMS Web program, Analytical Reading Inventory, Online Coach and Spelling City programs.

Highlight strategies to address the PLC questions #3 and #4:

#3 – What will you do if students don't learn the concept?

Evergreen Middle School will provide multiple interventions to help students who struggle to learn the identified concepts. At an individual level, students could be retaught the concept in a different way or approach, in reference to multiple intelligences or multi-modal responses. Students have access to a variety of online tutoring sites, peer discussion boards, electronic models and websites through Haiku. In class, there are frequently advanced students who are guided to support struggling students through teamwork and peer mentoring. Staff members are willing and frequently offer opportunities to work with students before or after the school day and contact parent/guardians for advice. If unavailable or unwilling, students are also given passes to meet with teachers during our homeroom time at the end of the day. Students who struggle to complete assignments can be referred to the Homework Lunch (HOWL) program where kids are given a positive, structured, quiet environment during lunch to work with a staff member and volunteers to complete the practice activity or assessment. Teachers frequently collaborate about struggling students through grade level meetings, department-based meetings and individual student staffings with parent/guardians and specialists to discuss current progress, previous strategies and develop plans for future interventions. If necessary, EMS also offers Safety Net, Study Skills and Special Education classes to provide specific curriculum, instruction and assessment to support each student.

#4 – What will you do if students already know the concept?

The staff at EMS has created "Eagle Opportunities" in each content area to provide challenge and extra rigor for those students who can already demonstrate the given concept. Each of these Eagle Opportunities focuses on demonstrating the ability to transfer the identified concept to a new setting, outcome, product or problem. Students at this level, with support, can be excellent role-models and/or peer-tutors for others. Teachers could ask students to make instructional videos for staff to post on their Haiku sites or encourage students to examine challenge problems and projects that may extend beyond the classroom or school to tackle real-life problems. As we introduce laptops to every student, there is excitement and anticipation about how these dynamic devices can transform our ability to enrich and extend student learning for these students.





Redmond Middle School AMO Targets

Building	Subgroup Name	Subject	Baseline CE Total Tested Not Tested	Baseline CE Number Met	Baseline CE Percent Met	Target 2012	Target 2013	Target 2014	Target 2015	Target 2016	Target 2017	Increment
REDMOND JUNIOR HIGH	All	math	588	463	78.741	80.5	82.3	84.1	85.8	87.6	89.4	1.8
REDMOND JUNIOR HIGH	All	reading	584	500	85.616	86.8	88.0	89.2	90.4	91.6	92.8	1.2
REDMOND JUNIOR HIGH	American Indian	math										
REDMOND JUNIOR HIGH	American Indian	reading										
REDMOND JUNIOR HIGH	Asian	math	166	149	89.759	90.6	91.5	92.3	93.2	94.0	94.9	0.9
REDMOND JUNIOR HIGH	Asian	reading	165	149	90.303	91.1	91.9	92.7	93.5	94.3	95.2	0.8
REDMOND JUNIOR HIGH	Black	math										
REDMOND JUNIOR HIGH	Black	reading										
REDMOND JUNIOR HIGH	Hispanic	math	44	20	45.455	50.0	54.5	59.1	63.6	68.2	72.7	4.5
REDMOND JUNIOR HIGH	Hispanic	reading	44	26	59.091	62.5	65.9	69.3	72.7	76.1	79.5	3.4
REDMOND JUNIOR HIGH	White	math	346	274	79.191	80.9	82.7	84.4	86.1	87.9	89.6	1.7
REDMOND JUNIOR HIGH	White	reading	343	300	87.464	88.5	89.6	90.6	91.6	92.7	93.7	1.0
REDMOND JUNIOR HIGH	Limited English	math	20	7	35.000	40.4	45.8	51.3	56.7	62.1	67.5	5.4
REDMOND JUNIOR HIGH	Limited English	reading										
REDMOND JUNIOR HIGH	Special Education	math	50	13	26.000	32.2	38.3	44.5	50.7	56.8	63.0	6.2
REDMOND JUNIOR HIGH	Special Education	reading	51	22	43.137	47.9	52.6	57.4	62.1	66.8	71.6	4.7
REDMOND JUNIOR HIGH	Low Income	math	65	37	56.923	60.5	64.1	67.7	71.3	74.9	78.5	3.6
REDMOND JUNIOR HIGH	Low Income	reading	63	35	55.556	59.3	63.0	66.7	70.4	74.1	77.8	3.7
REDMOND JUNIOR HIGH	Pacific Islander	math										
REDMOND JUNIOR HIGH	Pacific Islander	reading										
REDMOND JUNIOR HIGH	Two or More Races	math	23	14	60.870	64.1	67.4	70.7	73.9	77.2	80.4	3.3
REDMOND JUNIOR HIGH	Two or More Races	reading	23	17	73.913	76.1	78.3	80.4	82.6	84.8	87.0	2.2

