

Tier I, II and III Schools
Application for Continued Funding for the
2009 1003(g) School Improvement Grant (SIG)

Division Name: Fluvanna County

School Name: Central, Columbia, Cunningham Elementary

Person Completing Report: Mr. Allen Cook

E-mail: acook@mail.fluco.org

Telephone: 434-589-8208 ext.

Application for Continuation of FY2009 1003(g) SIG Funding

Using the current 2010 data, including preliminary 2011 SOL data, please respond to the following questions for continued FY2009 1003(g) grant funding.

1. When are the dates of the division team’s monthly meetings through June 2012?

Month	Date(s)
August	1 st and 3 rd Tuesday 1 st with all admin. @ 3:00 3 rd @noon Aug. 2, Aug. 16
September	1 st and 3 rd Tuesday 1 st with all admin. @ 3:00 3 rd @noon Sept. 6, Sept. 20
October	1 st and 3 rd Tuesday 1 st with all admin. @ 3:00 3 rd @noon Oct. 4, Oct. 18
November	1 st and 3 rd Tuesday 1 st with all admin. @ 3:00 3 rd @noon Nov. 1, Nov. 15
December	1 st and 3 rd Tuesday 1 st with all admin. @ 3:00 3 rd @noon Dec. 6, Dec. 20
January	1 st and 3 rd Tuesday 1 st with all admin. @ 3:00 3 rd @noon Jan. 3, Jan. 17
February	1 st and 3 rd Tuesday 1 st with all admin. @ 3:00 3 rd @noon Feb. 7, Feb. 21
March	1 st and 3 rd Tuesday 1 st with all admin. @ 3:00, 3 rd @noon Mar. 6, March 20
April	2 nd and 3 rd Tuesday 1 st with all admin. @ 3:00 3 rd @noon Apr. 10 Apr. 17
May	1 st and 3 rd Tuesday 1 st with all admin. @ 3:00 3 rd @noon May 1, May 15
June	1 st and 3 rd Tuesday 1 st with all admin. @ 3:00 3 rd @noon J June 5, 19

2. When are dates of the division team quarterly meetings with principals of schools receiving school improvement funds through June 2012?

Quarter	Date(s)
First Quarter	Tuesday @ division-level meeting following submission of quarterly report: End of Nov.
Second Quarter	Tuesday @ division-level meeting following submission of quarterly report: End of Feb.
Third Quarter	Tuesday @ division-level meeting following submission of quarterly report: End of March
Fourth Quarter	Tuesday @ division-level meeting following submission of quarterly report: End of June

3. Who are the members of division team?
 At a minimum, identify the following:
- a. division representative for instruction
 - b. special education representative
 - c. Title I representative
 - d. ELL representative, if applicable.

Name	Email	Title
Margaret Crawford	mccrawford@mail.fluco.org	Director of Elementary Ed./Title I.
Allen Cook	acook@mail.fluco.org	Coach
Karen Decker	kdecker@mail.fluco.org	Director of Special Education
Sharon Leech	sleech@mail.fluco.org	Instructional Coach
Corey Crawford	corey-crawford@mail.fluco.org	Instructional Coach
Amy Barnabei	abarnabei@mail.fluco.org	Principal, Central Elementary
New Hire Coach		Instructional Coach
Jamie Mathieson	jmathieson@mail.fluco.org	Director of Testing and Accountability
New Hire Data Coach		Data Coach
Karen Purnell	kpurnell@mail.fluco.org	Instructional Coach
Sue Davies	sdavies@mail.fluco.org	Principal, Cunningham, Columbia Elementary
Gena Keller	Gena-keller@mail.fluco.org	Superintendent
Jennifer Valentine	jvalentine@mail.fluco.org	Assistant Principal, Central Elementary
Yvonne Howdyshell	yhowdyshell@mail.fluco.org	Assistant Principal, Central Elementary
Janet Harper	jharper@mail.fluco.org	Assistant Principal, Cunningham, Columbia Elementary
Tonya Cook	tcook@mail.fluco.org	Assistant Principal, Central Elementary
Brenda Gilliam	bgilliam@mail.fluco.org	Director of Secondary Education

