



Snoqualmie Valley School District School Improvement Plan 2011-2012



Twin Falls Middle School

46910 S.E. Middle Fork Road
North Bend, WA 98045

Mission, Vision, Guiding Principals

The Snoqualmie Valley Middle Schools collectively developed the following mission statement:

Snoqualmie Valley Middle Schools are committed to a safe community environment in which all students will have the opportunity to experience intellectual, social, emotional and physical growth. *Focus on Academics ~Arts ~ Activities*

Twin Falls Middle School embraces the above mission and continues the process of sustaining a meaningful mission, vision and goals for our school community. The following statement provides meaning as we continue to positively impact student learning.

TFMS Mission Statement

TFMS is a safe, accepting, learning-community that prepares middle school students to be respectful, resourceful, educated citizens.

Based on..... Relationships, Relevance, Rigor

Our Background ~ Past, Present, Future

The beginning work of the TFMS staff was spent brainstorming all aspects of school culture hopes and dreams. We evaluated what works from our experiences and what we would like to do differently. The LIT team reviewed the shared thinking from staff members, grade level teams and focus teams. The following statement guides our school improvement planning. This statement and the indicators are reviewed throughout the year as we reflect on our data and practices.

TFMS Vision Statement

Twin Falls Middle School is an inclusive learning environment based on academic rigor, collaboration, and the belief that all students learn as they become active participants in their own education.

Indicators of vision implementation:

- Smiles on students and staff faces
- Partnerships form between students, teachers and parents
- Everyone feels safe and accepted
- A variety of learning opportunities is evident
- A belief and message that all can achieve their potential in words and actions
- High level of success/competence and every student is challenged





I. Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	3
	• <i>Guiding Principals of School Improvement Planning</i>	
II.	Description of School Community and Team Members	4-7
	• <i>Overview of (Name of School)</i>	
	• <i>Leadership/Planning Team Members</i>	
	• <i>Participating Stakeholders</i>	
	• <i>District Review Team Members</i>	
III.	School Portfolio	8-23
	• <i>Creating the Portfolio: Demographics, Achievement Data, Perception Data, Contextual Data</i>	
	• <i>School Data Collection</i>	
	1. <i>School Demographic Data</i>	
	2. <i>Student Achievement Data</i>	
	3. <i>Perceptual Data</i>	
	4. <i>Contextual Data</i>	
	5. <i>School Strengths</i>	
	6. <i>Areas of Opportunities</i>	
IV.	SMART Goals and Action Plans	25-72
	• <i>School Wide Goal 25-26</i>	
	• <i>Professional Learning Community Continuum 27-30</i>	
	• <i>Critical Issues for Team Consideration 31</i>	
	• <i>School Wide Action Plan 32-35</i>	
	• <i>Exploratory Goal and Action Plan 36-39</i>	
	• <i>6th Grade Goal and Action Plan 40-43</i>	
	• <i>7th Grade Goal and Action Plan 44-48</i>	
	• <i>8th Grade Goal and Action Plan 49-53</i>	
	• <i>Special Education 6~7~8 Goal and Action Plan 54-56</i>	
	• <i>Science, LA and Math Cohort Action Plans 56-62</i>	
	• <i>Instructional Assistants' Action Plan 63</i>	
	• <i>Intervention Goals and Action Plans 65-69</i>	
	• <i>Cultural Competency Goal and Action Plan 70-72</i>	
V:	School Improvement Budget Worksheet	73



I. Introduction

Guiding Principles of School Learning Planning..... In a Professional Learning Community

Certain key principles have guided the process and the development of the improvement plan.

- All members of a school staff, and representatives of as many other stakeholders as possible, should participate in the planning process.
- Participants should review a broad database that includes information about student achievement, demography, learning environment, and perceptions about the school.
- School improvement planning is a journey of continuous improvement, and the plan is a road map for an ongoing discourse on school improvement.
- The School Improvement document is only as good as the quality of thought that goes into it and the time and commitment that is given by everyone who has a stake in the plan.
- Regardless of the quality of the plan, the real improvement must occur in the classroom. Teachers must be willing to be reflective about their practice and tenacious in their attempts to fine-tune the art of teaching to meet the needs of every student.





II. Description of School Community

Briefly describe your school and community to provide a context for your school learning plan.

Overview of Twin Falls Middle School, established in 2008

Twin Falls Middle School is in its fourth school year and the following background information conveys how our school developed. Thin Falls Middle School was the final name selected from a list of over 500 submitted names. Twin Falls is one of the famous waterfalls of the Pacific Northwest. It is located near Twin Falls Middle School in *Twin Falls State Park*. Our school is surrounded by the beautiful Cascade Mountains, with wildlife abundantly sharing the environment with our school. Our school colors are Forest Green named after our surrounding green belt, Black representing our *Raven Mascot* and Silver the mighty Twin Falls.

The Raven is the most intelligent bird. It soars high above the trees. It is capable of aerial stunts. It acts in partnership. Raven calls can express tenderness, happiness, surprise, emotion or rage. Ravens display high learning ability and use of logic for solving problems. The Raven is the perfect mascot for Twin Falls Middle School. We kept this in mind as we developed our core beliefs about student learning. We expect our students to learn at high levels, be connected emotionally and socially to our school community and solve problems and challenges as individuals and in groups. Our goal is for students to be competent learners, respectful and productive citizens within our school culture.

As we continue the Twin Falls story, staff members select focus areas to share their expertise and interest in developing school wide practices. The focus areas included:

- **Culture** - addressing school wide **behavior** discipline, **recognition** practices.
- **Facility** – emergency preparedness, facility care and procedures
- **LIT** – focus on learning practices, mission, vision, beliefs guiding our work with students
- **Communication** – School wide systems to ensure school, PTSA and community connections
- **ASB** – advisors working with student leadership teams in merging of district middle schools
- **Extra-Curricular** – Coordinate coaches, advisors for TFMS programs

The focus team process allowed for collaboration with all school plans and processes. The focus teams contributed high energy with intentional planning, targeting student learning and engagement. We established the following attributes as we started our school year:

- 1) **Culture metaphors of Disneyland, The Circus, and Salty's Buffet to begin our vision work**
(Clear boundaries, focused teamwork, quality choices to engage students academically, emotionally and socially)
- 2) School Wide Love and Logic Discipline – based on relationships, choices and student problem solving
- 3) Intervention Model to address struggling students in relationships, academics, social needs
- 4) Collaborative grade level teams that structured themselves around Professional Learning Communities to address learning needs and activities to target instructional levels
- 5) Recognition addressing monthly character traits and habits of mind
- 6) Partner with the TFMS PTSA and district to connect the community to TFMS
- 7) Coordinating and organizing the school environment for staff and students
- 8) Establishment of an Instructional Response to Intervention school wide through TFMS, M-Th Enrichment Model
- 9) Integration of Technology throughout all curricular areas

We are continuing with our focus teams, with particular attention to collaboration and communication practices that will be the foundation of our Professional Learning Community.





C. District Review Team Members

List the names and titles of the District Review Team Members

Scott Hodgins, – Board of Directors

Name & Title

Date Review: _____

Carolyn Loudenback, President – Board of Directors

Name & Title

Date Review: _____

Marci Busby – Board of Directors

Name & Title

Date Review: _____

Dan Popp, Vice President – Board of Directors

Name & Title

Date Review: _____

Craig Husa – Board of Directors

Name & Title

Date Review: _____

Joel Aune – Superintendent

Name & Title

Date Review: _____

Don McConkey – Assistant Superintendent

Name & Title

Date Review: _____





III. School Portfolio

Creating a School Portfolio and Conducting a Comprehensive Assessment of Strengths and Areas of Concern

A. School Data Collection

1. Demographic Data

LIST NARRATIVES:

Twin Falls Middle School was a newly opened school in 2008, serving the students of the Snoqualmie Valley School District; specifically the North Bend Community. Our 578 students are distributed between sixth, seventh, and eighth grade. Our 6th grade has 188 Students, 7th has 196, and 8th has 194. Elementary feeder schools for Twin Falls Middle School include North Bend Elementary, Snoqualmie Elementary, and Opstad Elementary.

Our instructional team consists of 29 teachers supported by 8 instructional assistants, 2 custodians, one full-time counselor, and one half-time counselor. Also supporting the instructional team is an assistant principal and a principal. Our community support comes from an extremely involved PTSA. Supporting students in other ways are the half-time school nurse, part-time speech pathologist, and part-time Friends-of-Youth Counselor for support of mental health and addiction prevention.

- 578 Students presently enrolled in TFMS
- New Students (after completion of SIP Plan, 2011)
- 92.2% Caucasian/White
- 3.7% Hispanic/Latino
- .07% Black
- .07% American Indian/Alaska Native
- 1.6% Asian
- 1.2% Multi Racial
- 0.3% Unexcused absences
- 15% of our students are eligible for free and reduced lunch
- 12.8% are eligible to receive special education
- .04% qualify for ELL services
- Students from General Education receive tier two support in math, reading and organization
Enrichment/Intervention- 90 math, 64 reading, 8-25 organizational skills and 8-12 social skills. The remaining students receive enhanced enrichment in current events, science, IEP enrichment, art, band, keyboarding, public speaking, reader's theatre, engineering, STEM and Shakespeare.
- 211 Active PTSA members inclusive of parents and staff





Class size

	Average	Highest	Lowest	IA Support
8th	28	35	26	1.2
7th	25	36	18	2
6th	29	33	25	1.3
Exploratory	30	66	17	0
Spec. Ed.	6	14	1	5
Enrichment/ Intervention	19	49	1	All

Class Size Variables:

- 1) High level performers (class size higher/struggling student lower)
- 2) Collaborative Teaming Time
- 3) Extended opportunity for intervention support

2. Student Achievement Data:

LIST NARRATIVES:

Twin Falls Middle School Data Report based on 2010-2011 MSP Scores

At Twin Falls Middle School, we are using data to develop a broader understanding of student needs and to drive decisions to positively impact student learning. Present data is gathered from the 2010-2011 MSP scores and data from the three elementary schools (OES, NBES, and SES).

Our Primary goal at Twin Falls is to increase every student by one level in Reading, Writing and Math. The secondary goal at Twin Falls is to ensure that students who are at level 4 do not drop down to a level 3. Although these goals may seem lofty, we are setting a high standard. As a school community we believe that all students want, can, and will learn.

Student progress is also monitored through math competence assessments, district writing and district reading assessments, throughout the school year.

2010-2011 MSP

Strength narratives regarding 5th graders at NBE and OES (Current TFMS 6th graders):

- 80% of current 6th graders met standard on the Reading MSP in 2011
- 45% of current 6th graders scored at a level 4 of the Reading MSP in 2011
- Since 2006 SVSD has scored higher than the state on the Reading MSP (on average 10%)
- The gender gap has decreased from 2009 to 2011 by 8% at NBE, making it now even
- Students from NBE scored 7% higher than the state average on the 5th grade Math MSP in 2011
- From 4th to 5th grade, the number of students not passing the Math MSP went from 54% to 47%
- At Opstad there was a ~20% increase in the number of students who passed the Math MSP from 4th (2010) to 5th (2011) grade





Narratives in areas for growth regarding 5th graders at NBE and OES (Current TFMS 6th graders):

- 20% of current 6th graders did not meet standard on the Reading MSP in 2011
- 5% of current 6th graders scored a level 1 on the Reading MSP in 2011
- 15% of current 6th graders scored a level 2 on the Reading MSP in 2011
- The gender gap has changed from male dominance (at 12% in 2009) to female dominance (at 20% in 2011) in Reading at Opstad Elementary
- Students from Opstad scored 9% lower than the state on the 5th grade Math MSP in 2011
- 47% of students from Opstad did not pass the Math MSP in 2011 during 5th grade
- 0% of special needs students coming from Opstad passed the 5th grade Math MSP in 2011
- At NBE 39% of Free/Reduced students passed the 5th grade Math MSP

Regarding TFMS 6th graders in 2010-2011:

Strength narratives regarding 6th graders on the 2010-11 MSP (Current TFMS 7th graders):

- The 6th grade students in 2011 scored higher than the state in all reading strands
- The highest scoring reading strand was informational text at 80.2% for 6th grade students in 2011
- 162 students out of 202 students met standard on the 6th grade Reading MSP in 2011
- 17 students are within 9 points of meeting standard in grade 6 on the Reading MSP in 2011
- TFMS is 16% higher than state average in procedures and concepts in 2011 6th grade Math MSP

Narratives in areas for growth regarding 6th graders on the 2010-11 MSP (Current TFMS 7th graders):

- 2011 6th graders continue to score lower than the district in analysis and literary text
- Only 58.4% of 6th graders in 2011 passed geometric sense on the Math MSP (only 2% higher than the state average in that area)
- 62% of students passed problem solving and reasoning strand on the 6th grade Math MSP in 2011

We are surprised with the following results:

- Increase on Math MSP scores from 2010-2011

We are wondering about:

- During some years were different ethnicities not counted or did none of them pass?
- Same question for special needs kids
- CKMS did better in math... why? Demographics or curriculum?
- 6th grade math strand scores lower than district but 7&8 grade math scores are not. Because we had lower students last year? or do we need to change our practices?