**Continuous Improvement Process Plan  
Redmond High School CIP 2012-2013**

**Purpose:** The Continuous Improvement Process (CIP) plan provides opportunity for the school staff to reflect and analyze results from the previous year’s SMART goals. The process uses the Planning, Learning, Implementation and Evaluation (PLIE) model, a Cycle of Inquiry, to improve learning for all students.

**Part 1: 2011-2012 Goals:** Due to DSS by October 12, 2012

**A. Data Summary, Look-back, Reflection and Analysis**

<u>Class of 2012</u>	
Year	On Time Graduation percentage of entire class
2012	95%

**2011-2012 SMART Goals were set for the class of 2014 only in Reading/Writing/Math/Science**

<u>Class of 2013- current 12<sup>th</sup> graders</u>						
On track for graduation (based on 2012 Spring EOY results)						
	Reading	Math	Science	Writing	Graduation Requirements	Credits
<b>N:</b>	<b>506</b>	<b>506</b>	<b>506</b>	<b>506</b>	<b>506</b>	<b>506</b>
<b>Percent:</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>91%</b>		<b>97%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>71%</b>

**Class of 2014- current 11<sup>th</sup> graders**

**2011-2012 SMART Goals**

Reading	Math	Science	Writing
<b>91.3%</b>	<b>Alg.:</b>	<b>Bio: 86%</b>	<b>86%</b>
	<b>Geo.:</b>		

**Spring 2012 Results**

Year	Reading		Math		Science		Writing	
	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient
2012 - 10 <sup>th</sup>	14%	76%	Alg.: 26%	Alg.: 52%	Bio: 29.9	Bio 49.5	36%	58%
			Geo.: 29%	Geo.: 55%				

**Results from previous two years**

2011 - 9 <sup>th</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	Bio: NA	Bio: NA	NA
2010- 8 <sup>th</sup>	23%	63%	39%	32%	43%	39%	NA



**Class of 2015- current 10<sup>th</sup> graders**

**2011-2012 SMART Goals: \*In the transition year to High Schools, 10<sup>th</sup> graders will not have SMART goals listed**

<b>Reading</b>	<b>Math</b>	<b>Writing</b>	<b>Science</b>
<b>NA</b>	<b>Alg.: NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>Bio.: NA</b>
	<b>Geo.: NA</b>		

**Spring 2012 Results**

Year	Reading		Math		Science		Writing	
	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient
2012-9 <sup>th</sup>	NA		Alg.: 22/67 n	Alg.: 13/67 n	Bio: NA	Bio: NA	NA	
			Geo.: 50/198 n	Geo.: 143/198				

**Results from previous two years**

2011-8 <sup>th</sup>	22%	68%	Alg.: 22/66 n	Alg.: 13/66 n	MSP: Counts not available	MSP: Counts not available	NA	
			Geo.: 5/83 n	Geo.: 78/83 n				
2011 – 8 <sup>th</sup>			MSP: 36%	MSP: 37%				
2010- 7 <sup>th</sup>	25%	63%	MSP: 38%	MSP: 43%	NA	NA		

**Class of 2016- current 9<sup>th</sup> graders**

**Goals 2011-2012 SMART Goals\*\*In the transition year to High Schools, 9<sup>th</sup> graders will not have SMART goals listed**

<b>Reading</b>	<b>Math</b>	<b>Writing</b>	<b>Science</b>
<b>NA</b>	<b>Alg.: NA</b> <b>Geo.: NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>Bio.: NA</b>

