



OREGON DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

TITLE III IMPROVEMENT PLANS Districts in 5+ years in Improvement Status

Submission Date: 6-28-12

District Name: Medford School District 549C

District Address: 815 S. Oakdale Ave.

City, State and Zip code Medford, OR 97501

ESL/Bilingual, Title III Director Terri Dahl Elizabeth Prusko Consultation –Carol Holm,Charlie Bauer

District Phone Number (541) 842-3636

Title III Director's Phone Number (541) 842-3633

Name of T III Director for SY 2012-2013 Terri Dahl

Name of Summer Contact July: Todd Bloomquist

Summer e-mail or phone # same

April, 2012

TITLE III IMPROVEMENT PLANS

Table of Contents for Title III Improvement Plans

ITEM	Page #
District/School Information	2
Components of Title III Improvement Plan	
Section A: Planning – Comprehensive Needs Assessment	2-3
1. Assessment results	4-12
2. Teacher Practices	13-15
3. Acts of Leadership	15-16
4. Strengths	16-17
5. Challenges	17-18
6. Identified Needs	18-19
Section A: Inquiry	19
1. Possible cause-effect relationships	19
2. Strategies driven by specific needs	19
3. Analysis of adult actions	20
Section A: SMART Goals	21
Section B: Implementation	25
Instructional Strategies	25
Section B: Master Plan Design	26
1. Purposeful, focused action steps	27-29
2. Adult learning and change process considered	30-31
3. Strategies linked to specific student needs	32
4. Action Steps and Timelines	34
Section C: Monitoring	
1. Monitoring Plan	39-40
2. Monitoring Frequency	43-45
3. Annual Evaluation	46-47

District information:

Check all that apply:

2010-11 AMAOs Report

AMAO 1: Acquiring English Language proficiency

Met Not Meet

AMAO 2 – Proficiency acquired (exited students)

Met Not Meet

AMAO 3 – Adequate Yearly Progress for the ELL Sub-group

Reading

Met Not Meet Corrective Action Year 7 (Year 1,2, ...)

Mathematics

Met Not Meet Corrective Action Year 7 (Year 1,2, ...)

School information

List the schools that will contribute to the 2012-2013 Title III Improvement Plan, provide name of school and grade levels each school serves. On the AMAOs/AYP columns check all that apply.

School Name	Grades	# ELLs	AMAO 1		AMAO 2		AYP Read		AYP Math	
			Met	N M	Met	NM	Met	NM	Met	NM
North Medford HS	9-12	45	X		X					
South Medford HS	9-12	45	X		X					X
Central Medford HS	9-12	5		X		X		X		
Hedrick MS	7-8	21	X		X			X		X
McLoughlin MS	7-8	45	X		X			X		X
Abraham Lincoln ES	K-6	13		X		X				
Griffin Creek ES	K-6	25		X	X					
Hoover ES	K-6	16	X			X				
Howard ES	K-6	105	X			X	X			X
Jackson ES	K-6	135	X		X		X			X
Jacksonville ES	K-6	13		X		X				
Jefferson ES	K-6	65		X		X	X		X	
Kennedy ES	K-6	55		X	X		X			X
Lone Pine ES	K-6	12		X		X				
Oak Grove ES	K-6	105	X		X		X			X
Roosevelt ES	K-6	60	X		X		X			X
Ruch School	K-8	3	X		X					

Washington ES	K-6	105	X		X		X			X
Wilson ES	K-6	65		X		X	X			X

Very Important

Section A: Planning – Comprehensive Needs Assessment - A1. Assessment Results: Narrative Required

I. Formative Achievement Data

a. DIBELS Data

- i. End of the Year Average DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency Scores for Active ELLs by Building and Grade Level:** In schools with larger sample sizes, such as Title I schools (shaded in the table below), the range in average scores among buildings is large in the primary grades, yet decreases by grades 4 and 5, the result being that ELL students from various schools demonstrate similar Oral Reading Fluency levels.

Grade Level:	1	2	3	4	5
Abraham Lincoln	73.8	56.0	56.5	n/a	45.5
Griffin Creek	48.3	68.5	86.8	n/a	80.0
Hoover	70.0	52.0	51.5	77.3	n/a
Howard	53.1	80.0	69.9	101	98.6
Jackson	47.9	69.2	100.6	102.3	99.3
Jacksonville	86.0	38.5	65.0	n/a	129.5
Jefferson	64.4	92.8	84.8	105.6	105.7
Kennedy	9.7	48.1	55.8	72.4	95.3
Lone Pine	47.0	66.5	81.0	50.0	n/a
Oak Grove	71.4	85.8	96.9	105.2	97.8
Roosevelt	73.0	52.4	52.0	102.0	98.7
Washington	40.7	48.8	74.9	98.2	95.0
Wilson	26.6	68.0	105.2	90.0	101.0
District	48.9	68.9	83.4	97.0	96.7
Growth Compared to 2010-2011	6.9	-5.9	-0.2	1.7	8.1
Grade Level	1	2	3	4	5
	47.8	68.3	83.4	89.7	98.2

- ii. Fall to Spring* Average DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency Growth for Active ELLs by Building and Grade Level:** Using the “Adequate Response to Intensive

Intervention” chart by Fuchs, Fuchs, Hamlett, Walz and Germann (1993), the expected realistic growth for 29 weeks of intervention would be: 1st Grade: 58.0, 2nd Grade: 43.5, 3rd Grade: 29.0, 4th Grade: 24.7, 5th Grade: 14.5. The actual amount of intervention for these students varied considerably, as did the number of weeks between which growth was measured.

Grade Level:	1	2	3	4	5
Abraham Lincoln	42.0	16.0	7.0	n/a	15.0
Griffin Creek	31.0	28.7	20.3	n/a	9.5
Hoover	28.5	30.0	29.0	39.3	n/a
Howard	17.2	29.4	20.4	33.6	29.4
Jackson	27.6	32.7	29.3	41.8	26.6
Jacksonville	43.0	20.5	28.0	n/a	38.0
Jefferson	36.8	42.9	26.2	21.7	23.7
Kennedy	6.1	18.1	16.0	22.4	9.8
Lone Pine	24.0	30.5	12.0	25.0	n/a
Oak Grove	32.1	40.0	37.0	37.7	22.4
Roosevelt	46.0	25.1	30.5	59.5	25.5
Washington	22.7	25.3	29.1	34.8	18.2
Wilson	13.6	26.3	22.0	30.1	27.2
District	25.3	31.0	26.3	35.3	22.9
Gap Between Actual and Expected Growth	32.7	12.5	2.7	-10.6	-8.4

* For students who did not have both fall and spring scores, growth scores were calculated for the time frame for which scores were available. Students with only one score for the year were not included.

Growth data reveals that although young students who have recently begun school lag behind in expected Oral Reading Fluency growth, by 3rd grade their rate of growth is comparable to the expected rate of growth for readers at that grade level. Overall, the rates of growth for ELLs on this measure continue to increase as students progress through the grade levels, and by the intermediate grades, exceeds expected rates of growth. This result is not surprising in that as students progress through the grade levels, their English language proficiency also increases, allowing them to more effectively process and benefit from reading instruction in English. This “faster than expected” growth should then allow ELLs to accelerate their progress and eventually catch up to the benchmark Oral Reading Fluency rate for their grade level.