A pattern we notice:

- Students coming from Opstad score lower than state
- Wider gender gap from Opstad than NBE

We feel good about the following:

- Math skill increased from 2010-2011 MSP
- Reading skill improvement 2010-2011 MSP

Areas for us to dig into:

- Geometric Sense



Regarding TFMS 7th graders in 2010-2011:

Strength narratives regarding 7th graders on the 2010-11 MSP (Current TFMS 8th graders):

- 78.3% of 7th grade students met or exceeded standard in Reading on the MSP in 2011
- 82% of 7th grade students met or exceeded standard in the literary strand of the 2011 MSP compared to 75.6% district wide
- TFMS 7th grade students scored higher than the average district score in every reading strand on the 2011 MSP
- 90 students scored at level 4 in Reading on the 2011 MSP
- 76.6% of 7th grade students met standard on the 2011 Math MSP
- 79.3% of 7th grade students met standard in number and algebraic sense on the 2011 Math MSP
- 71.2% of 7th grade students met standard in probability and statistics on the 2011 Math MSP
- TFMS 7th grade students scored higher than the average district score in every mathematics strand
- 67 - 7th grade students scored at level 3 in Math on the 2011 MSP
- 74 - 7th grade students scored at level 4 in Math on the 2011 MSP
- 28 - 7th grade students were within 12 points of level 4 in Math on the 2011 MSP
- 89.7% of 7th grade students met standard on the 2011 Writing MSP
- 112 out of 184 students scored at level 4 in Writing on the 2011 MSP

Narratives in areas for growth regarding 7th graders on the 2010-11 MSP (Current TFMS 8th graders):

- 21.7% of 7th grade students did not meet standard in Reading on the 2011 MSP
- 7 - 7th grade students scored at a level 1 in Reading on the 2011 MSP
- 32 - 7th grade students scored at a level 2 in Reading on the 2011 MSP
- 54 - 7th grade students scored at a level 3 in Reading on the 2011 MSP
- 17 - 7th grades students that scored at a level 2 in Reading on the 2011 MSP were within 10 points of meeting standard
- 65.5% of 7th grade students met standard in the comprehension strand on the 2011 MSP. Comprehension represents the lowest percentage of students meeting standard district wide.
- 67.2% of 7th grade students met standard in the informational text strand in Reading on the 2011 MSP
- 12 - 7th grade students scored at level 1 in Math on the 2011 MSP
- 31 - 7th grade students scored at level 2 in Math on the 2011 MSP
- 12 - 7th grade students were within 12 points of level 3 in Math on the 2011 MSP
- 11 - 7th grade students scored and 8 with 9 passing in Writing on the 2011 MSP
- In conventions on expository, 22 - 7th grade students scored at level 1 in Writing on the 2011 MSP
- 26 - 7th grade students scored at a level 1 in persuasive writing on the 2011 Writing MSP
- 16 - 7th grade students scored at a level 2 on COS in expository writing on the 2011 Writing MSP
- 7 - 7th grade students scored at a level 2 on COS in persuasive writing on the 2011 Writing MSP

We are surprised with the following results:

- Surprised and pleased to have exceeded expectations on the 2011 Math MSP by 6%
- Surprised at the number of level 4s in Writing on the 2011 MSP





We are wondering about:

- The impact of on-line testing vs. paper/pen
- When will writing be on-line
- What can we do to engage students during testing

A pattern we notice:

- TFMS consistently scores higher than district and state averages

We feel good about the following:

- Math, Science and Writing

Areas for us to dig into:

- How to improve probability and statistics scores in Math on the 2012 MSP
- How to move 2s to 3s on the 2012 MSP
- 7th grade Reading MSP scores

Student Potential:

- **ALL** students have potential and they will rise to meet whatever level of expectation we set for them
- We must meet students where they are, low or high, and develop ways to move them beyond what they may have thought possible - rigor

Regarding TFMS 8th graders in 2010-2011:

Strength narratives regarding 8th graders on the 2010-2011 MSP (Current MSHS 9th graders):

- TFMS 8th grade students scored approx.. 15 percentage points higher than the state
- TFMS 8th grade students are performing above or equal to SVSD 8th graders (2009-2011)
- TFMS 8th grade students are constantly above 80% passing in Reading on the MSP
- 85% passed Reading on the 2011 MSP
- Females consistently score (approx. 10%) higher than males
- TFMS consistently scores higher than the state in Math on the MSP
- 2010-2011 gain of approx. 9 percentage points
- On the 2011 MSP, 44% scored at level 4 and 33% scored at level 3 on the 2011 Math MSP
- 77% of 8th grade students passed the Math MSP in 2011 compared to __% in 2010 (Their cohort group had 66% pass in 6th grade and 77% pass in 8th grade on the Math MSP)
- The number of students in level 1 on the Math MSP has decreased by 9 percentage points
- From 2009-2011 the gender gap on the 8th grade Math MSP has closed – 2% difference in 2009/12% difference in 2010/equal in 2011
- On the 2011 Math MSP, 100% of 8th grade students met standard on the EOC
- On the 2011 Math MSP, 95% of 8th graders scored at a level 4 on the OEC and 5% scored at a level 3 on the OEC
- There is NO gender gap in algebra (EOC) on the 2011 Math MSP
- 2009-2011 TFMS students have scored higher than the state – 35% in 2009, 30% in 2010 and 27% in 2011
- 43% of special needs kids passed the 2011 Science MSP
- 80% of students on Free and Reduced Lunch passed the 2011 Science MSP
- In 2011, 88% of 8th grade students passed the Science MSP/ 47% at level 4 and 41% at level 3
- 2011 males outperformed the females on the 2011 Science MSP (males 88% and females 85%)





Narratives in areas for growth regarding 8th graders on the 2010-2011 MSP (Current MSHS 9th graders):

- In 2011, 64% of 8th grade students scored at level 4 on the Reading MSP, 21% at level 3, 11% at level 2 and 1% at level 1
- 4% increase in students passing in Reading from 2010-2011 on the MSP
- In the last 3 years females are scoring 90%, males are scoring 80% on the Reading MSP
- 15% of students are struggling to pass the 8th grade Reading MSP in 2011
- The number of students scoring a level 2 on the 2011 Math MSP has increased by 1 percentage point
- In 2011, 12 % of students did not pass the 8th grade Science MSP (level 1 and 2 combined)

We are surprised with the following results:

- We are increasingly working hard to improve student scores, regardless of how the state performs

A pattern we notice:

- High expectations are leading to the improvement of level 3 and level 4 scores, while reducing the number of level 1 and level 2 scores
- Presentation styles seem to be engaging to a more equitable group of students based on gender
- We feel that the EOC was an accurate measure of students' understanding because it only tested algebra concepts for the algebra standards
- Strong collaboration between grade level math teachers as well as most middle (6-8) level math teachers is a contributing factor in increased math scores
- District-wide science cohorts collaborate on a monthly basis to guide student learning and teacher pedagogy
- OEL Cycles to observe how students are learning and analyze for improvements across grade levels within school

We feel good about the following:

- We feel that the gain of the 9 percentage points is due to a better alignment of the curriculum to the state standards
- We also feel that the gain of the 9 percentage points is due to better scope and sequence throughout the middle grade levels
- We feel that extremely high expectations of all students allows them to be successful on the MSP
- Students with level 1 and level 2 scores have improved with IA support of small group pull-out and small group modifications and adaptations
- Within-grade-level collaboration was key with keeping students challenged and interested in what they were learning. Teachers were helping each other with his/her content expertise

Regarding TFMS 6th, 7th and 8th grade Special Education Students in 2010-2011:

Strength narratives regarding 6th, 7th and 8th grader Special Ed students on the 2010-2011 MSP

- 9% of the students who were 6th graders in 2010 passed the MSP math; as 7th graders, that same cohort passed at 30%
- Students who were 6th graders in 2010 passed the Reading MSP as 7th graders at the same percentage (23%)
- 19% of the students who entered 6th grade in 2008 passed the math 2009 MSP. 31% passed the math MSP in 7th grade, 31% passed the math MSP as 8th graders
- Of 7th graders who took the Reading MSP in 2011, 2 passed and 5 were at level 2





- Of 7th graders who took the Math MSP in 2011, 3 passed and 2 were at level 2
- Of 7th graders who took the Writing MSP in 2011, 5 passed and 7 were at level 2
- Of 6th graders who took the Reading MSP in 2011, 8 passed and 22 were at level 2
- Of 6th graders who took the Math MSP in 2011, 4 passed and 16 were at level 2
- In 2011, 45% of special education students passed the 7th grade Writing MSP*
- In 2011, 45% of special education students passed the 8th grade Science MSP*

*Progress note: in 2009 no TFMS special education 7th graders passed the WASL, but as 8th graders in 2010 5% passed the MSP. Compare this narrative to passing scores on writing and science test for 2011 MSP.

Narratives in areas for growth regarding 8th graders on the 2010-2011 MSP (Current MSHS 9th graders):

- Regarding the cohort group of students who entered 6th grade in 2008: in the 2009 Reading MSP, they passed at 29%; in 2010 they passed at 36%; in 2011 they passed at 22%
- Of 7th graders who took the Reading MSP in 2011, 5 were at level 1
- Of 7th graders who took the Math MSP in 2011, 7 were at level 1
- Of 6th graders who took the Reading MSP in 2011, 3 were at level 1
- Of 6th graders who took the Math MSP in 2011, 13 were at level 1

We are surprised with the following results:

- Uneven growth in reading
- Improved Science skills

We are wondering about:

- Did the criteria for scoring written part of MSP change at the state level? There was so much improvement in the writing scores.
- What kind of improvement will we begin to see now that we have researched basic curriculum

A pattern we notice:

- Students who have been at TFMS for all three years are improving their MSP test scores

We feel good about the following:

- Improvement in writing scores

Areas for us to dig into:

- Static math and reading scores
- We are piloting two curricula in Math – Saxon and Trans Math – which program is best for our student





3. Perceptual Data

National Center for School Leadership Survey Narratives

EXTRA-CURRICULAR INVOLVEMENT

Strengths

- 81% of TFMS students involved in clubs answered favorably when asked if they are satisfied with the overall quality of the school
- 96% of students at TFMS involved in athletics answered favorably when asked if they know how to behave while at school
- A higher percentage (67%) of music students take pride in their school than all other clubs, sports activities or the school as a whole

Growth Areas

- 29% of the TFMS students involved in student clubs at TFMS responded unfavorably when asked if bullying is not a problem at my school
- 76% of students involved in clubs at TFMS answered favorably to Q7 (I have at least one teacher or counselor, who knows me as a person) vs. on 51% of students NOT involved in extra-curricular activities

POSITIVE RELATIONSHIPS

Strengths

- Higher percentage (77%) of favorable responses at TFMS that feel teachers help with school work when needed compared to national (69%)/district (71%) responses
- 65% of TFMS students responded that at least one teacher or counselor, knows them as a person
- 83% of TFMS students report that their parents are well informed about their academic progress, compared to 74% district wide

Growth Area

- 8% decrease in students who felt teachers encouraged them to do well in school from 7th to 8th grade in 2010-2011
- Percentage of students who answered unfavorably to Q7 (at least 1 teacher/counselor who knows me as a person) has increased by 5% from 7th to 8th grade in 2011
- In regards to Q7 (at least 1 teacher/counselor who knows me as a person) 2010 19% of 6th graders answered unfavorably vs. 12% of 7th grade in 2011
- More 8th grade students do not agree that their parents are as well informed as compared to 6/7 in 2010 and 2011
- 8th grade students feel their parents are less informed about academics than 6/7 graders
- The TFMS and Snoqualmie Valley students report 10% less than national students that they get useful information about careers, colleges and other opportunities
- 35% of TFMS students report that no adult or counselor knows them as a person





Data Reflection

- Surprises: That more students aren't involved in extra-curricular activities
- Wondering About: Did the survey happen after the college ed presentation by the counselors
- Patterns: AS students become 8th graders they feel that teachers help and encourage them less
- Feel good about: We do a great job keeping our parents informed about the students progress
- Areas for us to dig into: Getting to know students individually

VOICE AND CHOICE

Strengths

- 71% of all TFMS students in 2010 and 2011 have a favorable response to teachers listening and responding to them
- 93% of students believe/understand getting an education is important. 2% greater than the national averages and from 2010
- 58% (2010) to 62% (2011) felt teachers provided learning choices
- 57% do believe teachers listen and accept student ideas and suggestions about classwork
- AS a school 73% of students feel they know where to go for help. 83% (of 2010 cohort) were strong in knowing where to get help

Growth Area

- 63% of TFMS 8th graders had a favorable response that teachers listen and respond to them
- 7% of students need help to believe/understand getting an education is important
- 49% of TFMS 8th graders provided them with choice decreased from 2010
- 43% of students scored teachers as listening and accepting ideas and suggestions unfavorably
- Student perceptions increased 10% from 7th to 8th grades in knowing where to get help (6% decrease in knowing how to get help with a problem)

Data Reflection

- Surprises: A decrease from 8th grade to 7th grade in teachers listening to and accepting ideas and suggestions
- Wondering About: 8th graders perception of less choice by the 10% decrease from 2010
- Patterns: Upward trend in 7th grade in voice and choice areas
- Feel good about: 93% of TFMS students believe getting and education is important. Over all students believe teachers listen and respond to them. 7th graders feel they know where to get help.
- Areas for us to dig into: Help students and teachers think about choice ideas, suggestions about classwork





FLEXIBLE TEACHING STYLES

Strengths

- 43% of TFMS students feel their teachers do a very good job making their lesson materials interesting for their student, this is higher than both the national and district average
- 38% of TFMS students rated their teachers as being very familiar with how they learn best, which is 10% higher than the national/district averages
- 83% of TFMS students feel that their teachers do a good job of aligning their lesson to most students' learning styles
- 78% of TFMS students report they feel they are given opportunity to work in group task oriented activities as well as 72% reporting hands-on learning activities as parts of the curriculum

Growth Area

- Though approx. 50% of TFMS students feel strongly that teachers lessons are aligned with most students learning styles, only 28% feel strongly that teachers have aligned their lessons to match their personal learning style
- There appears to be a downward trend from 2010-2011 in how students at TFMS perceive their teachers matching their lessons to a student's personal learning style as shown by shifting averages from favorable to unfavorable (though the shift is relatively small at this point) This is interesting since the opposite trend is shifting in student's believing that teachers are better aligning lessons for "most students" for the same period

Data Reflection

- Surprises: TFMS consistently scored higher regarding flexibility in teaching style than either the district average or the national average in all areas
- Wondering About: Why our students would feel teachers are doing a very good job aligning their lessons to the learning style of most students but not as good of a job of aligning to them personally, and yet still rate their teachers high on knowing how they learn
- Patterns: Current pattern shows a downward trend in students feeling the lessons are best suited to their personal learning style as shown on Q33 comparing 2010 data to 2011
- Feel good about: How TFMS is doing compared with other middle schools in our district and across the nation in the area of flexible learning styles
- Areas for us to dig into: How students perceive themselves as learners. If they feel their teachers are doing a good job on knowing how they learn best, matching lessons to learning style of most students and in making lessons interesting, why do they feel lessons are not as well suited to their learning style?