**Spring 2012 Results**

Year	Reading		Math		Science		Writing	
	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient
2012-8 <sup>th</sup>	21%	66%	Alg.: 106/284 n Geo.: 5/106 n	Alg.: 116/284 n Geo.: 95/106 n	MSP: 40%	MSP: 50%	NA	
2012 – 8th			MSP: 34%	MSP: 44%				

**Results from previous two years**

2011-7 <sup>th</sup>	30%	54%	Alg: NA	Alg.: NA	NA		
2011 – 7 <sup>th</sup>			MSP: 40%	MSP: 43%			
2010-6 <sup>th</sup>	47%	39%	MSP: 42%	MSP: 34%	NA	NA	

**School-wide Analysis of Multiple Measures**

Briefly explain school-wide systems used to improve student success in each of the following areas:	
Reading:	<b>English/SS block survey classes at 10<sup>th</sup> grade, placing special emphasis on skill and work habit development in first semester and transition to general education in second semester; SPED classes mirroring gen ed curriculum at 10<sup>th</sup> grade; Academic Reading at 11<sup>th</sup> grade</b>
Math:	<b>Algebra I/Geometry block for students who have not passed Algebra I, with emphasis on manipulatives and kinesthetic approaches to math.</b>
Writing:	<b>Writing Essentials for 12<sup>th</sup> graders in need of support to write proficient Level V essays</b>
Science:	<b>Extended sessions to support students in writing FLR's.</b>
Credits:	<b>On line classes used for credit retrieval.</b>
Graduation Requirements	

### Sub-Group Analysis

Which school-wide sub-group/s creates opportunities for celebration or cause for concern (e.g. Gender, Ethnicity, ELL, Special Education, SES)? Please provide examples and explanations.

Our SPED students passed both Reading and Math. We believe this is partially attributable to good hiring decisions, to improved collaboration between SPED and general education and to attention to standards-based curriculum in SPED classes. We still need to focus on the rate of participation among our SPED students.

Our Hispanic students continue to struggle in Reading and Math. We need to give some thought to a sheltered math class and better assessment to determine innate abilities and level of education in a student's own language so that we can determine proper programming. We may also want to mount an education campaign for Hispanic parents on the value of a high school diploma.

It is difficult to determine where to place priorities and how to program for our SES population. Instinctively, we believe that these students may fall into other categories which form a focus for us, but because the information about the identity of these students is confidential, we cannot be certain.

### B. Perception Data Summary Reflection and Analysis

Year	Goal Area #1 From- To Percentage Teachers receive regular feedback.	Goal Area #2 From – To Percentage All students are consistently challenged by a rigorous curriculum.
2012	52% agreement	67% agreement
2011	57% agreement	69% agreement
2010	57% agreement	70% agreement

### Analysis of Perception Data

Why were these goal areas selected? What actions were taken to achieve these goals?

These are two of seven areas to score consistently below 70% agreement. We are pleased that most of the items on the Nine Characteristics Survey show a high level of agreement, particularly for a senior high school, but we are troubled by those on which we are struggling. We believe that the slight decrease over time in Goal Area #2 can be partially attributable to the increase in the number of SPED and 504 students and the knowledge about safety net placements the staff now has. There is a somewhat pervasive feel, among the staff who have been here a considerable amount of time, that we are not the same school we were several years ago, when our demographics tended toward upper middle class, white, and college-bound. While that feeling is certainly true in reality, we are still serving our highly motivated, high achieving students well AND we are serving students who struggle academically and who come to school without a great deal of resources well. It will be interesting to see if the percent of agreement on this goal changes with the influx of new staff.

On the first goal, we are frankly puzzled by the results. We have had discussions with staff about what “feedback” means, and while those discussions were inconclusive, we believe that some staff may still perceive this question to mean “recognition” or “reward” instead of feedback. Administrators were in classrooms often last year and provided written feedback to all staff after each visitation. Staff were invited to observe each other, and some staff participated in a critical friends group called the “3MOC” (3 minute observation club.) Staff reported positive feelings about these opportunities, and, in general, staff seem to be receptive to constructive criticism when they are evaluated. We will again try to ferret out the underlying attitude or beliefs in this question so that we know how to begin to address it.