- b. Grades Analysis for North Medford High School:** In December, 2011, 1st quarter grades and class sizes were analyzed for North Medford High School (NMHS). NMHS was chosen for analysis based on not meeting AYP for graduation rates for the 2010-2011 school year.

i. Class Sizes:

Class Type:	Regular	Honors	AP
Average Class Size	31.04	30.56	24.75

- ii. Year 1 and 2 Monitored Students:** Year 1 and Year 2 monitored students were identified as having “academic concerns” based on one of two possible criteria: 1. Failing more than 1 class during the 1st quarter, or 2. not on track to graduate based on accumulated credits. Out of 91 monitored students, 25.3% were identified as having academic concerns. Of those with academic concerns, 82.6% were identified as migrant or homeless or had an IEP or 504 plan, or a combination of those factors. In addition to this general data analysis, the sub-group of migrant and monitored students was looked at to determine whether or not academic success was correlated with participation in the Migrant Ed. after-school program, Hispanic Academic Outreach (HAO). The table below indicates the number of migrant and monitored students falling into each category:

	Academic Concerns	No Academic Concerns
Participated in HAO	2 (1 of which missed the first 2 weeks of school.)	6
Did Not Participate in HAO	7	7

- iii. Biology Grades for Active ELL and Year 1 and 2 Monitored Students:** A review of 1st quarter grades for Active ELL and Year 1 and 2 Monitored students revealed a high percentage of failing grades in the Biology course. Further analysis was then conducted on individual students in Biology classes.

- a. Active ELLs:** Five out of nine, or 55.5%, of Active ELLs failed the 1st quarter of Biology. Of those who failed, all were either of Latino or Pacific Islander race/ethnicity. Of the four who passed, one was of Latino ethnicity, and the others were of mainland Asian race/ethnicity.
- b. Year 1 and 2 Monitored Students:** Nine out of eleven, or 81.8%, of Year 1 and 2 Monitored students failed the 1st quarter of Biology. Of those who failed, all were either of Latino or Pacific Islander race/ethnicity. Of the two who passed, one was of Latino ethnicity, and the other was of mainland Asian race/ethnicity. In addition, of those who failed, for six out of nine, or 66.7%, of them, Biology was the only class they failed.

c. Science Grades Analysis for McLoughlin Middle School

II. Summative Achievement Data

a. ELPA

- i. AMAO 1: AMAO calculations are based on ELPA scores received through the May batch; therefore, it is difficult to draw conclusions from them. However, preliminary calculations reveal the district-wide AMAO 1 to be 51.0%, compared to last year's official AMAO 1 calculation of 56.71%. Based on this information, it appears that growth on ELPA has decreased from last year.

Elementary: 51.0%
 Middle School: 68.1%
 High School: 38.8%

School	% of LEP Students Increasing 1+ Levels on ELPA From 2010-2011 to 2011-2012
NMHS	33
SMHS	47
CMHS	0
Hedrick MS	81
McLoughlin MS	58
Abraham Lincoln	87
Griffin Creek	41
Hoover	40
Howard	49
Jackson	55
Jacksonville	57
Kennedy	47
Lone Pine	67
Oak Grove	56
Roosevelt	52
Washington	41
Wilson	46

- ii. AMAO 2A: Preliminary AMAO 2A calculations reveal that 16.7% of all ELLs were exited this year, which is 0.3% short of the AMAO 2A target of 17.0%.

Elementary: 14.4%
 Middle School: 24.7%
 High School: 26.0%

School	% of LEP Students Exited During 2011-2012
NMHS	27.1
SMHS	40.8
CMHS	0.0
Hedrick MS	40.0
McLoughlin MS	17.6
Abraham Lincoln	31.6
Griffin Creek	9.0
Hoover	5.3
Howard	14.7
Jackson	16.7

Jacksonville	11.1
Kennedy	17.0
Lone Pine	36.4
Oak Grove	14.1
Roosevelt	4.9
Washington	17.1
Wilson	14.9

iii. **AMAO 2B:** Preliminary AMAO 2B calculations reveal that 52.2% of ELLs who have received ELL services for 5 or more years were exits, which exceeds the AMAO 2B target of 26.5%

Elementary: 61.5%
Middle School: 30.6%
High School: 42.5%

b. **OAKS ELA:** (Substitute with Pre-preliminary AYP data if possible) Preliminary calculations (which exclude SEM calculations and possible 3rd opportunity scores) reveal that 23.3% of the LEP subgroup met or exceeded on the ELA OAKS test.

Elementary: 29.6%
Middle School: 16.3%
High School: 7.0%

c. **OAKS Math:** (Substitute with Pre-preliminary AYP data if possible) Preliminary calculations (which exclude SEM calculations and possible 3rd opportunity scores) reveal that 21.9% of the LEP subgroup met or exceeded on the Math OAKS test.

Elementary: 24.5%
Middle School: 26.1%
High School: 7.0%

d. **Essential Skills Requirements Met for Seniors:** The percentage of seniors who have met the Reading Essential Skills requirement for graduation is disaggregated in the chart below by factors that include LEP status, current participation in the ELL Program and SPED eligibility.

Subgroup	All Students	Excluding SPED students
LEP Students Participating in ELL Program	25%	30%
Year 1 and Year 2 Monitored Students	90%	93%
Non-ELL Students (Including students exited more than 2 years ago)	91%	95%
LEP Students Parent Refusal of Services	0%	0%

- I. ELD Observational Data:** Eighteen unannounced ELD lesson observations were conducted by a team of 2 observers (usually the principal and ELL TOSA) in May 2012. The SELD observation tool was used. All ELL teachers were observed at least once.
- a. Results:** ELD observational data revealed that out of eighteen unannounced observations, nine did not exhibit enough essential components of an SELD lesson (as described in the SELD Lesson Observation tool) to meet the criteria of the SELD framework. Seven of the nine lessons that did not meet the SELD criteria exhibited characteristics of an ELA lesson. The other two involved special projects/activities, including a game-based review for an upcoming assessment and a holiday-related project.
- i. “Teacher” portion of the SELD Observation Tool:** The lesson components most consistently implemented were “bringing language to life” and “clearly and succinctly explaining the task”. The area least consistently implemented was “closing the lesson”.
- ii. “Students” portion of the SELD Observation Tool:** The lesson feature most consistently observed was “participation in activities”. The feature least consistently observed was “language practice” in whole group, small group or partners and “self-assessment”.
- iii. “Environment/Materials” portion of the SELD Observation Tool:** The element most consistently observed was the use of “age-appropriate, culturally diverse visuals/text”. The element least consistently observed was the use of “manipulatives” during language practice.
- b. Implications for Professional Development:** During an ELL Department meeting on June 6, 2012, ELL teachers analyzed the observational data and used it to identify strengths and areas of need. One goal was identified for each of the three portions of the SELD Observational Tool. These goals will form the basis of professional development opportunities for next year, which will be conducted during monthly ELL Department meetings.
- II. SEI Observational Data:** One-hundred seventy-five unannounced content-area lesson observations were conducted by teams made up of various combinations of the ELL TOSA, principals, the Title III Director and SEI-trained teachers. The “Sheltered English Instruction Observation Tool for Objectives” was used. Observation dates varied by building, but all occurred after mid-November.
- a. Results:** The purpose of the SEI observation data collection was to collect baseline data to help focus future goals in that area. Previously, there was no systemic process or venue for identifying or discussing SEI strategies being used in the classroom. Sixty percent of the classrooms observed demonstrated some manifestation of a content objective. (“Credit” for manifestation of a content objective was given even at a level as minimal as posting the reading skill for the week.) Forty percent demonstrated some manifestation of a language objective. (“Credit” for manifestation of a language objective varied widely depending on the expertise/experience of the people conducting the observation. In a few cases, it appears that regular content area vocabulary instruction, or expression of what students were required to say or write, was treated as a language objective. Therefore, the 30% rate is very likely an overestimate of the actual use of true language objectives, as defined in such SEI models as SIOP or CM.) In 60% of classrooms observed, students were able to state the content objective. (“Credit” was given for this component even if the content objective was not explicitly posted or stated. In these cases, the observer inferred the content objective from the

nature of the instruction and made a judgment call as to whether or not the student's statement reflected that inference.) In 20% of classrooms observed, students were able to state the language objective.