SCHOOL CLIMATE

School Satisfaction

Strengths

- Increase in satisfaction with the quality of their school from 2010-2011
- According to 94% of TFMS students - most students know how to behave at school
- 72% of students at TFMS are satisfied with the overall quality of the school v. district wide
- 70% of TFMS students feel they are treated fairly by adults compared to 64% district wide





Growth Area

- Fewer 8th graders are satisfied with the quality of their school as they were in 7th grade (2010-60% satisfied vs. 2011-58% satisfied)
- Fewer 8th graders feel they are treated fairly at school by an adult as they were in 7th grade (2010-70% vs. 2011-65%)
- 29% of 8th graders in 2011 strongly disagreed with taking pride in their school
-

Safe at School/Bullying

Strengths

- 79% of TFMS students feel safe at school
- 24% of TFMS students vs. 32% of district students see bullying as a problem
- 24% of TFMS students vs. 35% of students nationally see bullying as a problem
- The 2011 8th graders at TFMS who saw bullying as a problem decreased by 20%

Growth Area

- 24% view bullying as a problem at TFMS
- 21% of TFMS students don't feel safe at school
- 30% of our students don't feel that they are treated fairly by adults

Data Reflection

- Surprises: Increase in negativity from 7th to 8th grade
- Wondering About: The time of year that the survey is taken
- Patterns: Decrease in school satisfaction from 7th to 8th grade but increase from 6th to 7th grade
- Feel good about: Students stated that they know how to behave (current 8th grade)
- Areas for us to dig into: Do we need to be clearer on the rules or expectations?

FEEDBACK AND GOAL SETTING

Academic Expectations

Strengths

- 80% of TFMS students understand our expectations compared to 72% on district and national responses

Growth Area

- Only 55% of TFMS students reported favorably to setting academic goals and track their progress towards those goals





Communicating Academic Expectations to Individual Students

Strengths

- 99% of last year's 7th grade students responded favorably to understanding the academic expectations that the school has for them

Growth Area

- 47% of TFMS students did not respond favorably that teachers provide them with specific input on how I am performing in school

Tracking Progress toward Goals

Strengths

- 56% of TFMS students respond favorably that teachers provide me with useful suggestions on how I can improve academically, which is 8% higher than the district response

Growth Area

- 61% of last year's 8th grade responded unfavorably or neutrally to setting and tracking academic goals
- 66% of TFMS students responded favorably that "the school challenges me to reach specific academic goals"
- 30% of TFMS students did not respond favorably to knowing how they performed on the most recent state standardized tests

Data Reflection

- Surprises: 89% of this year's 7th graders understand the academic expectations compared to 78% of the previous year's 7th graders
- Wondering About: Q24, concerning teachers providing students with specific input on how they are performing in school, low because students check their performance on line instead of teachers telling them
- Patterns: Last year's 8th graders seem to have responded unfavorably to many of the engagement questions than the other grade levels
- Feel good about: The number of favorable responses that are higher than district and national results
- Areas for us to dig into: Continue with academic goal setting

ENGAGED LEARNING

Strengths

- 69% of TFMS students responded favorable that the work they do at school challenges them vs. 61% state and district
- 82% of TFMS students responded neutral or favorable that school work requires them to think about how various topics relate to real-life situations
- 90% of TFMS students responded neutral or favorable that teachers require students to do more than memorize facts and figures; students must fully understand topics and concepts in order to do well on tests





Growth Area

- 24% of TFMS students responded unfavorably that students in their classes are engaged learners
- Only 37% of TFMS students responded unfavorably that they are very interested in my school work
- Only 35% of TFMS students responded favorably that they are engaged in learning

Data Reflection

- Surprises: 35% of students in my classroom are engaged in learning
- Wondering About: Why did students respond less favorably to lesson that really engage students (Q27) compared to feeling challenged in school (Q28)
- Patterns: Students at TFMS are more engaged in school than the district responses
- Feel good about: Students feel school is challenging and teachers use variety in their lessons and not just memorizing facts
- Areas for us to dig into: How to increase students interest in school work

4. Contextual Data

LIST NARRATIVES:

- 7 of our teaching staff have 1-5 years of classroom experience
- 17 have 6-15 years of classroom experience
- 9 are veteran teachers with 16+ years of experience
- Student population is made up from the North Bend Community
- All staff trained in the tenants of Love and Logic with agreed upon School Wide Beliefs and Common Classroom Expectations
- Recognition team developed common beliefs, activities that is student centered and addresses the diversity of all students
- Grade Level Teams meet daily to review learning targets, student needs and collaborative practices that promotes team building and common instructional expectations
- All staff participates in one or more collaborative teams to provide creativity, problem solving, school wide direction, and a focus to improve student learning and belonging within the school community
- Curriculum Cohorts (LA, Science, Math & Special Ed) for grades 6-7-8 meet monthly
- We encourage every TFMS student to be involved in at least one extra-curricular activity ie: homework club, athletics, community service clubs, the arts (art club, cooking club, talent show and drama club), and science/environmental/technical clubs. By the end of the 2011-12 school year, we estimate that about 175 students will have participated in clubs and 400 will have participated in sports.
- Intentional efforts are made to maintain and encourage our “green” school, providing recycling opportunities for our student body
- Student leadership; ASB coordinates student body service and school wide spirit. Leadership opportunities for all students through spirit crew and ASB events.
- 2nd Annual Read/Walk/Run-a-thon resulting in over \$11,000 collected for our ASB
- Students lead the daily Pledge and share in making morning announcements.
- Student Store provides real-world learning opportunities for TFMS students
- Student-led assemblies (both spirit and cultural focus)





- Cultural Competency program incorporated into our Recognition team
- Service learning is captured as community needs surface, Key Club Directed or initiated in classes.
- 275 students involved in the band/choir program
- Establishment of an intervention model (team consists of administration, school counselors, Friends of Youth and school psychologist, who collaborate to develop Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions to best meet the academic and behavioral needs of struggling learners). We also provide common enrichment time for all students with all staff participating in small and large groups.
- Weekly electronic communication from the office staff and PTSA to our parent community
- Life Skills program to provide real-life skills for our special needs students
- School-wide recognition including Raven grams and monthly character traits.
- Exploratory programs include public art displays throughout the school, student technology projects and support; band/choir contributions through assemblies, concerts, competitions; physical education fitness and health classes for all students
- PTSA membership and participation is evident throughout the day, evening socials/dances and through a commitment to raise funds for the Twin Falls Wish List to support student learning and activities
- TFMS has 33-60 Natural Helpers trained and providing leadership to peers and school-wide events
- Foundation Grant awarded to Natural Helpers Program, Band/Choir, Technology Tools and Professional Development supporting Math program
- All staff involved in RTI training to support diverse learning needs of students
- Friends of Youth Grant providing emotional and academic support
- Title 1 funding supporting interventions for struggling learners
- Community Service Programs including: National disaster relief, clothing bank, food bank in North Bend Community and US Troop Support, etc.
- First Parent Math Night attended by 100+ parents from TFMS and the community to learn about math pathways, resources and Q&A about math program
- 7th grade book study with parent and staff and community members leading about 44 different groups of students on Fridays from January 2010 – April 2011.
- All students participate in highly engaged science labs
- We have our first all-school Science Fair planned for April 2012

5. Summary of Twin Falls Middle School's Strengths

LIST STRENGTHS:

We have set up Professional Learning Communities throughout our school. The different teams are as follows: Grade Level Interdisciplinary Teams, Cross Graded Cohort Teams (Math, Science Language Arts), Learning Improvement Team, Recognition & Behavior Teams, Intervention Team, RTI Team and Special Education Team. Each of these teams will collect data; both perceptual data and targeted academic common assessments, grade performance through progress reports and formative assessments will be monitored.



MSP Achievements

Strength narratives regarding 5th graders at NBE and OES (Current TFMS 6th graders):

- 80% of current 6th graders met standard on the Reading MSP in 2011
- 45% of current 6th graders scored at a level 4 of the Reading MSP in 2011
- Since 2006 SVSD has scored higher than the state on the Reading MSP (on average 10%)
- The gender gap has decreased from 2009 to 2011 by 8% at NBE, making it now even
- Students from NBE scored 7% higher than the state average on the 5th grade Math MSP in 2011
- From 4th to 5th grade, the number of students not passing the Math MSP went from 54% to 47%
- At Opstad there was a ~20% increase in the number of students who passed the Math MSP from 4th (2010) to 5th (2011) grade

Strength narratives regarding 6th graders on the 2009-10 MSP (Current TFMS 7th graders):

- The 6th grade students in 2011 scored higher than the state in all reading strands
- The highest scoring reading strand was informational text at 80.2% for 6th grade students in 2011
- 162 students out of 202 students met standard on the 6th grade Reading MSP in 2011
- 17 students are within 9 points of meeting standard in grade 6 on the Reading MSP in 2011
- TFMS is 16% higher than state average in procedures and concepts in 2011 6th grade Math MSP

Strength narratives regarding 7th graders on the 2009-10 MSP (Current TFMS 8th graders):

- 78.3% of 7th grade students met or exceeded standard in Reading on the MSP in 2011
- 82% of 7th grade students met or exceeded standard in the literary strand of the 2011 MSP compared to 75.6% district wide
- TFMS 7th grade students scored higher than the average district score in every reading strand on the 2011 MSP
- 90 students scored at level 4 in Reading on the 2011 MSP
- 76.6% of 7th grade students met standard on the 2011 Math MSP
- 79.3% of 7th grade students met standard in number and algebraic sense on the 2011 Math MSP
- 71.2% of 7th grade students met standard in probability and statistics on the 2011 Math MSP
- TFMS 7th grade students scored higher than the average district score in every mathematics strand
- 67 - 7th grade students scored at level 3 in Math on the 2011 MSP
- 74 - 7th grade students scored at level 4 in Math on the 2011 MSP
- 28 - 7th grade students were within 12 points of level 4 in Math on the 2011 MSP
- 89.7% of 7th grade students met standard on the 2011 Writing MSP
- 112 out of 184 students scored at level 4 in Writing on the 2011 MSP

Strength narratives regarding 8th graders on the 2009-10 MSP (Current MSHS 9th graders):

- TFMS 8th grade students scored approx.. 15 percentage points higher than the state
- TFMS 8th grade students are performing above or equal to SVSD 8th graders (2009-2011)
- TFMS 8th grade students are constantly above 80% passing in Reading on the MSP
- 85% passed Reading on the 2011 MSP
- Females consistently score (approx. 10%) higher than males
- TFMS consistently scores higher than the state in Math on the MSP
- 2010-2011 gain of approx. 9 percentage points
- On the 2011 MSP, 44% scored at level 4 and 33% scored at level 3 on the 2011 Math MSP
- 77% of 8th grade students passed the Math MSP in 2011 compared to ___% in 2010 (Their cohort group had 66% pass in 6th grade and 77% pass in 8th grade on the Math MSP)





- The number of students in level 1 on the Math MSP has decreased by 9 percentage points
- From 2009-2011 the gender gap on the 8th grade Math MSP has closed – 2% difference in 2009/12% difference in 2010/equal in 2011
- On the 2011 Math MSP, 100% of 8th grade students met standard on the EOC
- On the 2011 Math MSP, 95% of 8th graders scored at a level 4 on the OEC and 5% scored at a level 3 on the OEC
- There is NO gender gap in algebra (EOC) on the 2011 Math MSP
- 2009-2011 TFMS students have scored higher than the state – 35% in 2009, 30% in 2010 and 27% in 2011
- 43% of special needs kids passed the 2011 Science MSP
- 80% of students on Free and Reduced Lunch passed the 2011 Science MSP
- In 2011, 88% of 8th grade students passed the Science MSP/ 47% at level 4 and 41% at level 3
- 2011 males outperformed the females on the 2011 Science MSP (males 88% and females 85%)

6. Twin Falls Middle School Prioritized Areas of Opportunities.

Narratives in areas for growth regarding 5th graders at NBE and OES (Current TFMS 6th graders):

- 20% of current 6th graders did not meet standard on the Reading MSP in 2011
- 5% of current 6th graders scored a level 1 on the Reading MSP in 2011
- 15% of current 6th graders scored a level 2 on the Reading MSP in 2011
- The gender gap has changed from male dominance (at 12% in 2009) to female dominance (at 20% in 2011) in Reading at Opstad Elementary
- Students from Opstad scored 9% lower than the state on the 5th grade Math MSP in 2011
- 47% of students from Opstad did not pass the Math MSP in 2011 during 5th grade
- 0% of special needs students coming from Opstad passed the 5th grade Math MSP in 2011
- At NBE 39% of Free/Reduced students passed the 5th grade Math MSP

Narratives in areas for growth regarding 6th graders on the 2009-10 MSP (Current TFMS 7th graders):

- 2011 6th graders continue to score lower than the district in analysis and literary text
- Only 58.4% of 6th graders in 2011 passed geometric sense on the Math MSP (only 2% higher than the state average in that area)
- 62% of students passed problem solving and reasoning strand on the 6th grade Math MSP in 2011

Narratives in areas for growth regarding 7th graders on the 2009-10 MSP (Current TFMS 8th graders):

- 21.7% of 7th grade students did not meet standard in Reading on the 2011 MSP
- 7 – 7th grade students scored at a level 1 in Reading on the 2011 MSP
- 32 – 7th grade students scored at a level 2 in Reading on the 2011 MSP
- 54 – 7th grade students scored at a level 3 in Reading on the 2011 MSP
- 17 – 7th grades students that scored at a level 2 in Reading on the 2011 MSP were within 10 points of meeting standard
- 65.5% of 7th grade students met standard in the comprehension strand on the 2011 MSP. Comprehension represents the lowest percentage of students meeting standard district wide.