**Part 2: Goals for 2012-13:** Due to DSS by November 16, 2012

**A. Performance Goals – statements (Current year’s work)**

Class of 2013														
	Reading		Math		Science		Writing		Graduation Requirements		Credits		On Time Graduation	
	Fr:	To:	Fr:	To:	Fr:	To:	Fr:	To:	Fr:	To:	Fr:	To:	Fr:	To:
N:	486	508	467	508	429	508	493	508	410	508	359	508	206	508
Percent	95%	100%	91%	100%	85%	100%	97%	100%	81%	100%	71%	100%	40%	100%

Class of 2014														
	Reading		Math		Science		Writing		Graduation Requirements		Credits		On Time Graduation	
	Fr:	To:	Fr:	To:	Fr:	To:	Fr:	To:	Fr:	To:	Fr:	To:	Fr:	To:
N:	444	468	413	416	407	416	450	473	446	478	345	411	53	478
Percent	97%	98%	86%	87%	85%	87%	98%	99%	93%	100%	72%	86%	11%	100%

Class of 2015 & 2016										
“Class of”	Reading		Writing		Math		Science		On Track with Credits	
	From:	To:	From:	To:	From:	To:	From:	To:	From:	To:
2015- 10 <sup>th</sup>	90%	97%	92%	97%	Alg.	Alg.	Bio:	Bio:	81%	90%
					92%	93%				
2016- 9 <sup>th</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	Alg.	Alg.	Bio:	Bio:	NA	NA
					74%	90%				
					Geo:	Geo:				
					62%	80%				
					23%	35%				

**Challenge Goal:**

Identify area	From	To
Hispanic Students’ Performance:		
Math	66.7%	70%
Reading	72.5%	74%

**Perception Goals:**

Year	Goal Area #1 From/To Percentage	Goal Area #2 From/To Percentage
2012-2013	<b><i>All students are consistently challenged by a rigorous curriculum.</i></b> From 67% agreement to 75% agreement.	<b><i>Teachers receive regular feedback on how they are doing.</i></b> From 52% agreement to 60% agreement.

## Process Summary

Highlight building-wide strategies to meet goals in reading, math, science, writing, graduation requirements, credits, and on-time graduation:
Safety net courses at 9 <sup>th</sup> and 10 <sup>th</sup> grades (blocked English/Social Studies); Academic Reading safety net at 11 <sup>th</sup> and Writing Essentials safety net at 12 <sup>th</sup> ; Alg/Geo block; Two tiered Advanced Algebra; COE sessions after school; Graduation Standards support seminars before school; Intense counselor and administrator intervention on students at risk; Staff mentoring; Staffings on students of concern; Intensive data collection and analysis for the purposes of Child Find; use on online resources for credit recovery.
Highlight use of technology to improve student learning:
Netbooks and Haiku, specifically used for formative assessment, research, communication; content-specific software; digital textbook resources for differentiation.
Highlight steps to involve staff, students, parents, families, and community in the CIP process:
All staff involved in data analysis and selection of appropriate goals; all staff involved in making explicit linkage between PLC goals and CIP. Family communication via monthly newsletter and in person at PTSA meetings.
Highlight process for progress monitoring, describing what assessments you will use throughout the year:
Data tracking of students identified as at risk; CBM's aligned with state testing; surveys to determine level of agreement on Nine Characteristics areas of focus.
Highlight strategies to address the PLC questions #3 and #4:
Focus on critical thinking and quality questioning in PLC goals; focus on differentiation strategies particularly by using technology and digital resources; focus in staff evaluations on these two areas; programmatic regrouping of Algebra 1 and AA students to provide intervention for struggling students; staff development on the teaching of reading to secondary students, particularly with regard to information texts; staff development on assessment systems, grading and common core state standards.



**Continuous Improvement Process Plan  
Explorer Community School CIP 2012-2013**

**Purpose:** The Continuous Improvement Process (CIP) plan provides opportunity for the school staff to reflect and analyze results from the previous year's SMART goals. The process uses the Planning, Learning, Implementation and Evaluation (PLIE) model, a Cycle of Inquiry, to improve learning for all students.