- b. Implications for Professional Development:** Results of the SEI observational data collection indicate a need to support teachers in the identification of content and language objectives for district-wide curriculum. Next year, Title funds will be used to support teams of teachers to work with the ELL TOSA to write content and language objectives for each week's lesson in the elementary reading curriculum. In addition, a more clearly articulated and sensitive observation tool should be used to address the lack of consistency in the way that various observers evaluate the use of content and language objectives, which stems primarily from the wide range of expertise/experience that various principals have in SEI strategies.

III. Anecdotal Elementary Scheduling Data: On February 1, 2012, during an ELL department meeting, elementary ELL teachers gave anecdotal descriptions of what students were missing during ELD instruction and how double-dose instruction was scheduled and implemented for ELLs.

- a. Results:** Anecdotal descriptions of ELD and double-dose scheduling indicated a variety of approaches to scheduling. Four out of seven Title I schools indicated that ELD was scheduled during the double-dose block. The other Title I schools, as well as the non-Title schools, described various combinations of instruction missed for ELD, including specials (art, music, PE, etc.), science and social studies, writing and SSR. In a few individual cases, students missed portions of core reading or math instruction, not exceeding 15 minutes per day. Since each building has a different amount of resources for double-dose interventions, and a different plan for using them, there were no consistent patterns in terms of how many or which ELLs had access to double-dose interventions. More granular detail, student by student, would be needed to glean out that information.
- b. Implications for Professional Development:** More follow-up is needed to secure the schedules early in the year. (Before the school year begins for school-wide master schedules and by the 3rd week of school for ELD group schedules.) As part of the district-created "SEI Program Plan Worksheet," which was shared with principals on November 16, 2011 and will be fully implemented in the 2012-2013 school year, principals will be required to submit by the end of September the following:
- i. School-wide master schedule
 - ii. ELD schedule, including grouping structures and students' names
 - iii. List of ELLs who qualify for double-dose under the school's RTI structure
 - iv. Double-dose schedule for all ELLs who qualify under the school's RTI structure, including grouping structures, students' names and curriculum used
 - v. SPED services schedule for all dual-identified ELL/SPED students.

Continued professional development is also needed to help principals and double-dose coordinators understand the legal requirements for access to the core instructional program, including all needed services, and strategies for creating a schedule that provides such access.

Very Important

A3. Comprehensive Needs Assessment: - Acts of Leadership Narrative Required

Leadership actions describe the degree to which leaders monitor performance, in ELD and core content classrooms, set direction, provide feedback, or communicate values.

I. ELD Program

- a. **Involvement in Observational Data Collection:** The ELL Teachers were asked for input as to who would conduct the ELD observations. They chose to have the ELL TOSA and the building principal conduct the observations, seeing the experience as an opportunity for dialogue between the ELL TOSA and their building principals. Sixteen out of seventeen observations were conducted in this manner. After the observation, the ELL TOSA and principal debriefed and discussed elements of effective ELD instruction. Principals vary widely in their level of experience with and knowledge about ELD instruction. This experience allowed for individualized professional growth.
- b. **Building-based ELD Program Leadership:** The principals of two elementary buildings invited the ELL TOSA to provide a professional development presentation to their entire teaching staff. The presentation was focused on the use of content and language objectives in the classroom. Each building principal and ELL teacher was asked to provide a minimum 45-minute presentation to their building staff on an ELL-related issue. In fourteen out of nineteen buildings, a whole-staff presentation on an ELL-related issue occurred. (In three of the fourteen schools, the presentation was done by either the ELL TOSA or an ELL teacher from a different school.) Out of the five secondary schools, only Hedrick Middle School conducted a staff presentation on an ELL-related issue.

II. SEI Program

- a. **Involvement in Observational Data Collection:** Building principals were given the opportunity to decide who would conduct the SEI observations. Eleven principals felt equipped to do the data collection by themselves. Four invited the ELL TOSA to join them, and three had SEI-trained teachers conduct the observations (one in conjunction with the ELL TOSA). The process allowed principals to begin looking at classroom instruction through another lens and making connections between SEI strategies and other instructional initiatives they are working on (including Math Studio, Active Participation Strategies and Proficiency-based Learning).
- b. **Building-based SEI Program Leadership:** Each principal was presented in November with a worksheet to guide them through the components of a SEI program. The district made the decision to implement a “soft start” to the development of building-based SEI programs. For the 2011-2012 school year, principals were expected to collect the observational data and provide a venue for the ELL teacher to host an ELL-related presentation to their staff. Full implementation of the SEI Program documentation requirements would take place during the 2012-2013 school year.

Very Important

A4. COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: Strengths **Narrative Required**

Rank-order the identified areas of strength (3-5) from the EL student performance (cognitive data), data, and/or graduation index and indicate the supporting data sources:

- I. **Student Achievement - ELD:** According to AMAO 2B data, the majority of students who receive ELD instruction through the elementary grades are exiting the ELL program within the research-based average of 5-7 years.

II. Student Achievement - SEI: According to Essential Skills data indicated in section A1.II.d. above, students who have successfully exited the ELL program within the past 2 years meet the Essential Skills reading requirement for graduation at virtually the same rate as native English-speakers and students who exited the ELL program more than 2 years ago. Additionally, 25% of active ELL students meet the Essential Skills reading requirement (in English!).

III. Teaching Practices - ELD: The ELD observational data analysis process provided clear, focused direction for further professional development to refine the implementation of the research-based instructional model adopted by the district (Systematic English Language Development – SELD). The ELL Teachers themselves analyzed the data and determined goals for increasing the level of implementation for three essential components of effective ELD instruction.

IV. Leadership Actions: For both ELD and SEI Programs, the experience of conducting classroom observations and/or debriefing the results together has provided a venue for principals and ELL specialists (ELL TOSA, building ELL Teachers, regional ELL “experts”) to discuss instructional practices through the lens of ELLs. This process could provide a point of traction for improving the implementation of effective ELD and SEI practices.

Very Important

A 5. COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT - Challenges: Narrative

Required

The identified challenges will lead to the goals. The contributing factors of the challenges will lead to the strategies.

I. Student Achievement

- a. **ELD:** ELP growth has continued to plateau at the Intermediate – Early Advanced levels, as demonstrated in AMAO 1 data, especially at the secondary level.
- b. **SEI:** ELLs at the secondary level have a high failure rate in science courses, as demonstrated in the grade data analysis completed for students at McLoughlin Middle School and North Medford High School.

II. Teaching Practices

- a. **ELD:** ELD observation data shows that the implementation of the components of a SELD-framed ELD lesson is inconsistent.
- b. **SEI:** SEI observation data shows that the implementation of the use of content and language objectives is inconsistent and, when done at all, is generally implemented at a minimal level. (i.e. Content Objectives are written as single words or short phrases rather than in complete sentences and/or are posted but not stated or revisited.)

III. Leadership Actions: For both ELD and SEI, principals’ expertise/experience with the components of effective programs varies considerably from building to building, as does the extent of pro-active involvement in the development of these programs at the building level. These differences reveal themselves in the process of planning and conducting observations and the frequency and nature of communication between principals and ELL specialists, both at the building and district levels.

These differences present a challenge when attempting to collect data and implement procedures consistently throughout the district.

Very Important

A6. Identifying Needs - What Do You Want To Accomplish? Narrative Required

Prioritize Needs

Several of the Challenges presented in the above section are highly inter-related. Clarifying these relationships allows for clearer prioritization of needs.

- I. ELD Instruction and ELP Growth:** There is likely a correlation between the lack of adequate implementation of components of an effective ELD lesson (as measured by the SELD observation tool) and the plateau effect observed in students at the Intermediate – Advanced ELP levels. Therefore, both of those challenges will be investigated together, as implementation and impact sides of the same coin.