- 67.2% of 7th grade students met standard in the informational text strand in Reading on the 2011 MSP
- 12 – 7th grade students scored at level 1 in Math on the 2011 MSP
- 31 – 7th grade students scored at level 2 in Math on the 2011 MSP
- 12 – 7th grade students were within 12 points of level 3 in Math on the 2011 MSP
- 11 – 7th grade students scored and 8 with 9 passing in Writing on the 2011 MSP
- In conventions on expository, 22 – 7th grade students scored at level 1 in Writing on the 2011 MSP
- 26 – 7th grade students scored at a level 1 in persuasive writing on the 2011 Writing MSP
- 16 – 7th grade students scored at a level 2 on COS in expository writing on the 2011 Writing MSP
- 7 – 7th grade students scored at a level 2 on COS in persuasive writing on the 2011 Writing MSP

Narratives in areas for growth regarding 8th graders on the 2009-10 MSP (Current MSHS 9th graders):

- In 2011, 64% of 8th grade students scored at level 4 on the Reading MSP, 21% at level 3, 11% at level 2 and 1% at level 1
- 4% increase in students passing in Reading from 2010-2011 on the MSP
- In the last 3 years females are scoring 90%, males are scoring 80% on the Reading MSP
- 15% of students are struggling to pass the 8th grade Reading MSP in 2011
- The number of students scoring a level 2 on the 2011 Math MSP has increased by 1 percentage point
- In 2011, 12 % of students did not pass the 8th grade Science MSP (level 1 and 2 combined)





Mission and Vision

- **100% of our staff believes colleagues are willing to work at creating a “Great School” centered around professional learning communities focusing on:**
 1. *What do we want students to know? (GLE & Power Targets)*
 2. *How do we know if they have learned? Formative & Summative Assessments*
 3. *What are we going to do if they have not learned it? Intervention/Differentiation*
 4. *What are we going to do if they have already learned it? Enrichment*

Indicators:

- **Staff believes we collaborate to improve student learning**
- **Staff, students and parents believe the school is orderly and safe**
- **Staff believes there is a clear and shared mission/vision of Twin Falls Middle School**
- **Students clearly understand the daily learning targets**
- **Staff, students and parents believe students are productively engaged in learning**
- **Evidence of Relationships, Relevance and Rigor through school community**

IV. Developing SMART Goals Worksheet.

SMART Goal Criteria:

S – Specific and clearly stated

M – Measurable and based on formative and/or summative data

A – Attainable and realistic

R – Related to student achievement and performance

T – Time Bound

School Wide Goal: Collaboration & Communication ~ Year 4

100% of our staff believes we can collaborate at the Sustaining Stage on the PLC Continuum

Areas for Learning & Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each team identify collaborative practices that focus on student learning needs • Application of a shared mission, vision, beliefs about student learning • Consistent school wide expectations on behavior, learning performance • Special Education Team Collaboration and Planning • Intervention Team Model Addressing Struggling Learners • LIT coordinate collaboration focused around learning activities for staff • Instructional Assistants collaborative work with each other and teams to improve student learning. • District meetings and building instructional planning • Identify daily, monthly and trimester learning targets/objectives published for students • SharePoint Sites updated daily for students, homework support and parent communication • Taking team collaborative time to the next levels---Daily PLC Time • Review formative and summative data to set up school improvement activities by team and common cohorts • RTI • Instructional Model Implementation (Learning Targets/Student Engagement) • Technical Integration • Implementation of I-5 Instructional Framework • School wide read and analysis of <i>The Highly Engaged Classroom</i> by Marzano and Pickering
---	--



The Professional Learning Community Continuum

Element of a PLC	Pre-Initiation Stage	Initiation Stage	Developing Stage	Sustaining Stage
<p>Mission: It is evident that learning for all is our core purpose?</p>	<p>No effort has been made to engage faculty in identifying what they want students to learn or how they will respond if students do not learn. School personnel view the mission of the school as teaching rather than learning.</p>	<p>An attempt has been made, typically by the central office, to identify learning outcomes for all grade levels or courses, but this attempt has not impacted the practice of most teachers. Responding to students who are not learning is left to the discretion of individual teachers.</p>	<p>Teachers are clear regarding the learning outcomes their students are to achieve. They have developed strategies to assess student mastery of these outcomes, they monitor the results and they attempt to respond to students who are not learning.</p>	<p>Learning outcomes are clearly articulated to all stakeholders in the school, and each student's attainment of the outcomes is carefully monitored. The school has developed systems to provide more time and support for students experiencing initial difficulty in achieving the outcomes. The practices, programs, and policies of the school are continually assessed on the basis of their impact on learning. Staff members work together to enhance their effectiveness in helping students achieve learning outcomes.</p>
<p>Shared Vision: Do we know what we are trying to create?</p>	<p>No effort has been made to engage faculty in describing preferred conditions for their school.</p>	<p>A vision statement has been developed for the school, but most staff are unaware of or unaffected by it.</p>	<p>Staff members have worked together to describe the school they are trying to create. They have endorsed this general description and feel a sense of ownership in it. School improvement planning and staff development initiatives are tied to the shared vision.</p>	<p>Staff members routinely articulate the major principles of the shared vision and use those principles to guide their day-to-day efforts and decisions. They honestly assess the current reality in their school and continually seek effective strategies for reducing the discrepancies between the conditions described in the vision statement and their current reality.</p>



The Professional Learning Community Continuum

Element of a PLC	Pre-Initiation Stage	Initiation Stage	Developing Stage	Sustaining Stage
<p>Clarity regarding what students must know and be able to do</p> <p>Daily learning targets to focus students engagement</p>	<p>There has been little effort to establish a common curriculum for students. Teachers are free to determine what they will teach and how long they will teach it.</p>	<p>District leaders have established curriculum guides that attempt to align the district curriculum with state standards. Representative teachers may have assisted in developing the curriculum guides. The materials have been distributed to each school, but there is no process to determine whether the designated curriculum is actually being taught.</p>	<p>Teachers have worked with colleagues to review state standards and district curriculum guides. They have attempted to clarify the meaning of the standards, establish pacing guides, and identify strategies for teaching the content effectively.</p>	<p>Teachers have worked in collaborative teams to build shared knowledge regarding state standards, district curriculum guides, trends in student achievement, and expectations of the next course or grade level. As a result of this collective inquiry, teachers have established the essential learning for each unit of instruction and are committed to instruct their students in the essential learning for each unit of instruction and are committed to instruct their students in the essential learning according to the team's agreed-upon pacing guide. They know the criteria they will use in judging the quality of student work, and they practice applying those criteria until they can do so consistently. They demonstrate a high level of commitment to the essential curriculum, to their students, and to their teammates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6th Rubrics/ThinkMarks • 7th-Projects/Rubrics • 8th-Targets & Assessments • X-Team-Curriculum Mapping and targets



The Professional Learning Community Continuum

Element of a PLC	Pre-Initiation Stage	Initiation Stage	Developing Stage	Sustaining Stage
<p>Collaborative Teams of teachers focus on issues that directly impact student learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SIOP/Glad • The Highly Engaged Classroom • Relevance & Rigor • Assessment 	<p>There is no systematic plan in place to assign staff members to teams or provide them with time to collaborate. Teachers work in isolation with little awareness of the strategies, methods, or materials used by their colleagues.</p>	<p>Some structures have been put into place for teachers who may be interested in collaborating. Teachers are encouraged but not required to participate. Topics tend to focus on matters other than classroom instruction and student learning.</p>	<p>Time has been provided during the contractual day for teachers to work together in teams on a regular basis (at least once a week). Guidelines have been established in an effort to ensure staff members use collaborative time to address topics that will impact instruction. Teams are attempting to develop positive relationships and implement specific procedures, but they may not be convinced the collaborative team process is beneficial. Leaders of the school are seeking ways to monitor the effectiveness of the teams.</p>	<p>Self-directed teams represent the primary engine of continuous improvement in the school. Team members are skillful in advocacy and inquiry, hold each other accountable for honoring the commitments they have made to one another, consistently focus on the issues that are most significant in improving student achievement, and set specific measurable goals to monitor improvement. The collaborative team process serves as a powerful form of job-embedded staff development, helping both individual members and the team in general become more effective in helping students learn at high levels. Staff members consider their collaborative culture vital to the effectiveness of their school.</p>





Critical Issues for Team Consideration

Team Name: _____

Team Members: _____

Use the scale below to indicate the extent to which each of the following statements is reflective of your team.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Emerging

Evolving

Arriving

1. ___ We have identified team norms and protocols to guide us in working together.
2. ___ We have analyzed student achievement data and have established SMART goals that we are working interdependently to achieve.
3. ___ Each member of our team is clear on the Curriculum Standards of our course in general as well as the Power Standards of each unit.
4. ___ We have identified course content and/or topics that can be eliminated so we can devote more time to essential curriculum.
5. ___ We have agreed on how to best sequence the content of the course and have established pacing guides to help students achieve the intended learning targets.
6. ___ We have created instruments to assess whether students have the prerequisite knowledge and skills.
7. ___ We have developed common summative assessments that help us assess the strengths and weaknesses of our program.
8. ___ We have agreed on the criteria we will use in judging the quality of student work related to the essential learnings of our course, and we practice applying those criteria to ensure consistency.
9. ___ We have taught students the criteria we will use in judging the quality of their work and have provided them with examples.
10. ___ We evaluate our adherence to and the effectiveness of our team norms at least twice each year.
11. ___ We use the results of our common assessments to assist each other in building on strengths and addressing weaknesses as part of a process of continuous improvement designed to help students achieve at higher levels.
12. ___ We use the results of our common assessments to identify students who need additional time and support to master essential learnings, and we work within the systems and processes of the school to ensure they receive that support.
13. ___ We take time to observe other classrooms: inside our subject area, outside our subject area and outside our team.





ACTION PLANS

School Wide Collaboration

School Improvement Goal #1: 100% of the TFMS staff believes we collaborate at the sustaining stage as indicated on the PLC Continuum to improve student learning.

Strategy: Grade level teams, cross graded teams, building focus teams, district cohort groups work on common practices and consistent language to improve student learning. **Guiding Questions:**

1) What do we want students to know? 2) How do we know when they have learned it? 3) What will we do if they have not learned? 4) What do we do if they have already learned it?

Rationale: Teams will base collaboration on *Relationships, Relevance and Rigor* in common expectations at team level and common practices in common content areas to ensure learning consistency and retention of learning.

Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur?</i> <i>What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
Building leadership teams focusing on school wide culture practices: LIT Behavior Recognition Facilities Communication Budget RTI	Professional Learning Communities Review Understanding Behavior Styles...Achieving Results Through Effective Relationships Developing team agreements and norms for collaboration Use SPACE Brain Strategies to increase student engagement Response to Intervention training Learning Target Identification to increase student learning	Sept. Initiate Continue Implementation throughout the year Sept.-Dec.	Instruction for All Students Love and Logic DVD/Books Professional Learning Communities	Ruth & Marty LIT Team reps Behavior team reps Recognition team reps Facilities team reps Communication-Connie S. and team communicators	Team minutes & feedback PLC Continuum Audit (PLC) Critical Issues for Team Consideration-reflection Student Discipline Student Attendance Progress Report Data End of Year Review





Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur?</i> <i>What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
Daily Common Grade Level PLC Time <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teamwork Communication of common expectations • Identifying struggling students and interventions • Mapping the Curriculum • Identify Learning Targets • Common Assessments • Recognition-Raven Grams • Unit Development 	Unit Planning –Mapping Differentiation Common Rubrics/Assessments Struggling Student Tier 1 and Tier 2 Interventions	September-June	Teaming to the Next Levels Professional Growth/Clock Hours for unit developments Common Planning Times to identify learning targets lessons and pace in common curricular and with interdisciplinary planning	Each Team Member	Team Minutes Feedback PLC Continuum per Team Visibility of curriculum mapping and electronic documentation
Observe other classrooms: inside our subject area, outside our subject area and outside our team	All Teams to observe	Sept. – June	Ruth & Marty Instructional Rounds	LIT Team Teaching Teams	LIT Update Critical Issues for Team Consideration item #13
Math and Science Cohort-Cross Graded <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignments • Common Practices • Parent Evening • Interventions 	Struggling Students Strategies Differentiation using strand levels for levels 1 & 2 students Manipulative-How to Exam View – Electronic assessments Small Group Instruction Strategies Highly Engaged Classroom	Building Time Professional Growth Opportunities	TOSA and Tech Support Math Articles Webinars Training Tools George, Dave B. Dawn F., Carolyn Katrina OEL Training I Can Learn	LIT Team – Math Cohort Science Cohort	Feedback Summary of accomplishments Progress Report Checks Common Assessments





Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur?</i> <i>What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
Language Arts Cohort 6-7-8 Reading and Writing Reading Review (needs assessments) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignments • Common Practices • Interventions 	Differentiation Strategies in reading	Building Time Professional Growth Opportunities	Ruth and Marty Training Materials ASCD NMSA District Office Teaching and Learning Comp. Tool Kit Nine Reasons to Read	Ruth and Marty LIT Team	LIT Team Teacher Feedback Student Feedback ARI MSP Reading RAI Results
Special Education 6-7-8 Teacher collaboration in building and with district Establish target goals and strategies to improve student progress in reading, writing and math	Meet 5-8 times a year District resources Differentiation Language	Oct. – June	District Office Training materials Language	Judy West Joe Brazier Susie Martin Rose Wildes Judy Clark	LIT Team report Student progress Data MSP Assessments in writing, math and reading
School wide Culture – Service Learning Natural Helpers	Service learning School models	Oct. – June	other schools’ implementation	Ruth and Marty Recognition Team Independent Classes Key Club Natural Helpers	Monthly check Recognition Team
Exploratory Team Collaboration Integration Planning/Goal setting Enrichment	Exploratory Team Model Curriculum Mapping How to Integrate	Oct. – June	PLC Teaming to the next level	Ruth and Marty LIT Team X-team: Matt Wenman Jana Mabry Robby Moore Jim Ullman Austin Bachelder Dave Weller	Feedback LIT report





Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur? What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
Intervention Collaboration to identify and support struggling students Skill Based Instruction Goal Setting (Navigation) RTI Process	RTI Models Conferences as appropriate Pat Quinn	Sept. – June Weekly and monthly meetings	Counselors Conferences Differentiation	Administration John Coulon, Dawn Dugan, Laura Baker, Judy Clark RTI Leadership 6th-Dwaina & Karen 7th-Dawn F. 8th-Dave B. and Carolyn X-Dave W.	Student Progress LIT Team Student discipline End of year MSP
School wide Read and Analysis of <i>The Highly Engaged Classroom</i> by Marzano & Pickering	Book Chapter lessons	Sept. – June 30 clock hours	Read book Staff	LIT Team All Team members	Team minutes and feedback Bldg. day Reflections-Student Engagement Survey Observations in classrooms
Recognition Collaboration	Team members Other school models	Sept. – June		Ruth and Marty Recognition team members: Carol Masters, Dana Fowler, Kyle Wallace, Judy Beal, Sara June Treadwell, Connie Shroades, and Carolyn Phelps, Camille Currie and Austin Bachelder	Student Progress Staff feedback Parent feedback
School wide student goal setting and feedback	Identify rationale brainstorm ways to integrate	Nov. – Dec.	Teaching Teams	LIT Team Teaching Teams	Student Engagement Survey Increase student results

Procedures for evaluating success in reaching this goal: Continual feedback, reflection surveys, evaluation of what is working and what to do differently throughout all focus responsibilities. *What summative evidence will be used to show this activity has made a difference in student outcomes? MSP 11-12, PLC Continuum, Perception check with students and parents.*

How will you know these interventions are working? Students, Staff and Parents committed to task. Student progress evident through assessments, progress reports, behavior referrals. **Intentional plans to connect all staff members, content standards for integration and consistency to improve instruction.**



Exploratory Team

SMART Goal Criteria:

S – Specific and clearly stated

M – Measurable and based on formative and/or summative data

A – Attainable and realistic

R – Related to student achievement and performance

T – Time Bound

Goal #1: Collaboration & Communication

<p>Areas for Learning & Improvement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each team identify collaborative practices that focus on student learning needs • Development of a shared mission, vision, beliefs about student learning • Consistent school wide expectations on behavior, learning performance • Special Education Team Collaboration and Planning • Intervention Team Model Addressing Struggling Learners • LIT coordinate collaboration focused around learning activities for staff • Instructional Assistants collaborative work with each other and teams to improve student learning. • District meetings and building instructional planning • Identify daily, monthly and trimester learning targets/objectives published for students • SharePoint Sites updated • Taking team collaborative time to the next levels---Daily PLC Time • Review formative and summative data to set up school improvement activities by team and common cohorts • RTI • Instructional Model Implementation (Learning Targets/Student Engagement) • Technical Integration • School wide read and analysis of <i>The Highly Engaged Classroom</i> by Marzano and Pickering 									
<p>How will you measure improvement towards these goal(s)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Teams Share Meeting Minutes • Student progress reports • Team products from collaborative planning • PLC Continuum Review through LIT • Measurement of Student Progress (MSP) 11-12 Assessment 									
<p>Current Results</p>	<p>PLC Continuum: Developing and Sustaining Stages based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mission and Vision statements • Clarity regarding what students must know and be able to do, through team reports • Focus on issues that directly impact student learning, especially behavior issues • Commitment to a collaborative culture • Systems of interventions <p>10 MSP</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">6th Reading 79.2%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7th Reading 80.3%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8th Reading 86.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">6th Math 70.3%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7th Math 69.7%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8th Math 67.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">7th Writing 90.9%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8th Science 86.5%</td> </tr> </table>	6 th Reading 79.2%	7 th Reading 80.3%	8 th Reading 86.5%	6 th Math 70.3%	7 th Math 69.7%	8 th Math 67.6%		7 th Writing 90.9%	8 th Science 86.5%
6 th Reading 79.2%	7 th Reading 80.3%	8 th Reading 86.5%								
6 th Math 70.3%	7 th Math 69.7%	8 th Math 67.6%								
	7 th Writing 90.9%	8 th Science 86.5%								



<p>Current Results (cont.)</p>	<p>11 MSP</p> <p>6th Reading 80.2% 7th Reading 78.3% 8th Reading 84.9%</p> <p>6th Math 70.3% 7th Math 76.6% 8th Math 76.2%</p> <p>7th Writing 89.7% 8th Science 87.8%</p>
<p>Completed Goal Statement</p>	<p><i>100% of the TFMS staff believes we collaborate at the sustaining level to improve student learning as demonstrated on the indicators/behaviors of the PLC Continuum by Spring 2011.</i></p> <p><i>100% of the TFMS staff believes we collaborate at the sustaining level to improve student learning as demonstrated on the indicators/behaviors of the PLC Continuum by Spring 2012.</i></p> <p><i>All students will improve their state assessment score by 10%, by Spring of 2011</i></p> <p><i>All students will improve their state assessment score by 10%, by Spring of 2012</i></p>
<p>Target 3-5 years</p>	<p><i>Collaborative work will increase student achievement demonstrating 95% of students will meet or exceed standard on the State – Measurement of Student Progress (MSP) given in grades 3-8</i></p> <p><i>100% of students will increase their level of proficiency on the state MSP</i></p>





Team: Exploratory Team

Team Improvement Goal: 100% of the TFMS staff believes we collaborate at the sustaining stage as indicated on the PLC Continuum to improve student learning.

Strategy: Grade level teams, cross graded teams, building focus teams, district cohort groups work on common practices and consistent language to improve student learning. **Guiding Questions:**

- 1) What do we want students to know? 2) How do we know when they have learned it? 3) What will we do if they have not learned? 4) What do we do if they have already learned it?

Rationale: Teams will base collaboration on *Relationships, Relevance and Rigor* in common expectations at team level and common practices in common content areas to ensure learning consistency and retention of learning.

Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur? What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
Meet daily with team to plan student intervention	Meet with special ed teachers & counselors for background info on students	2011-2012 school year	Counselors Special Ed teachers Discipline and academic info 504's and IEP's	All X-Team members	Student achievements and discipline reports Student concerns Feedback from other Teams
Develop pacing calendars for curriculum areas	Visit cohorts to plan Bldg. communication between cohort members	2011-2012 school year	-Equipment -EALR's & GLE's -District goals -Team & Cohort time	All Cohort members	-Student achievement -Student products & Publications -Finished work
Writing across the curriculum	Attend district writing assessment Meet with Language Arts teachers	2011-2012 school year	LA teachers Curriculum mapping from building teams	All of us. We need to work on this with all team members	In class assessment
Attending other teacher's classrooms	Send emails to visit other classes to observe students	2011-2012 school year	We are all resources	All team members	
Learning Targets	Cohort EALRS	2011-2012 school year	OSPI Cohort GLE's	Entire X-Team	Monitor student achievement and assessments





Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur? What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
Team curriculum mapping	Lay out our curriculum in a team session	Before end of 1st trimester	We are all resources	All team members	Building connections between each other's classes Students will see connection
Cross building mapping	Lay out our curriculum map in a building session	2011-2012 school year	Use all building members as resources	Building members	Building Connections between each others classes Students will see these connections
School wide Read and Analysis of <i>The Highly Engaged Classroom</i> by Marzano & Pickering	Book Chapter lessons	Sept. – June 30 clock hours	Read book Staff	LIT Team All Team members	Team minutes and feedback Bldg. day Reflections Observations in classrooms
Raven Grams	Feedback from each other	2011-2012 school year Each Thursday	We have raven grams and student lists	Team members	Positive praise from parents and students
<p>Procedures for evaluating success in reaching this goal? 1. Completing curriculum maps and plans to integrate with each other and core, 2. Clear understanding of daily posted learning targets to enhance student learning and engagement, 3. Review PLC collaboration continuum to identify celebrations and next steps.</p>					
<p>How will you know these strategies are working? Fewer discipline issues, assessments demonstrating continued improvement</p>					



6th Grade Team

1. **What do we want students to learn?**
Essential GLE's, Learning Targets
2. **How will we know if they have learned it?**
Common, Formative assessments and Focus on Results
3. **What are we going to do if they do not learn it?**
Intervention and Differentiation
4. **What are we going to do if they have already learned it?**
Elaboration-Depth-Quality and Differentiation

Goal #1: Collaboration & Communication

Reading-Green /Math-Red/All-Black

Area for Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intentional weekly time for planning & developing yearlong curriculum map • Increase student math scores from level 1 to level 2 • Increase student math scores from level 2 to level 3 • Increase student reading scores from level 1 to level 2 • Increase student reading scores from level 2 to level 3 • School wide read and analysis of <i>The Highly Engaged Classroom</i> by Marzano and Pickering
How will you measure improvement towards these goal(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion and update of map • Students will ultimately acquire greater understanding of each curricular topic/area as evidenced by “aha’s” in their Think Marks that reflect a greater understanding and connection • Scores on state learning assessment will increase.
Current Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September thru December has been mapped • Subject areas are emerging in alignment • Major projects are integrated among subjects • Team wide emphasis on best organization practices
Target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sixth grade team will collaborate weekly to align lessons with each other, and with state standards, and to map our team curriculum • Monitor effectiveness of intervention program for struggling math students • Continue to monitor effectiveness of initial “comprehension Toolkit” curriculum and adjust to student needs
Standard 3-5 year goal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed curriculum map • Integrated skills/units/ lessons between curricular areas • Increase MSP scores to having 95% of students meet or exceed standard
Completed Goal Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sixth grade team will collaborate weekly to align lessons with each other, and with state standards, and to map our team curriculum, and aligning & integrating areas of commonality across subject areas. • Results of this collaborative alignment would increase student achievement levels on the MSP by at least 10%





Team: 6th Grade Team Reading and Writing

Team Improvement Goals: 1. Sixth grade team will collaborate weekly to align lessons with each other, and with state standards, and to map our team curriculum, aligning & integrating areas of commonality across subject areas. 2. Results of this collaborative alignment would increase student achievement levels on the MSP by at least 10%.

Strategy: Grade level teams, cross graded teams, building focus teams, district cohort groups work on common practices and consistent language to improve student learning. Participate in learning Differentiation Strategies and team developed Curriculum Mapping.

Guiding Questions:

- 1) What do we want students to know? 2) How do we know when they have learned it? 3) What will we do if they have not learned? 4) What do we do if they have already learned it?

Rationale: Teams will base collaboration on *Relationships, Relevance and Rigor* in common expectations at team level and common practices in common content areas to ensure learning consistency and retention of learning.

Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur? What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
-Autobiography -Response journals for novel work -Chapter notes -Daybook assignments -Tool Kit lessons	-Team Planning Time -Clock hour planning time -Colleague observations	Sept. – June 1 day per trimester 1 day per month	-Literature Book -Daybook -Write Source 2000 -Class-set novels -Step-up -History Alive! -Comprehension Tool Kit -SS study guides	Karen, Dana & Pat	-Entry/Exit slips -Learning logs -Aha’s from Think Marks -Week in review Paragraphs -Rough drafts -Pre-writes -Class discussion/participation -Writing circles -Peer edits
Learn differentiation strategies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson • Rubrics • Reflections 	Team PLC time SIOP Training	Monthly		LIT Pat Dana Karen	Rubrics Student feedback





Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur? What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
School wide Read and Analysis of <i>The Highly Engaged Classroom</i> by Marzano & Pickering	Book Chapter lessons	Sept. – June 30 clock hours	Read book Staff	LIT Team All Team members	Team minutes and feedback Bldg. day Reflections Observations in classrooms
<p>Procedures for evaluating success in reaching this goal: For reading and writing we will use post writing assessments (District wide), State scores, final drafts on autobiography chapters and tests (Lit book/Daybook). What summative evidence will be used to show this activity has made a difference in student outcomes? MSP 11-12, PLC Continuum, Perception check with parents and students.</p>					
<p>How will you know these strategies are working? Smaller percent of D & F students, articulate Think Marks/Week in reviews, higher test scores (positive movement from level 2's to 3's) and feedback from 7th grade teachers</p>					

Team: 6th Grade Team Math and Science

Team Improvement Goals: 1. Sixth grade team will collaborate weekly to align lessons with each other, and with state standards, and to map our team curriculum, aligning & integrating areas of commonality across subject areas. 2. Results of this collaborative alignment would increase student achievement levels on the MSP by at least 10%.

Strategy: Grade level teams, cross graded teams, building focus teams, district cohort groups work on common practices and consistent language to improve student learning. **Guiding Questions:**

1) What do we want students to know? 2) How do we know when they have learned it? 3) What will we do if they have not learned? 4) What do we do if they have already learned it?

Rationale: Teams will base collaboration on *Relationships, Relevance and Rigor* in common expectations at team level and common practices in common content areas to ensure learning consistency and retention of learning.



Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur? What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur? What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
Teach problem-solving strategies for word problems		Sept. – June	Active Inspire Review Packets MSP cards 4 – square	Dwaina, Johanna & Kyle	Quizzes, tests diagnostic test MSP scores
Differentiation of math instruction	Collaborative work time	Sept. – June	RTI classes Manipulative Kit Observe	Dwaina, Johanna & Kyle	Quizzes, tests, diagnostic test MSP scores grades
Concrete learning for struggling learners – manipulatives	Workshop with a professional Kim Sutton workshop	By 3rd trimester	Our manipulative kit	Ruth to coordinate training	Teacher generated documents/supplementary materials
School wide Read and Analysis of <i>The Highly Engaged Classroom</i> by Marzano & Pickering	Book Chapter lessons	Sept. – June 30 clock hours	Read book Staff	LIT Team All Team members	Team minutes and feedback Bldg. day Reflections Observations in classrooms
Team collaboration on lesson plans and pacing	n/a	Weekly	Curriculum Curriculum Map	Dwaina, Johanna & Kyle	Common pacing between teachers Improved MSP scores
Procedures for evaluating success in reaching this goal. For math, classroom tests, quizzes and diagnostic tests will be used for evaluating success. <i>What summative evidence will be used to show this activity has made a difference in student outcomes MSP 11-12, PLC Continuum, Perception check with parents and students.</i>					
How will you know these strategies are working? MSP scores will improve					



7th Grade Team

1. **What do we want students to learn?**
Essential GLE's, Learning Targets
2. **How will we know if they have learned it?**
Common, Formative assessments and Focus on Results
3. **What are we going to do if they do not learn it?**
Intervention and Differentiation
4. **What are we going to do if they have already learned it?**
Elaboration-Depth-Quality and Differentiation

Goal #1: Collaboration & Communication

Reading-Green/Writing-Purple/Math-Red/Science-Blue/All-Black

<p>Area for Learning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase reading comprehension and reading analysis • Improve student achievement on the state writing assessment from 90% to 94% of students meeting standard • Integrate tech. across the curriculum by applying new hardware and software • Use curriculum mapping and support common and consistent language across the curriculum in 7th grade • Understand and implement differentiated instruction to improve scores for struggling learners & high achievers • Refine learning targets • Modify curriculum for differentiated instruction • Supplement adopted FOSS curriculum • School wide read and analysis of <i>The Highly Engaged Classroom</i> by Marzano and Pickering
<p>How will you measure improvement towards these goal(s)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State assessment-Measurement of Student Progress (MSP) • Classroom assessments • Formative district assessments • District Writing Assessments • RAI Assessments • CBA Assessments • Literature circle worksheets • Summative assessment • Diagnostic testing • Performance on trimester projects • Student generated investigations
<p>Current Results</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the 2011 MSP, 78.3% of students met or exceeded standard in the area of reading • On the 2010 MSP, 89.7% of students met or exceeded standard in the area of writing • 40.2% of students passed the 2010 Math MSP at level 4 • On the 2011 MSP, 76.6% of students met or exceeded the standard in the area of math



<p>Target</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our goal is for 82% of students to meet or exceed standard in reading on the 2012 MSP • Our goal is for 92% of students to meet or exceed standards in writing on the 2012 MSP • Our goal is for 77% of students to meet or exceed standards in math on the 2012 MSP
<p>Standard 3-5 year goal</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative work will increase student achievement – 85% of students will meet or exceed standard on the state MSP in math • 80% of students will meet or exceed standard on the inquiry strand in science on the MSP • In 3-5 years our goal is for 95% students to meet or exceed standards in writing on the MSP • 100% of students will show improvement on the MSP or maintain their level 4 scores
<p>Completed Goal Statement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our goal is for 80% of students to meet or exceed standard in reading on the 2012 MSP • Our goal is for 92% of students to meet or exceed standards in writing on the 2012 MSP • 100% of students will show improvement or maintain their level 4 score in math on the 2012 MSP





Team: 7th Grade Team Reading and Writing

Team Improvement Goals: Our goal is for 82% of students to meet or exceed standard in reading and 92% of students to exceed standards in writing on the 2012 Measurement of Student Progress (MSP).

Strategy: Grade level teams, cross graded teams, building focus teams, district cohort groups work on common practices and consistent language to improve student learning. **Guiding Questions:**

- 1) What do we want students to know? 2) How do we know when they have learned it? 3) What will we do if they have not learned? 4) What do we do if they have already learned it?

Rationale: Teams will base collaboration on *Relationships, Relevance and Rigor* in common expectations at team level and common practices in common content areas to ensure learning consistency and retention of learning.

Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur? What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
Differentiated instruction	Professional development on differentiated instruction	Sept. – June	NMSA articles on differentiated instruction and rubrics Rick Wormeli Conference	Shawn	On-going reading/writing progress monitoring
Comprehension Took Kit Literature Circle program Exam View	Release time for reading and writing rubrics	Jan. – March	Professional reference books Tool Kit Training Graphic organizers	Shawn, Sara June and Judy B., Steve, Nancy and Katy Morris	Student reflections Student Blogs MSP reading scores RAI Scores
Reading RTI	Release Time Training	Sept. – June	Comprehension Tool Kit Jamestown Reader – 6 Minute Solution	Dawn D. & Shawn	MSP Scores RAI Scores
Writing integrated with literature and social studies and science	Release time to develop curriculum materials Tech Pathway Collaboration	Sept. – June	TCI Curriculum Stratalogica	Shawn, Sara June and Judy B., Steve Nystrom	CBA TCI Assessments





Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur?</i> <i>What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
Identify critical thinking strategies for use in content areas: Finding evidence Inference Compare/contrast Cause & effect Analysis Main Idea	Cohort Collaboration	Sept. – June	Thinking skills resources Graphic Organizers	Interdisciplinary team	Curriculum map in team room RAI CBA
School wide Read and Analysis of <i>The Highly Engaged Classroom</i> by Marzano & Pickering	Book Chapter lessons	Sept. – June 30 clock hours	Read book Staff	LIT Team All Team members	Team minutes and feedback Bldg. day Reflections Observations in classrooms

Team: 7th Grade Team Math and Science

Team Improvement Goals: Our goal is for 100% of students to show improvement on the MSP and 80% of students to pass on the inquiry of science standard in spring of 2012.

Strategy: Grade level teams, cross graded teams, building focus teams, district cohort groups work on common practices and consistent language to improve student learning. **Guiding Questions:**

1) What do we want students to know? 2) How do we know when they have learned it? 3) What will we do if they have not learned? 4) What do we do if they have already learned it?

Rationale: Teams will base collaboration on *Relationships, Relevance and Rigor* in common expectations at team level and common practices in common content areas to ensure learning consistency and retention of learning.





Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur? What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
Math & Science -Identify learning target	Subject area – Math Collaboration – Science (OEL)	Sept. – June	-Text in Math -State standard in Math and Science -Foss Curriculum in Science	Math – George & Ashley Science – Ashley & Dawn	Students can identify learning targets
Differentiated instruction for Math and Science	-Math and Science training -Holt math training -I Can Learn Training -OEL	Sept. – June	-Training -Math text-online -Math and Science rubrics -I Can Learn software	George, Ashley & Dawn	-Formative assessment -More students accepting challenging work -MSP Scores
Math exam view training	-Holt math training -TFMS Personnel	Sept. – June	Software	Interdisciplinary team	-Formative – student success using exam view
School wide Read and Analysis of <i>The Highly Engaged Classroom</i> by Marzano & Pickering	Book Chapter lessons	Sept. – June 30 clock hours	Read book Staff	LIT Team All Team members	Team minutes and feedback Bldg. day Reflections Observations in classrooms
Math & Science use common and consistent language	-Math and Science text -Curriculum planning time	Sept. – June	-Text (math) -Foss curriculum (science) Science/Math standard	Ashley & Dawn	Modify curriculum for earth history
Procedures for evaluating success in reaching this goal. Assessments and team feedback					
How will you know these strategies are working? Student improvement, parent feedback, consistent and common practices, grade to grade carryover and student feedback.					



8th Grade Team

1. **What do we want students to learn?**
Essential GLE's, Learning Targets
2. **How will we know if they have learned it?**
Common, Formative assessments and Focus on Results
3. **What are we going to do if they do not learn it?**
Intervention and Differentiation
4. **What are we going to do if they have already learned it?**
Elaboration-Depth-Quality and Differentiation

Goal #1: Collaboration & Communication

Reading-Green/Writing-Purple/Math-Red/Science-Blue/All-Black

Area for Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common and consistent language • Learning objectives identified • Curriculum mapping • Differentiation instruction • School wide read and analysis of <i>The Highly Engaged Classroom</i> by Marzano and Pickering • Implement Technology
How will you measure improvement towards these goal(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State and district assessments • Formative & summative assessment • Students can explain the objectives and what they've learned • 8th grade team will collaborate to identify 3-5 topics where students will synthesize skills and/or concepts from several subject areas to produce a final product(s).
Current Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2011 MSP data: -Reading/84.9% -Math/76.2% -Science/87.8%
Target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% of students will show improvement on Measurement of Student Progress (MSP)
Standard 3-5 year goal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% of students will show improvement on Measurement of Student Progress (MSP)
Completed Goal Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8th grade teachers will continue to synthesize skills and concepts from various subject areas to produce written assessments • 90% of students will pass systems strand of the 2012 science MSP • 87% of students will pass the critical thinking strand on the 2012 reading MSP • All students will show improvement by 10% on the 5 math strands on the 2012 MSP





Team: 8th Grade Team Reading and Writing

Team Improvement Goals: Our goal is for 90% of students to meet or exceed standard in reading on the 2012 MSP.

Strategy: Grade level teams, cross graded teams, building focus teams, district cohort groups work on common practices and consistent language to improve student learning. **Guiding Questions:**

- 1) What do we want students to know? 2) How do we know when they have learned it? 3) What will we do if they have not learned? 4) What do we do if they have already learned it?

Rationale: Teams will base collaboration on *Relationships, Relevance and Rigor* in common expectations at team level and common practices in common content areas to ensure learning consistency and retention of learning.

Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur? What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
Teachers will guide students to read more non-fiction across the curriculum	Align curriculum in 6 th and 7 th grade to provide historical fiction in <u>variety</u> to support intentional focus on narrowing gender gap in reading	Ongoing	-Academic articles -Historical fiction -Non-fiction selections -Periodicals	Emily Rourke Camille Currie Janet Munson Susie Martin (shared responsibility)	Entry task: Non-fiction selections of individual reading strategies Mini lessons
Use of structured writing to develop elaboration strategies and critical thinking		Sept. 2011 – June 2012	Bi-weekly collaborative meetings Collaboration with other grade levels to get graphic organizers	8 th Grade LA Cohort	Analytical skills improve
Incorporate multiple strategies in daily lessons from the Reading Comprehension Tool Kit	Comprehension Tool Kit training	Sept. 2011 – June 2012	Comprehension Tool Kit	8 th Grade LA Cohort	Improved RAI & MSP scores



Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur? What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
Investigate appropriate historical fiction a. Select titles and pre-read b. Adopt 6-7 titles and obtain 15 copies of each c. Literature Circles		ongoing	Continual conversations with students and other reading teachers in search for interesting novels	8 th Grade LA Cohort	-closing the gender gap on the MSP
Teachers will use the six trait rubric to achieve student-led writing goals	Teachers will continue their participation in district writing assessment scoring More intentional and focused collaboration as an 8th grade LA/SS team to ensure that titles chosen have mutual appeal to boys and girls	Sept. – June	-Other teacher’s observation during assessment sessions -Student’s writings -6 trait rubric	Janet Munson Emily Rourke Camille Currie Susie Martin	Improving assessment scores
Teachers will instruct students to read analytically	Differentiation strategies for all learners <u>The Highly Engaged Classroom</u> by Marzano and Pickering Review Ralph Fletcher’s <u>Boy Writer’s</u>	Nov - June	District support Structured writing Staff development resources Thinking Skills G.O. Differentiation	Janet Munson, Emily Rourke, Camille Currie, Susie Martin Staff Development (RTI)	Assessments Pre-summative Reflections
Teachers will instruct students to write in a structured form to show analysis	Teacher will collaborate with their grade level cohort, building cohort and district cohort	Sept - June	District Cohorts High School teachers Eighth grade teachers	Janet Munson, Emily Rourke, Camille Currie, Susie Martin	Writing samples
School wide Read and Analysis of <i>The Highly Engaged Classroom</i> by Marzano & Pickering	Book Chapter lessons	Sept. – June 30 clock hours	Read book Staff	LIT Team All Team members	Team minutes and feedback Bldg. day Reflections Observations in classrooms





Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur? What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
Identify learning targets/objectives Curriculum Map	Building day classes teaming to the next level	Sept. – June	Collaborative daily PLC time	Janet, Emily, Camille, Dave, Katrina, Carolyn & Susie	District Writing Assessment On-going mapping Reflection
Integration of Technology -Data Dashboard -Stratalogica	District Classes	Sept. – June	Team Members	Janet, Emily, Camille, Dave Katrina, Carolyn & Susie	
<p>Procedures for evaluating success in reaching this goal: <i>What summative evidence will be used to show this activity has made a difference in student outcomes?</i> Progress reports, summative writing, data provided by ExamView, results posted on Data Dashboard and district reading assessments (RTI).</p>					
<p>How will you know these strategies are working? Students will improve their Measurement of Student Progress (MSP) score, as well as achieve higher scores on teacher’s summative and formative assessments.</p>					

Team: 8th Grade Team Math and Science

Team Improvement Goal: Eighth grade team will collaborate daily by not only aligning lessons with each other, and with state standards, but also my mapping our team curriculum and aligning & integrating areas of commonality across subject areas. 2. Results of this collaborative alignment would increase student achievement levels on the MSP to at least 90% in Math and to at least maintain or increase in Science.

Strategy: Grade level teams, cross graded teams, building focus teams, district cohort groups work on common practices and consistent language to improve student learning. **Guiding Questions:**

- 1) What do we want students to know?
- 2) How do we know when they have learned it?
- 3) What will we do if they have not learned?
- 4) What do we do if they have already learned it?

Rationale: Teams will base collaboration on *Relationships, Relevance and Rigor* in common expectations at team level and common practices in common content areas to ensure learning consistency and retention of learning.





Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur? What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
Integration of state standards and text book Algebra standards	Common time to work with fellow math teachers	Began last year and will end when standards stabilize	New Holt textbook & Newly revised standards	Dave B. and Carolyn	Students will understand daily objective
Exam view-continued Cognitive Complexity Problem solving strategies	As needed	Sept - June	Holt materials	Dave B. and Carolyn	Increase student achievement scores
RTI math implementation	I Can Learn webinar	Sept - June	Internet	Dave B. and Carolyn	Results on assessments
School wide Read and Analysis of <i>The Highly Engaged Classroom</i> by Marzano & Pickering	Book Chapter lessons	Sept. – June 30 clock hours	Read book Staff	LIT Team All Team members	Team minutes and feedback Bldg. day Reflections Observations in classrooms
Science Fair	Building Day District Directed Day	Sept. – April	Katrina Alegado	Science Cohort	Community Involvement All grades participate
Procedures for evaluating success in reaching this goal: <i>What summative evidence will be used to show this activity has made a difference in student outcomes?</i> Increase in MSP scores, weekly assessments and team reflections.					
How will you know these strategies are working? Math: Students will show increased mathematical aptitude. Science: We will focus on inquiry in order to maintain or increase MSP scores in Science.					



Special Education ~6-7-8 Collaboration

Goal: Collaboration & Communication

Area for Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of Language! – district wide MS Language Arts adoption • Improve student performance on math standardized tests (MSP) • Improve student performance on reading standardized tests (MSP) • Improve student performance on IEP goals • Maintain Navigation 101 implementation
How will you measure improvement towards these goal(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful completion of lessons at each grade level in Language! • Spring MSP scores • Yearly IEP assessments • 3-year re-evaluations • Content Assessments for Language! • Summative Assessments for Language!
Current Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding the cohort group of students who entered 6th grade in 2008: in the 2009 Reading MSP, they passed at 29%; in 2010 they passed at 36%; in 2011 they passed at 22% • Of 7th graders who took the Reading MSP in 2011, 5 were at level 1 • Of 7th graders who took the Math MSP in 2011, 7 were at level 1 • Of 6th graders who took the Reading MSP in 2011, 3 were at level 1 • Of 6th graders who took the Math MSP in 2011, 13 were at level 1 • 9% of the students who were 6th graders in 2010 passed the MSP math; as 7th graders, that same cohort passed at 30% • Students who were 6th graders in 2010 passed the Reading MSP as 7th graders at the same percentage (23%) • 19% of the students who entered 6th grade in 2008 passed the math 2009 MSP. 31% passed the math MSP in 7th grade, 31% passed the math MSP as 8th graders • Of 7th graders who took the Reading MSP in 2011, 2 passed and 5 were at level 2 • Of 7th graders who took the Math MSP in 2011, 3 passed and 2 were at level 2 • Of 7th graders who took the Writing MSP in 2011, 5 passed and 7 were at level 2 • Of 6th graders who took the Reading MSP in 2011, 8 passed and 22 were at level 2 • Of 6th graders who took the Math MSP in 2011, 4 passed and 16 were at level 2 • In 2011, 45% of special education students passed the 7th grade Writing MSP* • In 2011, 45% of special education students passed the 8th grade Science MSP* <p>*Progress note: in 2009 no TFMS special education 7th graders passed the WASL, but as 8th graders in 2010 5% passed the MSP. Compare this narrative to passing scores on writing and science test for 2011 MSP.</p>
Target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase at least one grade level on IEP goals
Standard 3-5 year goal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 3 years, all students at TFMS will have completed 6th, 7th and 8th grade Navigation 101 transition program • Consistently raise reading scores on IEP's by at least one grade level
Completed Goal Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% of IEP students who were at level 1 will improve to level 2 in the math on the 2012 MSP • 75% of IEP students who were at level 2 will improve to level 3 in the reading on the 2012 MSP • 50% of IEP students will meet standards in writing on the 2012 MSP





Team: Special Education~6-7-8

Team Improvement Goal #1 MATH: 75% of IEP students who were at level 1 will improve to level 2 in the Math MSP by 2012

Strategy: Implementation of SAXON Math and TransMath with fidelity

Rationale: Low district Special Education MSP scores

Team Improvement Goal #2 READING: 75% of IEP students who were at level 2 will improve to level 3 in the Reading MSP by 2012

Strategy: Implementation of Language! program with fidelity

Rationale: Low district Special Education MSP scores

Team Improvement Goal #3 WRITING: 50% of IEP students will meet standards in the Writing MSP by 2012

Strategy: Implementation of Language! Curriculum with fidelity

Rationale: Low district Special Education MSP scores

Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur? What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
Spec. Ed. math curriculum middle school wide Pilot SAXON/TransMath	Training on curriculum through the publisher Colleague/site -reflections	October/Done Ongoing	SAXON/TransMath Curriculum, Publisher Reps, Publisher website	Spec. Ed. Director, TOSAs, and Spec. Ed. Teachers	CBAs, IEP goals, and MSP scores
Implementation (with fidelity) of Language! Curriculum	Training on curriculum through the publisher. Colleague/site -reflections	Ongoing Ongoing	Language! Curriculum, Publisher reps, Publisher website	Spec Ed. Director, TOSAs and Spec. Ed. teachers,	CBAs, IEP goals, and MSP scores
Implementation of technology integration, eg: hardware and software	District technology training	Ongoing	Netbooks, iPads, Activboards, accompanying software	Spec. Ed. Director, TOSAs, Spec. Ed. teachers, and TILT	Positive student engagement





Team: Special Education~6-7-8

Team Improvement Goal #2: By June 2012, 100% of special ed. Students will have completed Navigation 101 program for their grade level.

Strategy: Implement Navigation 101 ~ Guiding Questions:

- 1) What do we want students to know?
- 2) How do we know when they have learned it?
- 3) What will we do if they have not learned?
- 4) What do we do if they have already learned it?

Rationale: All special service students will be able to identify academic and personal goals toward pre and post-graduation plans

Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur? What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
Special education teachers need to review Navigation 101 program		Continue implementation throughout the school year	Basic Navigation 101 booklet at each grade level	Judy W. Judy C. Susie M. Rose W. Joe B.	Inventories Student reflections

Action Plans - TFMS SCIENCE COHORT 6-7-8

School Wide Focus Teams

School Improvement Goal #1: 100% of the TFMS staff believes we collaborate at the sustaining stage as indicated on the PLC Continuum to improve student learning.

School Improvement Goal #2: Students will improve MSP science scores by the following: % increase and number of students
8th Grade:

Strategy: Grade level teams, cross graded teams, building focus teams, district cohort groups work on common practices and consistent language to improve student learning. Guiding Questions:

- 1) What do we want students to know?
- 2) What will we do if they have not learned?
- 3) How do we know when they have learned it?
- 4) What do we do if they have already learned it?





Rationale: Teams will base collaboration on *Relationships, Relevance and Rigor* in common expectations at team level and common practices in common content areas to ensure learning consistency and retention of learning.

Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur? What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
4 Release Days Training -Build Lesson -Observe/Debrief Lesson (Do both for each grade level)	OEL	Sept 2011-June 2012	OEL Curriculum 4 Release Days	Kerstin Kramer (T.O.S.A.) Carolyn Kiehl (Systems Biology Rep)	Formative Classroom Assessment -Look Fors -Activ Expressions MSP Results
As a school discuss the released items from OSPI; focusing specifically on inquiry strand	Building days and district days team collaboration	Building days Sept 2011-June 2012	OSPI released items	Dawn Frearson and Katrina Alegado	In class assessments.
Collaborate with district science team on OSPI released items to create a grade level continuum and review investigation design.	Building days and district days	Sept 2011-June 2012	OSPI released items District teachers Science standards	Dawn F. & Katrina	In class assessments and MSP results.
Science Fair	Building Day District Directed Day	Sept. – April	Katrina Alegado	Science Cohort	Community Involvement All grades participate





Action Plans - TFMS LA COHORT (Reading & Writing) 6-7-8

School Wide Focus Teams

School Improvement Goal #1: 100% of the TFMS staff believes we collaborate at the sustaining stage as indicated on the PLC Continuum to improve student learning.

School Improvement Goal #2: Students will improve MSP reading and writing scores by the following: % increase and number of students
 8th Grade: **Reading: 87% will meet or exceed MSP standard (7 level 1 move to level 2; 27 level 2 move to level 3; 45 level 3 move to level 4)**
 7th Grade: **Reading: 87% will meet or exceed MSP standard (5 level 1 move to level 2; 26 level 2 move to level 3; 25 level 3 move to level 4)**
 6th Grade: **Reading: 85% will meet or exceed MSP standard (7 level 1 move to level 2; 17 level 2 move to level 3; 17 level 3 move to level 4)**

Strategy: Grade level teams, cross graded teams, building focus teams, district cohort groups work on common practices and consistent language to improve student learning. **Guiding Questions:**

- 1) What do we want students to know?
- 2) What will we do if they have not learned?
- 3) How do we know when they have learned it?
- 4) What do we do if they have already learned it?

Rationale: Teams will base collaboration on *Relationships, Relevance and Rigor* in common expectations at team level and common practices in common content areas to ensure learning consistency and retention of learning.

Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur? What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
WRITING					
Background Organizers 6-7-8	LA Teachers	Oct. 28 th Building Day	Building Cohort Time	6-7-8 LA Teachers LIT	Teacher Feedback
Intentional Instruction Around casual/friendly writing Academic writing Audience Awareness	Investigate Dialogue	Oct.-June	Explore	6-7-8 LA Teachers	Student Assessment





Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur? What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
District Writing Assessment Dialogue and recommended change at 8 th grade of writing target focused at structured writing format vs. persuasive 7 th grade MSP format		Oct.-June	District Time & Building Time	6-7-8 LA Teachers LIT	Student Work
Student Work Paragraph Analysis 6-7-8	Dialogue questions About student work	Jan.	Building Time	6-7-8 LA Teachers LIT	
<u>READING</u> Review 2011 Data and Strand Analysis MSP RAI Student strengths & weaknesses	Data Dashboard	Sept. - Jan.	Graphs Data Dashboard Building Time	6-7-8 LA Teachers LIT	Instructional Targets & Assessments
Exam View Application to increase experience of on-screen reading	Exam View Application	Dec. - May	Dave B. George W. Sara June Ruth Limited exp. Exam View Res.	6-7-8 LA Teachers LIT Dawn D. Nancy Kinsella-Johnson	Student Assessment response
Anchor Tests – multiple choice examinations	Exam Multiple Choice MSP questions	Dec. - April	Anchor Tests Exam View	6-7-8 LA Teachers LIT	Improved application of multiple choice options
Extended Reading Responses Instruction	Structured writing Vertical collaboration	Dec. - April		6-7-8 LA Teachers LIT	Response writing improvement
Sequence by grade-level Comprehension Tool Kit 6-7-8 Reading Strategies	Katy Morris Comprehension Tool Kit	Nov. – Feb.	Jan Formisano Katy Morris Comprehension Tool Kit	Jan Formisano Ruth Moen	Application of skills





Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur? What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
Novel Sharing-whole class set Readers Workshop Literary Circles How can the Tool Kit apply to the novels?	Vertical Collaboration	Dec. – Jan.	Grade level selections	6-7-8 LA Teachers LIT	Feedback
<i>Nine Reasons to Read</i> Kelly Gallagher Sequence by grade-level	Reading book Lesson sharing	Sept. - June	<u>Nine Reasons to Read</u> Kelly Gallagher	LIT Ruth Moen	Mini Lesson Feedback
Inquiry based discussions Apply in science and SS	Explore	Dec. - June	Explore Dawn F. and Katrina Building Time PGO	6-7-8 LA/SS LIT	Mini Lessons Assessments
<u>ENRICHMENT/RTI</u> Imp. 6 minute solution <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehension Tool Kit • Assessment • Reader’s Theatre • James Town Reader 	Resources	Sept. – June	_____ Plan Time _____ Materials	Intervention Teachers Dawn D. Jan Formisano Ruth Moen	Assessments
ARI Assessment Level 1 & 2 students	Tool	Sept. – May	IA/Counselors/Administrators ARI	Ruth	Pre and Post





Action Plans - TFMS MATH COHORT 6-7-8

School Wide Focus Teams

School Improvement Goal #1: 100% of the TFMS staff believes we collaborate at the sustaining stage as indicated on the PLC Continuum to improve student learning.

School Improvement Goal #2: Students will improve MSP math scores by the following: % increase and number of students and percentages
 8th Grade: 6 level 1 students will improve to level 2; 16 level 2 students will move to level 3; 5-10 level 3 students will move to level 4 – 80% will meet standard

7th Grade: 19 level 1 students will improve to level 2; 11 level 2 students will move to level 3; 18 level 3 students will move to level 4 – 80% will meet standard

6th Grade: 18 level 1 students will improve to level 2; 18 level 2 students will move to level 3; 18 level 3 students will move to level 4 – 86% will meet standard

Strategy: Grade level teams, cross graded teams, building focus teams, district cohort groups work on common practices and consistent language to improve student learning. **Guiding Questions:**

- 1) What do we want students to know?
- 2) What will we do if they have not learned?
- 3) How do we know when they have learned it?
- 4) What do we do if they have already learned it?

Rationale: Teams will base collaboration on *Relationships, Relevance and Rigor* in common expectations at team level and common practices in common content areas to ensure learning consistency and retention of learning.

Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur? What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
What do we want students to know? Define/clarify course curriculum guide /expectations	Build and combine course syllabi	Sept – Nov	Present guide for all courses	All math teachers	Unit Assessments Parents, students and staff understanding of courses
Train parents and students using Holt Resources Online 2007	Math Curriculum Night Power Point	Sept – Nov	Holt Online 2007 Text	Math Cohort Team	Feedback from parents and students Survey from Math Curriculum Night





Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur? What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
Design & implement problem solving matrix	Strategy tools Team created graphic	Sept - Nov	Holt Curriculum I Can Learn MSP Scores Math Teams	Math Cohort Team	Common Assessments Common Dialogue MSP
Identify struggling vs. high performing math students	I Can Learn – Training MSP Scores – Analyzing Data Data Dashboard	Aug- Oct	I Can Learn, Trainer MSP Scores Data dashboard	Math Cohort Team	I Can Learn Results Classroom Performance MSP Scores Data Dashboard Training
Mini units 6-7-8 Geometric sense probability	Geometric Sense Probability	Sept - June	Holt Additional Resources TBD	Math Cohort Team	Common Assessments Common Dialogue MSP
Develop common course chapter assessments/modification/practice Using Exam View	Review Standards & Test Creating	Sept – June	Holt Exam View	Math Cohort Team	Common Assessments Dialogue MSP Student Comfort Level Using On-line Assessments
Review & discuss assessment results/reports 6-7-8 from common assessment created	Cohort Time	Sept - June	Holt Exam View	Math Cohort Team	Common Assessments Dialogue MSP
Engaging the student	Bob Marzono's, <u>The Highly Engaged Classroom</u>	Sept - June	Professional Development Bob Marzono's, <u>The Highly Engaged Classroom</u>	Math Cohort Team	Common Assessments Dialogue MSP
Capture inconsistencies of mathematical processes 6-7-8	Classroom Visitation Math Cohort Dialogue	Each cohort time Nov – Apr	Math Cohort Team	Math Cohort Team	Common Assessments Dialogue MSP Common Practices
Strategies for improving MSP scores	Alignment of MSP strands with State Standards?	Sept. - June	OSPI question	Math Cohort Team	Common Assessments Dialogue MSP





Team: Instructional Assistants

Team Improvement Goal: 100% of the TFMS staff believes we collaborate at the sustaining stage as indicated on the PLC Continuum to improve student learning.

Strategy: Grade level teams, cross graded teams, building focus teams, district cohort groups work on common practices and consistent language to improve student learning. **Guiding Questions:**

- 1) What do we want students to know? 2) How do we know when they have learned it? 3) What will we do if they have not learned? 4) What do we do if they have already learned it?

Rationale: Teams will base collaboration on *Relationships, Relevance and Rigor* in common expectations at team level and common practices in common content areas to ensure learning consistency and retention of learning.

Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur? What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
Know our students -background on behavior and medical needs -expectations on students responsibilities at each grade level (homework, absent work) More training on student disabilities (ie autism)	Weekly meetings	Sept. – June	-Merge information from school -Team meetings -Spec Ed Cohorts -Entire staff	Laurie, Char Carol Gunning, Nurse	Para Educators can identify student strengths & areas of support
Clearer, defined role -Responsibilities will be different with each teacher -When and how do we modify -More collaboration with teachers (more direction on what they would like us to do in their classroom) -Teacher feedback (good, bad and ways to improve)		Sept. – June	-NMSA video -Created curriculum map -Create a rubric of expectations for student’s independence at each grade level	Laurie, Char, Dana LIT Team	Para Educators can label practices for each classroom





Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur? What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
Know the curriculum -Be able to re-teach and modify correctly -Need to be able to get material ahead of time (worksheets, tests, reading passages) -Math operations across all grade levels	-Differentiation methods -Visit other schools to observe other methods to use	Sept. – June	-LIT -Nancy Meeks and Sp Ed team	Administration Para-Educators Classroom Teams	Feedback Student progress
<p style="text-align: center;">Procedures for evaluating success in reaching this goal. Assessments and team feedback</p>					
<p style="text-align: center;">How will you know these strategies are working? Student improvement, parent feedback, consistent and common practices, grade to grade carryover and student feedback.</p>					





Goal: Intervention Model for Struggling Students

Reading-Green/Writing-Purple/Math-Red/Science-Blue/All-Black

<p>Area for Improvement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify struggling students • Improve struggling students total math • Improve struggling students total reading • Improve class work and assessments • Improve student learning to increase capacity and persistence to achieve
<p>How will you measure improvement towards these goal(s)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress Reports • Counselor Data Report on all struggling students per each trimester progress reports and final grading reports • Classroom Assessment • I Can Learn student data • Reading Comprehension and Fluency Assessments - RAI • 6th, 7th, 8th Grade MSP
<p>Current Results</p>	<p><u>MSP 2010-2011</u></p> <p>5th Grade Reading/Math areas for growth (NBE & OES)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20% of current 6th graders did not meet standard on the Reading MSP in 2011 • 5% of current 6th graders scored a level 1 on the Reading MSP in 2011 • 15% of current 6th graders scored a level 2 on the Reading MSP in 2011 • The gender gap has changed from male dominance (at 12% in 2009) to female dominance (at 20% in 2011) in Reading at Opstad Elementary • Students from Opstad scored 9% lower than the state on the 5th grade Math MSP in 2011 • 47% of students from Opstad did not pass the Math MSP in 2011 during 5th grade • 0% of special needs students coming from Opstad passed the 5th grade Math MSP in 2011 • At NBE 39% of Free/Reduced students passed the 5th grade Math MSP <p>6th Grade Reading/Math areas for growth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2011 6th graders continue to score lower than the district in analysis and literary text • Only 58.4% of 6th graders in 2011 passed geometric sense on the Math MSP (only 2% higher than the state average in that area) • 62% of students passed problem solving and reasoning strand on the 6th grade Math MSP in 2011 <p>7th Grade Reading/Writing/Math areas for growth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21.7% of 7th grade students did not meet standard in Reading on the 2011 MSP • 7 – 7th grade students scored at a level 1 in Reading on the 2011 MSP • 32 – 7th grade students scored at a level 2 in Reading on the 2011 MSP • 54 – 7th grade students scored at a level 3 in Reading on the 2011 MSP • 17 – 7th grades students that scored at a level 2 in Reading on the 2011 MSP were within 10 points of meeting standard • 65.5% of 7th grade students met standard in the comprehension strand on the 2011 MSP. Comprehension represents the lowest percentage of students meeting standard district wide. • 67.2% of 7th grade students met standard in the informational text strand in Reading on the 2011 MSP • 12 – 7th grade students scored at level 1 in Math on the 2011 MSP • 31 – 7th grade students scored at level 2 in Math on the 2011 MSP • 12 – 7th grade students were within 12 points of level 3 in Math on the 2011 MSP



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11 – 7th grade students scored and 8 with 9 passing in Writing on the 2011 MSP • In conventions on expository, 22 – 7th grade students scored at level 1 in Writing on the 2011 MSP • 26 – 7th grade students scored at a level 1 in persuasive writing on the 2011 Writing MSP • 16 – 7th grade students scored at a level 2 on COS in expository writing on the 2011 Writing MSP • 7 – 7th grade students scored at a level 2 on COS in persuasive writing on the 2011 Writing MSP <p>8th Grade Reading/Math/Science areas for growth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2011, 64% of 8th grade students scored at level 4 on the Reading MSP, 21% at level 3, 11% at level 2 and 1% at level 1 • 4% increase in students passing in Reading from 2010-2011 on the MSP • In the last 3 years females are scoring 90%, males are scoring 80% on the Reading MSP • 15% of students are struggling to pass the 8th grade Reading MSP in 2011 • The number of students scoring a level 2 on the 2011 Math MSP has increased by 1 percentage point • In 2011, 12 % of students did not pass the 8th grade Science MSP (level 1 and 2 combined)
Target	<p>-Increase a level for each struggling student in math and reading on the 2011 MSP -Students maintaining a C average or above in all classes</p>
Standard 3 – 5 year goal	<p>100% of struggling students will increase a level from their present level to meet standard in reading and math.</p>
Completed Goal Statement	<p>-100% of struggling students will demonstrate at least 10% improvement on the 2011 MSP -90% of students will achieve a C average or above in all classes on their final report card in June 2011</p>





ACTION PLANS

Intervention Team

Team Improvement Goal #1: Identify the 30% of students who fall below standard, and employ research validated intervention programs to decrease the number of students who fall below standard.

Team Improvement Goal #2: Students will improve MSP math and reading scores by the following: % increase and number of students

MATH MSP:

8th Grade: 6 level 1 students will improve to level 2; 16 level 2 students will move to level 3; 5-10 level 3 students will move to level 4 – 80% will meet standard

7th Grade: 19 level 1 students will improve to level 2; 11 level 2 students will move to level 3; 18 level 3 students will move to level 4 – 80% will meet standard

6th Grade: 18 level 1 students will improve to level 2; 18 level 2 students will move to level 3; 18 level 3 students will move to level 4 – 86% will meet standard

READING MSP:

8th Grade: Reading: 87% will meet or exceed MSP standard (7 level 1 move to level 2; 27 level 2 move to level 3; 45 level 3 move to level 4)

7th Grade: Reading: 87% will meet or exceed MSP standard (5 level 1 move to level 2; 26 level 2 move to level 3; 25 level 3 move to level 4)

6th Grade: Reading: 85% will meet or exceed MSP standard (7 level 1 move to level 2; 17 level 2 move to level 3; 17 level 3 move to level 4)

Strategy: Support the RTI Tier I, Tier II and Tier III process based on the 8 step model.

Guiding Questions: 1) What do we want students to know? 2) How do we know when they have learned it? 3) What will we do if they have not learned? 4) What do we do if they have already learned it?

Rationale: Historically, students have had access to school-wide, generalized curriculum. We know, based on experience, that students need intervention. RTI is a process of helping struggling students by responding to their specific needs.





Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur? What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
Revisit RTI process for key staff – clarify tier I, II, III	RTI workshop RTI Process training by counselors	Sept - June	RTI Resources & Forms	Dawn Dugan RTI Core Team RTI Leadership Team Teachers	Reflective Question
Further develop RTI program @ TFMS (forms system invest.)	RTI book The Highly Engaged Classroom	Sept - Nov	RTI book Visit other school Collection of other schools' formulas	RTI Core Team	RTI Leadership team to provide specific feedback on system & forms
Enrichment Period M-Th. 30 minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading • Math • Current Events • Science • IEP Enrichment • Art • Band • Keyboarding • Public Speaking • Reader's Theatre • Engineering • STEM • Shakespeare 	Cohort training-research	Sept - June	Comprehension Took Kit I Can Learn Navigation 101	Teachers	In class assessments
Referral process by teams during team times	Training by RTI Leadership team	Oct - Nov	Form & systems	Teachers & RTI Leadership team	The # of students who are referred





Tier II intervention Math, Organizational Skills & Reading	Videos "I Can Learn" webinars	Oct - June	"I Can Learn" "Vicki Phillips" personal development Comprehension Tool Kit	Teachers	Weekly assessment graphing The # of students exiting intervention program
Assess & evaluate all students 6-7-8 Reading inventory RAI	RAI Process	Oct – Jan	RAI Assessment Justin Talmage	Grade Level L/A teachers Justin Talmage Principals	Results of Assessment
<p>Procedures for evaluating success in reaching this goal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Movement up on MSP scores • Trimester grades • The # of students exiting RTI • Review the results of the Student Engagement Survey & prioritize needs. 					
<p>How will you know these interventions are working? Ongoing review of summative evidence.</p>					



Goal: Cultural Competency

<p>Learning Targets</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define Cultural Competence • Student and Staff Understanding and Celebrate Cultural Differences • Integrate within behavior, instructional and social experiences • Review district policy on controversial issues • Student goal setting • Mentoring relationships (staff/student, student/student)
<p>How will you measure improvement towards these goal(s)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequency of behavior, instructional and social experiences • End of year surveys (Healthy Youth, Perceptual, Classes) • Student interviews
<p>Current Results</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Center for school leadership
<p>Target</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the number of students who have a positive perception of time with adults by 25% • Increase student awareness and skill in goal setting from 50-80% • Decrease bullying behavior by 25%
<p>Completed Goal Statement <i>(Please see Exhibit 2)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% of staff and students will believe and celebrate the cultural diversity within our school culture and in the community in which they live as indicated on survey tools. • Increase student awareness and skill in goal setting from 50%- 80% •





Team Improvement Goal: 100% of staff and students will believe and celebrate the cultural diversity within our school culture and in the community in which they live as indicated on survey tools.

Strategy: Provide experiences and instruction focused around character traits, habits and celebrations.

Rationale: To prepare our students for 21st century relationships and professional skills

Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur?</i> <i>What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
Provide assemblies, and other experiences that creates different points of view: Anti Bullying Presentations Veterans Day Assembly Martin Luther King Other as designated by the ASB	Trained counselors, staff in anti bullying, habits of mind.	Throughout the 2011-2012 school year	Community Members Student Body Curriculum Projects Designated speakers	Administrators Counselors ASB	Reflections Surveys Pledges
Label and teach character traits, habits of mind through school recognition and instructional lessons	Defining cultural competencies – initiating school wide understanding of the Habits of Mind – Thinking Behaviors Love and Logic Principles	September-June	Art Costa Love and Logic Staff Members Students Library	Marty B. * Staff Members Students Ruth	School wide surveys Observe behaviors Discipline Referrals -Frequency of bully actions





Activities to Achieve this Goal <i>What action will occur?</i> <i>What steps will staff take?</i>	Professional Development <i>How will staff acquire the necessary skills & attitudes to implement the activity</i>	Timeline <i>When will this strategy or action begin and end?</i>	Resources Available <i>What existing and new resources will be used to accomplish the activity</i>	Who is Responsible <i>Who will provide the leadership?</i>	Monitoring Effectiveness <i>What on-going formative evidence will be gathered to show this activity is making a difference in student outcomes?</i>
Goal setting – school wide	Common goal setting tool	Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan	Organizers	Exploratory team Dave W., Austin, Dana, Robby	Monthly student check
<p>Procedures for evaluating success in reaching this goal: Continual monitoring and checking with all focus teams and end of year survey.</p>					
<p>How will you know these interventions are working? Focus team results presented to staff.</p>					





V. School Improvement Budget

(Tied to your School Improvement Plan)

**2011-12 School Improvement Allocation: Building Fund – Unit money that will allow staff development
SEA Professional Growth Money - \$4700, Title I,**

School Improvement Goal(s)	Professional Development Release Time, etc	Conferences Workshops	Consultants	Travel Expenses	Materials
Goal #1: Collaboration Focus Teams	SEA \$4700	Foundation Grant \$5000			
Goal #2: Intervention for struggling students Math	Title I – District Allocation	In Building Training			
Goal #3: LIT Team Staff Development	Unit Money \$4,275	In Building Training			
Total Cost:					