**Part 1: 2011-2012 Reflection Goals:**

**Data Summary, Reflection, and Analysis:**

<u>Class of 2020- current 5<sup>th</sup> graders</u>			
<b>2011-2012 SMART Goals</b>			
Reading	Math	Writing	
100%	91%	80%	

<b>Results:</b>							
Year	Reading		Math		Science	Writing	
	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	NA	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient
2012-4 <sup>th</sup>	25%	59%	33%	67%	NA	33%	67%
2011-3 <sup>rd</sup>	17%	75%	33%	42%	NA	NA	

<u>Class of 2021- current 4<sup>th</sup> graders</u>			
<b>2011-2012 SMART Goals:</b>			
Reading	Math		
91%	100%		

<b>Results:</b>						
Year	Reading		Math		Science	Writing
	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	Proficient	Exceeds Proficient	NA	NA
2012-3 <sup>rd</sup>	27%	64%	18%	82%	NA	NA



<b>Class of 2022- current 3<sup>rd</sup> graders</b>				
Year	EOY Reading DIBELS Benchmark	Math	Science	Writing
2012- 2 <sup>nd</sup>	91%	NA	NA	NA
2011- 1 <sup>st</sup>	91%	NA	NA	NA
2010- K	100%	NA	NA	NA

<b>Class of 2023- current 2<sup>nd</sup> graders</b>				
Year	EOY Reading DIBELS Benchmark	Math	Science	Writing
2012- 1 <sup>st</sup>	91%	NA	NA	NA
2011- K	91%	NA	NA	NA

<b>Class of 2024- current 1<sup>st</sup> graders</b>				
Year	EOY Reading DIBELS Benchmark	Math	Science	Writing
2012- K	NA	NA	NA	NA

## School-wide Analysis of Multiple Measures

Briefly explain school-wide systems used to improve student achievement in each of the following content areas:	
Reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structured independent reading at all grade levels</li> <li>• Guided Reading programs at all levels</li> <li>• Safety Net</li> <li>• Parent reading mentors</li> </ul>
Math:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IXL math</li> <li>• Math enrichment groups at all levels (parent supported)</li> <li>• Multiage math groups for extension and intervention</li> <li>• Mental math practice program</li> <li>• Safety Net</li> </ul>
Writing:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multiage “family” groups to develop and practice language arts skills</li> <li>• Inquiry research projects at all grade levels</li> <li>• Parent writing mentors</li> </ul>
Science:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applied science in the Explorer Garden and campus Wetlands</li> <li>• 4 week parent-led explorations program</li> </ul>

### Sub-Group Analysis

Which school-wide sub-group/s creates opportunities for celebration or cause for concern (e.g. Gender, Ethnicity, ELL, Special Education, SES)? Please provide examples and explanations.
<p><u>Celebrations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> grades students scored at or above standard on the MSP in all content areas.</li> <li>• Despite 6 students being identified at below standard in 4<sup>th</sup> grade writing, only 2 students did not pass the 4<sup>th</sup> grade writing MSP.</li> <li>• All but one 3<sup>rd</sup> grade student scored at or above standard on reading and math in the MSP.</li> <li>• 91% of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> grade students were identified at benchmark in the EOY DIBELS assessment.</li> </ul> <p><u>Cause for Concern:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The only subgroup that is not performing with the school-wide trend is students receiving Special Education services. The 7 students with IEPs at Explorer are the only students that were not at or above standard within any assessment data</li> </ul>

## Perception Data Summary, Reflection, and Analysis

Year	Goal Area #1 From- To Percentage	Goal Area #2 From – To Percentage
2012	#42: Teachers receive regular feedback on how they are doing. <i>Target: move from 61% To: 75%</i>	#29: Staff members trust one another. <i>Target: move from 60% to 80%</i>
2011	#42: Teachers receive regular feedback on how they are doing. <i>Target: move from 89% To: 95%</i>	#29: Staff members trust one another. <i>Target: move from 92% to 100%</i>
2010	Data not available	Data not available

### Analysis of Perception Data

Why were these goal areas selected? What actions were taken to achieve these goals?