- II. Leadership Actions and SEI Implementation:** As instructional leaders, principals set priorities for the implementation of instructional practices within the classroom setting. If principals clearly communicate to teachers that the components of effective SEI are expected, and provide professional development and resources to support implementation of those practices, then it is more likely that those practices will actually be implemented in a consistent manner. Therefore, the implementation of SEI in classrooms is closely linked to leadership action on the part of principals and district-level administrators.

- III. Science Instruction at the Secondary Level:** More so than in other content areas, ELLs are struggling to meet content area standards in science at the secondary level. High failure rates in science make it difficult for students to meet graduation credit requirements. Based on science course assignments for ELLs, it appears that the response to student failure in college preparatory science courses (i.e. Biology, Chemistry and Physics) has been to take the students out of those courses and switch them to a different set of courses (i.e. Life Science, Chemistry in the Community and Geoscience). Instead of using this approach, efforts need to be made to examine current science curriculum and instruction through the lens of effective SEI strategies with the goal of revising the ways in which the content standards are presented and assessed.

Very Important

A1. Comprehensive Needs Assessment – Inquiry Narrative Required

- I. ELD Instruction and ELP Growth:** The sequence indicated below documents the Root Cause Analysis process for the lack of adequate progress in ELD for Intermediate – Advanced levels.
 - a.** Students are not receiving effective ELD instruction at those levels.
 - b.** ELL teachers are, approximately 50% of the time (based on ELD observational data), delivering instruction during the ELD instructional time that does not meet the criteria for an ELD lesson, as defined by the SELD Observation Tool.
 - c.** Some teachers do not yet have a clear understanding of what ELD instruction should look like for students at higher proficiency levels.
 - d.** The state-approved, district-adopted curriculum (Ballard & Tighe) does not align with the SELD framework tightly enough to allow teachers to use it “as is”.
 - e.** Curriculum/SELD alignment work done over the past two years has revealed holes in the curriculum, especially at the Intermediate – Advanced levels.

- f. Additional materials were sought out to fill those holes in a way that is aligned to the SELD framework. The only materials located were materials from Monterey at the elementary level, materials from Redmond at the secondary level, EL Achieve’s SELD Instructional Kits at the elementary and middle school levels and EL Achieve’s CM Units at the high school level. These materials will be available for use next year.
- g. In addition to lack of appropriate curriculum materials, the lack of a common formative assessment also reduces the clarity of our instructional purpose for Intermediate – Advanced students.

II. Leadership Actions and SEI Implementation: The sequence indicated below documents the Root Cause Analysis process for the lack of implementation of an effective SEI Program in each building:

- a. Some classroom teachers lack an awareness of the rationale for the implementation of a SEI Program.
- b. Some teachers are aware of the rationale for the implementation of a SEI Program but lack the skills/knowledge to implement SEI strategies into their instruction.
- c. Some teachers have been trained in the strategies of SEI but do not have the time or energy to implement them because they are overwhelmed by competing requirements and initiatives.
- d. In all three of the above cases, principals have the authority/opportunity to address the issue. Some principals do not address the issue because they, themselves, are in the same situation as the teachers in their buildings.
- e. The variety in “quantity” and “quality” of background in ELL-related knowledge precludes the use of a “one-size-fits-all” response on the part of the district.
- f. Each building, therefore, must create its own SEI Program.
- g. Principals need varying levels of scaffolding to develop an effective SEI Program for their buildings, including support on the monitoring process and teaching strategies to emphasize with teachers.
- h. Tools, such as the SEI Program Planning Worksheet and SEI Observation Tool need to be tweaked in order to make them more usable for principals with more limited experience/expertise in SEI.

III. Science Instruction at the Secondary Level: The sequence indicated below documents the Root Cause Analysis process for the high failure rate experienced by Active and Year 1 and 2 Monitored ELLs in secondary science courses.

- a. Students are not able to effectively access the content area curriculum in secondary science courses.
- b. Students may lack sufficiency background in science concepts and vocabulary due to greatly diminished science instruction at the elementary level since NCLB was instituted. (A general survey of subpopulations on 5th grade Science OAKS results at schools with high numbers of ELL, Hispanic and Migrant students [i.e. Jackson Elementary in Medford, Phoenix Elementary in the PTSD and Mountain View Elementary in the Eagle Point SD shows a large gap [30 – 40%] between the general population and these subgroups. Therefore, it appears that the decrease in instruction in science negatively impacts these subgroups to a larger degree than it does the general population.)
- c. Instructional strategies and the instructional environment, including texts used, do not promote comprehensible input to the degree needed for ELLs.
- d. The linguistic demands of both comprehension and expression of content concepts in science courses exceed the independent linguistic skills of ELLs.
- e. Teachers are not providing language scaffolding and explicit instruction to the degree needed to all ELLs to comprehend and express content concepts in science courses.

- f. Resources, including staff time and have not been devoted to examining and revising current materials and instructional strategies in light of effective SEI.
- g. The “path-of-least-resistance” response to student failure has been to pull students out of college-prep classes and place them in classes that are thought to be less academically rigorous.
- h. Examination and revision of science materials and instructional strategies has not been prioritized at the department, building or district level.

Very Important

A. Comprehensive Needs assessment – SMART Goals Narrative Required

SMART Goals Template

Smart Goal: 57% of ELLs in grades 9-12 who scored a 3 or 4 Total Placement Level on ELPA in 2011-2012 will increase their Total Placement Level score by at least one level on ELPA in 2012-2013.

Specific – *What should be achieved?*

Students who scored a 3 or 4 Total Placement Level on ELPA in 2011-2012 will increase their Total Placement Level score on ELPA by at least one level in 2012-2013.

Measurable *How will you know if the goal has been reached?*

The calculation is based on AMAO 1, but with a subgroup identified by grade level and 2011-2012 ELPA scores.

Achievable (Action Plan) *Which actions will you take to achieve the goals*

1. Develop common formative assessments to monitor progress in ELP.
2. Provide professional development in effective ELD teaching strategies.
3. Monitor the implementation of those effective ELD teaching strategies.
4. Continue acquiring appropriate curriculum materials to support effective ELD instruction for Intermediate – Advanced ELLs at the high school level.

Realistic *Are they achievable?*

57% is the AMAO target for the 2011-2012 school year. This year, 46.7% of ELLs in grades 9-12 who received a 3 or 4 Total Placement Level score on ELPA increased one or more levels since the 2010-2011 school year. Thus, the goal is to increase the percentage by 10.3. The 46.7% figure puts the baseline close to the border between the 2nd and 3rd quartile, which have minimal growth targets of 12% and 7% respectively. Therefore, 10.3% is an appropriate rate of growth.

Time Frame *By when?*

The time frame reflects the time frame inherent in the ELPA testing and score-reporting process, which typically ends on June 15th of the school year.

Smart Goal: ELLs at the elementary level (grades 3-6) will increase their RIT score on the ELA OAKS test from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013 by an average of 5 points.

Specific – *What should be achieved?*

ELLs at the elementary level (grades 3-6) will increase their RIT score on the ELA OAKS test by an average of 5- 7 points.

Measurable *How will you know if the goal has been reached?*

After the OAKS testing window has closed in May 2013, students' highest RIT score from the 2011-2012 school year will be subtracted from the highest RIT score from 2012-2013 to determine the gain for each student. Those gains will then be averaged and compared to the goal.

Achievable (Action Plan) *Which actions will you take to achieve the goals*

1. For classrooms where ELLs are placed, principals will describe on the SEI Program Planning Worksheet the SEI strategies that will be targeted for professional development and implementation monitoring (i.e. content and language objectives, active participation strategies).
2. Title funds will be used to provide time for elementary ELA teachers to work with the ELL TOSA to identify weekly content and language objectives for the Reading Street curriculum at grades K-5.
3. Master Schedules (including ELD, double-dose and SPED schedules) will be collected and analyzed in September 2012 to determine the level of access ELLs have to appropriate ELA instruction.

Realistic *Are they achievable?*

According to criteria set by ODE the minimal growth from baseline scores to close the achievement gap are 1st Quartile >20%, 2nd Quartile >2%, 3rd Quartile 7%, and highest quartile > 4 %. By actually taking the students' highest RIT score from the 2011-2012 school year and subtracting that from the highest RIT score from 2012-2013 school year the gain for each student will be calculated and then be averaged and compared to the actual goal. These goals are sufficiently challenging to close the achievement/learning gaps for the targeted student sub-skill group rate for the 3 to 5 year targets. This goal will meet the criteria in achieving the school's overall records to student achievement and the ultimate goal of closing the achievement gap. The range of growth set is rigorous and attainable.

Time Frame *By when?*

The OAKS testing window typically closes at the end of May of each school year.

Smart Goal: 65 % of the quarter grades for Active and Year 1 and 2 Monitored ELLs in grades 7-12 will be a passing grade of C or better for their assigned science courses for the first 3 quarters of the 2012-2013 school year.

Specific – *What should be achieved?*

65% of Active and Year 1 and 2 Monitored ELLs in grades 7-12 will receive passing grades of C or better during the first 3 quarters of the school year in their assigned science courses.

Measurable *How will you know if the goal has been reached?*

After each quarter, science grades for Active and Year 1 and 2 Monitored ELLs will be analyzed to determine the percentage of passing grades (C or better) earned in science courses. After 3rd quarter grades have been entered, the percentage will be compared to the goal to determine if it was met.

Achievable (Action Plan) *Which actions will you take to achieve the goals*

Option 1 1. Principals will work with the Secondary Education Director to identify one team of middle school science teachers and one team of secondary science teachers. (All biology teachers on a team teach the same course.) The principals and director will create a schedule for conducting curriculum evaluation/revision work. The ELL TOSA will join the teams and help to facilitate the process.

Option 2 1. Using existing PLC structures, one middle school and one high school science PLC will be identified by the principals and the Secondary Education Director to conduct curriculum evaluation/revision work as part of their PLC (and given additional time in which to conduct the work). The principals and director will create a schedule for conducting curriculum evaluation/revision work. The ELL TOSA will join the teams and help to facilitate the process.

2. Implementation of the strategies identified during the curriculum evaluation/revision work will be monitored using the SEI Observation Tool used for 2012-2013 data collection.

Realistic *Are they achievable?*

The goal of 65% is based on the percent of the general student population that passed their middle school science class during the same time frame in which ELL grade data was collected at McLoughlin Middle School. The fact that Year 1 and 2 Monitored students failed at approximately the same rate as Active ELLs supports the hypothesis that student failure is not caused primarily by significantly limited English proficiency (i.e. being a Beginning or Early Intermediate ELL). Therefore, the expectation that changes in instructional strategies and scaffolding for language should allow these students to succeed in science classes at the same rate as the general population is a realistic one.

Time Frame *By when?*

Grade data will be collected after each of the first 3 quarters of the 2012-2013 school year.

Very Important

Section B: Implementation - Research-Based Strategies - Instructional Strategies Narrative Required

All of the instructional strategies outlined for ELD and regular education classrooms are grounded in sound research for standards-based practices. Evidence demonstrates how supporting strategies will improve achievements.

- I. ELD:** Systematic English Language Development is the framework for ELD instruction. The SELD Observation Tool is used to monitor implementation of the essential components of ELD instruction. Through analysis of ELD observation data at the June 6, 2012 ELL Department meeting, the following components were identified as areas in need of improvement:
 - a. Teacher:** Increase the frequency with which the lesson is closed effectively, including reviewing the objective and making connections to real-life and/or content applications for the target language.
 - b. Students:** Increase the percentage of time spent on structured language practice, including whole group, small group and partner practice.
 - c. Environment/Materials:** Increase the use of manipulatives during structured language practice.
- II. SEI:** A revised SEI Observation tool will be created to allow monitoring of the following essential components of effective SEI.
 - a. Content Objectives:** Posting, stating, revisiting and reviewing what students are supposed to learn during the lesson provide two primary benefits to learning:
 - i.** Helping the teacher to remain more focused on activities that support the learning goal.
 - ii.** Helping the students to be aware of the learning “destination”, rather than viewing the lesson as a series of activities to complete.
 - b. Language Objectives:** Posting, stating, practicing and assessing via explicit language structures (i.e. sentence frames or paragraph or genre summary templates) provide students with explicit instruction in the language needed to understand and express the content objective without assuming (often wrongly) that students are already coming to the content classroom proficient in those language structures.
 - c. Active Participation Strategies:** Although it was not specifically measured using this year’s SEI Observation Tool, anecdotally it was noticed that very few teachers employed active participation strategies during classroom instruction. Most instruction was conducted by the teacher calling on individual students. Active participation strategies, such as Think-Pair-Share, choral or whole group response and cooperative learning activities, including Numbered Heads Together and Reciprocal Reading, provide more opportunities for each student to actively engage in the content and also provide scaffolding for struggling students. In addition, these strategies allow for more frequent formative assessment in the form of “spot-checks”. Next year’s SEI Observation tool will include data collection for active participation strategies.

Section B: Implementation - Research-Based Strategies - Master Plan Design Narrative Required

GOAL 1 – Master Plan Design

(Rubric Indicator Sec B)

Initial Submission DATE: _____

Revised DATE: _____

Section A – Describe your goal and identify which need(s) it addresses. (Remember that in Sec A you identified the strengths and challenges/needs.)

SMART Goal 1	57% of ELLs in grades 9-12 who scored a 3 or 4 Total Placement Level on ELPA in 2011-2012 will increase their Total Placement Level score by at least one level on ELPA in 2012-2013.
Which need(s) does this Goal address?	ELD Instruction and ELP Growth
Is this Goal linked to the 2011-12 Plan? How? Describe the link and reason(s) why.	This goal is linked to the 2011-2012 goal of procuring effective ELD curriculum for Early Advanced and Advanced ELLs in that access to effective curriculum is likely to lead to more effective ELD instruction. It is also related to the goal of appropriate grouping of ELLs for ELD instruction in that proficiency-based grouping increases the effectiveness of ELD instruction. In addition, this goal is related to the goal of monitoring the ELD program in that monitoring allows us to measure our use of effective strategies and respond accordingly with targeted professional development.

ACTION STEPS – (Rubric Indicator Sec B)

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN – (Rubric Indicator Sec B)

Section B – Descriptively list the action you plan to take to ensure you will be able to progress toward your goal. Action steps are strategies and interventions which should be scientifically based and *include implications for professional development, and implications for parent and community involvement initiatives within the action steps of each goal.*

Section C For each of the Action Steps you list, give timeline, person(s) responsible, required resources, funding sources, evaluation strategy and performance results/outcomes. (For Evaluation Strategy, define how you will evaluate the action step.)