*NOTE: Perception data and goals are developed and monitored in conjunction with Dickinson staff, and are not reflective of the staff only at Explorer.*

#### **2011-2012**

##### **Goal #1: Teacher Feedback**

- The goal was selected in conjunction with the shared RLC focus on improving classroom instruction through providing regular feedback to teachers.
- Efforts made to meet this goal:
  - Principal created system to monitor ICED protocol, including providing instant feedback to teachers via email from a tablet device
  - Renewed building focus on PGE process throughout the year, providing frequent check-ins by principal and support for growth from colleagues
  - Instructional Leadership Team created, developing regular accountability protocols around data and increased teacher collaboration. This created opportunities for peers to provide feedback to one another in addition to the Principal

##### **Results:**

9 Characteristics Survey indicates that we exceeded our goal, with 93% of teachers indicating that they receive regular feedback on how they are doing. This is a 32% increase over the previous year.

##### **Goal #2: Trust Among Staff**

- This goal was selected due to dramatic decline of trust among staff members as indicated in the 9 Characteristics Survey in the year prior to Administrative transition.
- Efforts made to meet this goal:
  - New Principal assigned to building, assessed need through 1 on 1 interviews
  - August LEAP staff retreat to Challenges Northwest to develop trust through teambuilding activities
  - Principal established building-wide systems and distributed leadership teams
  - Principal established clearly defined protocols, roles and structure for the staff

- Staff developed and monitored norms for all adults at school
- Principal provided multiple opportunities for all staff to provide feedback and input regarding interests and needs
- Staff made a united effort to increase the level of professionalism throughout all areas of their work

**Results:**

9 Characteristics Survey indicates that we exceeded our goal, with 86% of teachers expressing agreement that they trust one another. This is a 26% increase over the previous year.

**Part 2: Goals for 2012-13:**

**Performance Goals – Statements (Current year’s work)**

“Class of”	Reading		Math		Science	Writing
	From:	To:	From:	To:	Baseline	Baseline
2020- 5 <sup>th</sup>	86%	93%	100%	100%	86%	NA
2021 -4 <sup>th</sup>	93%	100%	100%	100%	NA	86%
2022- 3 <sup>rd</sup>	NA	100%	NA	100%	NA	NA
2023-2 <sup>nd</sup>	81%	88%	NA	NA	NA	NA
2024- 1 <sup>st</sup>	86%	100%	NA	NA	NA	NA
2025- K	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

**Challenge Goal:** This goal is to increase the percentage of students exceeding standard (from 3 to 4) on the MSP in grades 3, 4, and 5 in a particular content area.

Grades 3-5: Identify content area	From	To
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Reading	57%	71%
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math	79%	93%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade Math	15%	36%

**Perception Goals:**

Year	Goal Area #1 From/To Percentage	Goal Area #2 From/To Percentage
2012-2013	#27: Staff routinely work together to plan what will be taught  From: 75% To: 85%	#44: Teachers provide feedback to each other to help improve instructional practice  From: 72% To: 82%

## Process Summary

Highlight building-wide strategies to meet goals in reading, math, science and writing:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• “Families Project” to facilitate multiage learning opportunities</li><li>• Virtues Project to improve student culture and increase time focused on academics</li><li>• Guided Reading program at primary level</li><li>• Safety Net reading intervention</li><li>• Collaboration with grade level teams at Dickinson</li></ul>
Highlight use of technology to improve student learning:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Grade 1-5 Technology skill planning</li><li>• IXL math practice</li><li>• Teacher developed Haiku websites</li></ul>
Highlight steps to involve of staff, students, parents, families, and community:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Regular communication with families via teacher websites</li><li>• Monthly required parent meetings</li><li>• Parent volunteers in all areas of the school day</li></ul>
Highlight process for progress monitoring, describing what assessments you will use throughout the year:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Continuous formative assessment in core content areas</li><li>• Pre assessments to inform differentiation strategies and flexible grouping</li></ul>
Highlight strategies to address the PLC questions #3 and #4:
<p><i>Question #3: How will we respond if students do not learn?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Weekly PLC meetings with entire Explorer Team</li><li>• Safety Net intervention</li><li>• Parent mentors to support students below standard</li></ul> <p><i>Question #4: How will we respond if students already know what we want students to learn?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Enrichment groups for students above standard</li><li>• Utilize transfer of learning opportunities through project based learning</li><li>• School-wide Inquiry Projects</li><li>• Use higher level thinking questioning strategies</li></ul>