		Person(s) Responsible	Timeline (frequency)	Evaluation Strategy	Performance Results / Outcomes	Required Resources	Projected Cost(s) & Funding Sources
Action Step	To ensure ELL are placed in appropriate groups for proficiency based grouping personnel will be added as well as scheduling to support improving achievement for ELL's.	ELL Director ELL Coordinator Building Principals	Starting September 2012- Spring 2013	Proficiency based grouping assessment ELPA results	LEVEL 3 and 4 students from 2011-2012 will increase their total placement level scores by at least one level.	ELPA tests and school schedules of instruction	General Funds ELL budget
Action Step: Research-based	Added 3 -.5FTE and 1 full time FTE ELL teachers to reduce caseloads and allow for flexible grouping in schools.	ELL Director Principals	Starting August 2012 ongoing permanent positions	Review ELPA scores and class schedules for proficiency based grouping results/student outcomes	LEVEL 3 and 4 students from 2011-2012 will increase their total placement level scores by at least one level.	ELPA tests and school schedules of instruction	General Funds ELL budget

Action Step: Implications for PD	ELL staff meetings/ principal meetings training on proficiency based grouping and custom scheduling to meet the needs of the ELL learner	ELL Director ELL Coordinator Building Principals	Starting September 2012- Spring 2013	Proficiency based grouping assessment ELPA results	LEVEL 3 and 4 students from 2011-2012 will increase their total placement level scores by at least one level.	ELPA tests and school schedules of instruction	General Funds ELL budget
Action Step: Implications for parent/community participation	At parent involvement meetings talk about proficiency based grouping and introduce new added staff in the Fall. In the Spring meet with parents again to go over the test results of ELPA scores 11-12 to 12-13 and look and the trend data of improvement.	ELL Director ELL Coordinator Building Principals ELL teachers	May 2013	ELPA results from current available scores in May	Chart ELPA data 2011-12 data compared to 2012-13 data	Chart ELPA data 2011-12 data compared to 2012-13 data	Parent involvement dollars

Tennessee School Improvement Process, Tennessee Department of Education

GOAL 2 – Master Plan Design

<i>(Rubric Indicator Sec B)</i>	Initial Submission DATE: _____	Revised DATE: _____
Section A –Describe your goal and identify which need(s) it addresses. (Remember that in Sec A you identified the strengths and challenges/needs.)		
SMART Goal 2	ELLs at the elementary level (grades 3-6) will increase their RIT score on the ELA OAKS test from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013 by an average of 5-7 points.	
Which need(s) does this Goal address?	Leadership Actions and SEI Implementation	
Is this Goal linked to the 2011-12 Plan? How? Describe the link and reason(s) why.	This goal is linked to the 2011-2012 goal of implementation of an SEI program in that the consistent use of SEI strategies is likely to lead to higher academic achievement for ELLs in academic content areas. It is also related to the goal of monitoring SEI programs in that monitoring allows us to measure our use of effective strategies and respond accordingly with targeted professional development.	
ACTION STEPS – (Rubric Indicator Sec B)	IMPLEMENTATION PLAN – (Rubric Indicator Sec B)	
Section B – Descriptively list the action you plan to take to ensure you will be able to progress toward your goal. Action steps are strategies and interventions which should be scientifically based and <i>include implications</i>	Section C For each of the Action Steps you list, give timeline, person(s) responsible, required resources, funding sources, evaluation strategy and performance results/outcomes. (For Evaluation Strategy, define how you will evaluate the action step.)	

<i>for professional development, and implications for parent and community involvement initiatives within the action steps of each goal.</i>		Person(s) Responsible	Timeline (frequency)	Evaluation Strategy	Performance Results / Outcomes	Required Resources	Projected Cost(s) & Funding Sources
Action Step	SEI training will be provided to gen ed teachers which ensures teachers use the SEI strategies.	ELL Director ELL Coordinator Building Principals	Starting September 2012- Spring 2013	Proficiency based grouping assessment ELPA results	All level ELL's 1-5 students from 2011-2012 will increase their total placement level scores by at least one level	SEI trainers	Title IIA dollars
Action Step: Research-based	SEI training will be given by certified trainers following the best practice research based strategies proven to enhance teacher instruction and student outcomes at the elementary schools.	ELL Director Principals	Starting August 2012 ongoing permanent positions	Review ELPA scores and class schedules for proficiency based grouping results/student outcomes	All level ELL's 1-5 students from 2011-2012 will increase their total placement level scores by at least one level	Observers to take data on teachers implementing SEI	Title IIA dollars
Action Step: Implications for PD	SEI training will occur and be paid for through Title IIA funds. All second year teachers receive SLOP. Second year elementary teachers content area	ELL Director ELL Coordinator Building Principals	Starting September 2012- Spring 2013	Proficiency based grouping assessment ELPA results	Teacher observations and general observation data will be collected.	SEI trainer and sub pay for teachers to attend	Title IIA dollars
Action Step: Implications for parent/community participation	Parent Involvement night to review SEI strategies for student in the content area classroom and administer parent survey regarding specific needs around the program	ELL Director ELL Coordinator Building Principals ELL teachers	May 2013	ELPA results from current available scores in May to be reviewed with parents	Teacher surveys and student outcome data will be reviewed and collected. Parent feedback will be recorded	Parent involvement surveys and staff to oversee parent involvement meetings	Title 1A dollars Title Schools Title IIA dollars non-Title schools

GOAL 3 – Master Plan Design

(Rubric Indicator Sec B)

Initial Submission DATE: _____

Revised DATE: _____

Section A – Describe your goal and identify which need(s) it addresses. (Remember that in Sec A you identified the strengths and challenges/needs.)

SMART Goal 3	65% of the quarter grades for Active and Year 1 and 2 Monitored ELLs in grades 7-12 will be a passing grade of C or better for their assigned science courses for the first 3 quarters of the 2012-2013 school year.						
Which need(s) does this Goal address?	Science Instruction at the Secondary Level						
Is this Goal linked to the 2011-12 Plan? How? Describe the link and reason(s) why.	This goal is linked to the 2011-2012 goal of implementation of an SEI program in that the consistent use of SEI strategies is likely to lead to higher academic achievement for ELLs in academic content areas. It is also related to the goal of monitoring SEI programs in that monitoring allows us to measure our use of effective strategies and respond accordingly with targeted professional development.						
ACTION STEPS – (Rubric Indicator Sec B)				IMPLEMENTATION PLAN – (Rubric Indicator Sec B)			
Section B – Descriptively list the action you plan to take to ensure you will be able to progress toward your goal. Action steps are strategies and interventions which should be scientifically based and <i>include implications for professional development, and implications for parent and community involvement initiatives within the action steps of each goal.</i>				Section C For each of the Action Steps you list, give timeline, person(s) responsible, required resources, funding sources, evaluation strategy and performance results/outcomes. (For Evaluation Strategy, define how you will evaluate the action step.)			
		Person(s) Responsible	Timeline (frequency)	Evaluation Strategy	Performance Results / Outcomes	Required Resources	Projected Cost(s) & Funding Sources
Action Step	SEI training will be provided to content area teachers which ensures teachers use the SEI strategies.	ELL Director ELL Coordinator	Training start Fall 2012	Training participation and progress monitor through focus walks and trainer observations	Observational data gathered from SEI observation tool	Observational data gathered from SEI observation tool	Title IIA funds \$10,000
Action Step: Research-based	SEI training will be given by certified trainers following the best practice research based strategies proven to enhance teacher instruction and student outcomes.	Certified SEI trainer	Starting in the Fall of 2012 and ending Spring 2013	SEI observational protocol	Observational data gathered from SEI observation tool	Observational data gathered from SEI observation tool	Title IIA funds \$10,000
Action Step: Implications for PD	SEI training will occur and be paid for through Title IIA funds. All second year teachers receive SLOP. Second year content area teachers will receive SEI.	Certified SEI trainer	Starting in the Fall of 2012 and ending Spring 2013	SEI observational protocol	Observational data gathered from SEI observation tool	Observational data gathered from SEI observation tool	Title IIA funds \$10,000

Action Step: Implications for parent/community participation	Parent Involvement night to review SEI strategies for student in the content area classroom and administer parent survey regarding specific needs around the program	District Title III Director and ELL staff	Fall 2012 October	Parent needs survey	Survey Summary Data compiled and shared	Survey and parent involvement funds Childcare Snacks	Title IA and Title III funds
---	--	---	----------------------	---------------------	--	--	------------------------------

Very Important

Section B: Implementation -- Professional Development Narrative Required

- I. **ELD Professional Development:** Professional development for ELL teachers will be focused on the three goals identified by the ELL teachers on June 6, 2012 based on their analysis of the ELD observation data collected during the 2011-2012 school year. (Goals are specified in a previous section of this plan.) Observations will be conducted twice for each teacher next year (once before January 2013 and once during or after January 2013) to monitor the implementation of the strategies learned. Professional development training will be delivered during monthly ELL Department Meetings, which occur on the first Wednesday of each month. The ELL TOSA and Federal Programs Supervisor will provide the professional development. The content of the professional development will be a refinement of strategies within the SELD framework.

- II. **SEI Professional Development:** In addition to continued offerings of SIOP, CM and GLAD trainings to interested teachers, the district will enhance its coaching/implementation support via the following goals.
 - a. **Reading Street Content and Language Objectives:** The ELL TOSA will work with grade-level ELA teachers to identify weekly content and language objectives for the Reading Street curriculum, which is used in grades K-5. Teachers will be recruited by the ELL TOSA and building principals. Title funds will be used to pay for the extra time required, either via release-time or as additional hours paid per the teachers' contract. Teacher teams will be identified by the end of October 2012 and will work on individual schedules based on the participants' convenience. Weekly content and language objectives for all grade levels will be identified by June 2013. These objectives will then be made available to teachers by fall 2013.

 - b. **Science Curriculum Evaluation and Revision:** The ELL TOSA will work with one team of middle school science teachers and one team of high school Biology teachers to evaluate and revise the science curriculum to include features of SIOP and tools from the Constructing Meaning approach. Teachers will be recruited by the ELL TOSA and building principals. Title funds will be used to pay for the extra time required, either via release-time or as additional hours paid per the teachers' contract. Teacher teams will be

identified by the end of October 2012 and will work on individual schedules based on the participants' convenience. The evaluation and revision process will be completed by June 2013. The revisions will then be made available to teachers by fall 2013.

Major Components of the Professional Development Plan: **SMART Goal:**

Identify the focused professional development

Planning - The Professional Development System must be based upon”:	Dates of delivery	Dates for systematic consultation with internal trainers, regional or state personnel designated to provide on-going technical assistance	Dates for monitoring of local professional development programs.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyses of student achievement data ELL PLC's work to analyze student achievement data quarterly 	Quarterly	Fall by November 24, 2012	Spring by May 20, 2013
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student needs The appropriate group placement through proficiency based grouping. 	Quarterly	November 24, 2012 January 29, 2012, March 19, 2013, June 10, 2013	November 24, 2012 January 29, 2012, March 19, 2013, June 10, 2013
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel needs (describe your processes for collecting data on personnel needs) Needs assessment indicates teachers need more training in SIOP, GLAD, SELD. 	Semi-annually	August 2012 training Mid-year training	August 2012 Mid-year training
<p>Delivery - “In-service activities for instructional personnel shall focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> analysis of student achievement data, on-going formal and informal assessments of student achievement, identification and use of instructional strategies that emphasize rigor, relevance. enhancement of subject content expertise (ELD and other core content areas), integrated use of classroom technology that enhances teaching and learning. 	PLC work quarterly check-in	Once a quarter November 24, 2012 January 29, 2012, March 19, 2013, June 10, 2013	November 24, 2012 January 29, 2012, March 19, 2013, June 10, 2013

FOLLOW-UP Describe the ways in which professional development is focused and delivered in the district.

Describe the ways in which the district provides:	Dates of delivery	Dates for systematic consultation with internal trainers, regional or state personnel designated to provide on-going technical assistance	Dates for monitoring of local professional development programs.
In-service activities coupled with follow-up support appropriate to accomplish district-level and school-level improvement goals and standards.”			
Provide for the continuous evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of professional development programs in order to eliminate ineffective programs and strategies and to expand effective ones. Evaluations must consider the impact of such activities on the performance of participating educators and their students' achievement and behavior.			
Describe the ways in which the district evaluates major professional development efforts to document the effectiveness of the programs and the efficacy of the use of the funds for professional development.			
Master Plan for in service Activities must be based on input from teachers and district and school instructional leaders, and must use the latest available student achievement data and research to enhance rigor and relevance in the classroom.			
Describe the district’s commitment to and method for funding professional development.			

In-service Activities for School Administrative personnel: Include in-service activities for school administrative personnel that address updated skills necessary for instructional leadership and effective school/program management.			
---	--	--	--

Very Important

Parental Participation Narrative Required

Action Steps describe empowering ways to include parents in improving ELs student achievement.

1. Convene an annual meeting at a time convenient for parents of Els:

- All parents shall be invited and encouraged to attend
- The school will provide information and explain the requirements of Title III and the rights of parents. Parent needs assessments will occur to better meet the needs of all stakeholders.
- The district will hold a series of accessible meetings with parents and guardians to develop and review the parental involvement policies
- The parent involvement policy draft will be presented to parent/community groups that reflect the diversity of the community, with particular attention to parents that have limited English proficiency, have limited literacy, are migratory, or are of any racial, cultural or ethnic minority background.

Activity/Task	Staff Responsible (Who will be doing it)	Timeline (When it will be done)	Steps (How it will be done)	Accountability/Evaluations (How success will be measured)
Parents will receive a lesson on PAL				
Parents will receive a lesson on PAL, a district reporting system	Title III Coordinator Tosa/ELL teachers District Interpreters as a district team	First 9 weeks of school	Parents will be shown how to log in and given a key to what each reporting area means in English/Spanish	Surveys will be sent to parents before and after lesson to gather data to see what needs to be taught and the post survey will report parent knowledge outcomes.

2. Offer a flexible number of meetings and may provide transportation, child care, or home visits, as such services related to parental involvement

Activity/Task	Staff Responsible (Who will be doing it)	Timeline (When it will be done)	Steps (How it will be done)	Accountability/Evaluations (How success will be measured)
Annual meeting regarding Title I and Title III programs				
Parents will be asked to give input on the district's Title 1 policy.	ELL Supervisor Title 1 staff Interpreters	Fall of 2012	Parents will be invited to attend a work session involving the district's Title 1 policy to be reviewed, modified and/ or approved Groups will provide group feedback regarding the policy and all stakeholders involved.	Parents will be sent a survey asking for feedback around the policy meeting .What went well and what they feel needs improvement .

3. Involve parents in an organized, ongoing, and timely manner, in the planning, review, and improvement of the Title III program.

Activity/Task	Staff Responsible	Timeline (When it	Steps	Accountability/Eva
---------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------	--------------------

(What will be done)	(Who will be doing it)	will be done)	(How it will be done)	luations (How success will be measured)
Title III Parent Input Meeting Parents will review the Title III program and give suggestions for improvement	ELL Supervisor ELL TOSA Interpreter	December 2012	Parents will come to a meeting and be given information on the Title III program and budget narrative. Parents will participate in groups for feedback on areas of strengths/weaknesses	Parents will fill out a survey responding to questions regarding Title III requirements and parents specific needs. Parents will identify specific areas of need.

4. Provide parents of participating children:

- Timely information about the Title III programs
- Description and explanation of the curriculum at the school, the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress, and the proficiency levels students are expected to meet
- Opportunities for regular meetings to formulate suggestions and to participate, as appropriate, in decisions relating to the education of their children

Activity/Task (What will be done)	Staff Responsible (Who will be doing it)	Timeline (When it will be done)	Steps (How it will be done)	Accountability/Evaluations (How success will be measured)
Parents will meet to set up a monthly timeline and agenda for parent focus groups to help explain the curriculum, the forms of academic assessments along with the outcomes, the proficiency levels the students are expected to meet and suggestions for future meeting topics	ELL Supervisor ELL TOSA ELL teachers Interpreter	Meet six times a year. The months are September, November, January, March, April, May	Parents will be sent invitations and it will also be published on our website. Meetings will have child care and interpreters provided. Each meeting will focus on one area of instruction. September -reading November-writing January – math March-social studies, science April – May test result interpretation	Each meeting parents will be given an evaluation for to complete reflecting their individual needs being met by the meeting activities/tasks. A section will also be provided to give suggestions for future topics and needs.

Adapted from Effective Planning for Continuous Improvement, Ontario, Canada

Very Important Section C – Monitoring Narrative Required

Monitoring and Adjusting Evaluation

Evidence of Monitoring Dates – Narrative response required

What are the calendar dates (Nov/Dec and May/June) when the School Leadership Team will meet to sustain the Medford School District Improvement Planning Process? Identify the person(s) responsible for monitoring and the role they will play in the monitoring process.

The ELL TOSA, Federal Programs Supervisor and ELL Director will meet in January 2013 and mid-May 2013 to monitor the 2012-1013 ELL PIP. It is anticipated that the SOESD will continue offering the ELL Regional Meeting as a venue for conducting this monitoring process. Carol Holm has been a resource for guiding the district through the monitoring process. Her input and support will continue to be utilized, assuming she is available. The ELL TOSA will collect the necessary data and present it to the FP Supervisor and ELL Director.

Evidence of a Process for Monitoring Plan – Narrative response required

What will be the process that the School Leadership Team will use to review the analysis of the data from the assessments and determine if adjustments need to be made in our plan?

The monitoring process essentially follows the continuous improvement cycle outlined by the ODE, including planning, implementing and monitoring, with the results of the monitoring leading into a more comprehensive needs assessment for the following year. Based on the outcome of the January monitoring session, action will be taken to ensure that all planned data collection and professional development occurs during the school year.

Evidence of a Process for Adjusting Plan – Narrative response required

What will be the process that the School Leadership Team will use for adjusting our plan (person(s) responsible, timeline, actions steps, resources, evaluation strategies) when needed?

The details of how and when the plan would be adjusted and by whom would depend on the exact nature of the adjustment needed. During the January 2013 monitoring session, an action plan will be developed for any adjustments that need to be made.

Evidence of a Plan for Communicating to All Stakeholders – Narrative response required

How will the School Leadership Team communicate success/adjustments of the plan to stakeholders and solicit ongoing input from stakeholders?

The details of how and when an adjustment to the plan would be communicated to stakeholders and by whom would depend on the exact nature of the adjustment needed. During the January 2013 monitoring session, an action plan will be developed for any adjustments that need to be made. The results of the plan will be communicated to principals by the ELL Director at an Administrators Meeting. Principals will then communicate the result to their staff members, or they may enlist the help of the ELL TOSA to communicate the result to their staff at a staff meeting or in-service. The result of the plan will need to be communicated in the fall of 2014, after the evaluation is conducted.

Adapted from School and District Improvement Planning Template, Tennessee Department of Education

**RUBRIC FOR EVALUATION OF IMPLEMENTATION OF
TITLE III IMPROVEMENT PLANS**
Improvement status five or more years *Narrative Required*

Very Important

This rubric is provided to assist schools/districts with completing the evaluation of Title III Improvement Plans for districts in improvement status of five or more years. The evaluation of the 2011-12 improvement plan will be the first section in the 2012-13 improvement plan and is expected to inform the new plan. The rubric contains **three guidelines**: 1) Procedures are provided to monitor to assess the implementation for all activities set forth in the master plan; 2) The formative (short-term) evaluation procedures should seek to determine if the strategy had the expected effect on student achievement; 3) The summative (long-term) evaluation procedures should seek to determine if the goals and objectives have been attained.

RUBRIC FOR EVALUATION OF IMPLEMENTATION OF TITLE III IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Guideline I. The evaluation procedures to monitor and assess the indicators of implementation for all activities should include at least three of the four of the following criteria:

1. What data instrument(s) was used to collect information and what kind of feedback was obtained as a result of the data analysis (inquiry)?
2. What was measured or assessed, and how was this information used?
3. Who conducted the evaluation? *Please use the position title, i.e. Curriculum Director, Principal, etc.*
4. How often were the goals/activities monitored (frequency)?

When reviewing each evaluation procedure, three out of the four criteria must be present.

- **For an acceptable rating, at least 75% of the evaluation procedures must fit the criteria.**

Example: Classroom observations conducted by the principal or the staff developer assessed the degree of implementation of SEI each quarter.

- These procedures provide documentation of degree of implementation.
- These evaluation procedures provide information to determine if the activities were actually implemented in the classroom.

Rubric

ACCEPTABLE		NOT ACCEPTABLE	
I. Procedures are provided to monitor to assess the implementation for all activities set forth in the master plan.			
a. Clear procedures were provided to assess the level of implementation of <u>all</u> activities.	b. Clear procedures were provided to assess the level of implementation of <u>most</u> activities	c. Clear procedures were provided to assess the level of implementation of <u>few</u> activities, or some procedures are unclear	d. <u>No clear procedures</u> were provided to evaluate the implementation of activities

Rationale and Comments

Guideline II. The formative (short-term) evaluation procedures should seek to determine if the strategy had the expected effect on student achievement.

- Did the evaluation procedures provide sufficient evidence to evaluate the short-term effects for each strategy on student achievement?
- Short-term effects may have included student portfolios, comparison of student’s work throughout the year, teacher-made tests, or other similar type evidence.

For an acceptable rating, at least 75% of the evaluation procedures must fit the criteria.

Rubric:

ACCEPTABLE		NOT ACCEPTABLE	
II Valid procedures were included for continual evaluation of short-term (during current school year) effects of each strategy on student achievement.			
a. All strategies had valid short-term procedures for evaluating student achievement.	b. Most strategies had valid short-term procedures for evaluating student achievement.	c. Few strategies had valid short-term procedures for evaluating student achievement.	d. None of the strategies had valid short-term procedures for evaluating student achievement

Rationale and Comments

Guideline III. The summative (long-term) evaluation procedures should seek to determine if the goals and objectives have been attained.

- Did the summative evaluation adequately conveyed if the school/district is improving?
- The summative evaluation should include the applicable testing instruments with descriptions of how they were used to determine if the goals and objectives were attained.
- This evaluation should include a comparison and/or analysis of test data but may also include other types of assessment and/or qualitative data.

For an acceptable rating, at least 75% of the overall evaluations must fit the criteria. If only a collection of testing instruments is listed, this item is unacceptable.

Rubric:

ACCEPTABLE		NOT ACCEPTABLE	
III. Valid procedures were provided to examine the degree to which the identified goals and objectives have been attained.			
a. Valid procedures were provided to examine the degree to which the goals and objectives have been attained.	b. Procedures were presented to determine whether the goals and objectives have been attained.	c. Vague or incomplete procedures were presented to determine whether the goals and objectives have been attained.	d. No valid procedures were presented to determine whether the goals and objectives have been attained.

Rationale and Comments

Guideline IV. If any of items I – III are not acceptable, then this item is not acceptable.

Rubric:

ACCEPTABLE		NOT ACCEPTABLE	
IV. Valid procedures for evaluation were specified for all strategies and activities set forth in the improvement plan.			
a. Valid evaluation procedures were specified for all strategies and activities.	b. Valid evaluation procedures were specified for most strategies and activities.	c. Valid evaluation procedures were not specified for few strategies and activities.	d. Valid evaluation procedures were not specified for the strategies and activities.

<p>Rationale and Comments</p>