4. Please provide a tentative **monthly agenda for division team** meetings.

	Agenda Item
1	Review of division’s Indistar® improvement plan
2	Updates needed to the division’s Indistar® improvement plan
3	Student Achievement Data Analysis/Focus on Sub-groups, students not making progress on MAP, students not successful on benchmark assessments
4	Teacher/Professional Goals
5	Professional Development Needs
6	Celebrations/Accomplishments

Must include the items indicated in rows 1 and 2

5. Please provide a tentative agenda for the **division’s quarterly** meetings with principals of schools receiving school improvement funds

	Agenda Item
1	Review of strategies and data analysis for students who are at-risk of failing a reading or mathematics SOL
2	Review of strategies and data analysis for students who have been identified for PALS intervention (K-3), if applicable
3	Review of strategies and data analysis for students who failed the SOL reading or mathematics assessment in 2010-2011
4	Review of strategies and data analysis for students who are below grade-level in reading or mathematics based on a disability
5	Review of division’s Indistar® improvement plan
6	Updates needed to the division’s Indistar® improvement plan

Must include the items indicated in rows 1-6

Copy and complete one chart for each school.

School Name: Central Elementary

2010-2011 School Year

1. What objectives did the school meet by June 2011?

- 100% of our teachers developed an annual goal/growth plan which included job-embedded professional development needs. Additionally, Coaches, administration, and the division-level improvement team collaborated frequently and analyzed walk-through data to develop a plan for meeting the professional development needs of the teachers. Logic models and checklists created by the division team were used during walk-throughs and to compile data of teacher professional development needs.
- While we made student achievement gains, preliminary SOL data indicate we have not reduced our failure rate by at least 10% with all sub-groups in literacy and/or math. Next year's broader focus on student achievement data from the start of the school year will increase student performance in all sub-groups by at least 10% in reading and math.

Describe the school's progress with meeting the first year's annual goals proposed in the grant.

- The Division Level Academic Handbook was used to create Logic Models which focused on remedial programs and the use of Core Extension for remediation and enrichment. Coaches, administration, and the division-level improvement team collaborated frequently to analyze student achievement data and walk-through data collected from the logic models and checklists. Frequent grade-level data meetings took place throughout the year and students were grouped fluidly for instruction and remediation as a result of these meetings. The data from these walkthroughs, as well as student achievement data, were used to plan professional development for our teachers. The Handbook is being revised with additional instructional focus and use of data.
- Central Elementary showed progress in grades 3 and 4 in Reading and Math as evidenced by preliminary spring 2011 SOL data. Based upon preliminary data for 2010-2011 Grade 5 did not show

expected progress. It is possible the preliminary 2010-2011 scores will increase once all scores including VGLA and VAAP are available. Additionally, the failure rate for students with disabilities in Reading and Math could possibly be reduced by 10% depending upon final calculations.

	Spring SOL 2009-2010	Preliminary Spring SOL 2010-2011
Reading Grade 3	72%	79%
Reading Grade 4	78%	82%
Reading Grade 5	87%	80%
Math Grade 3	88%	89%
Math Grade 4	80%	82%
Math Grade 5	88%	82%

- Although our meetings became more academically focused as evidenced through review of the minutes in Indistar, we found that we did not include review of student achievement data during 80% of our meetings, as was stated in the goals. For the 2011 – 2012 school year, we will include review of student achievement data on 100% of the agendas for school-level improvement meetings. This will be included as a task under Indicator IE06.
2. What processes were initiated during the 2010-11 year to support the school with accomplishing the stated goals? The following supported the process:
- The Division Leadership team met twice monthly with representation from the central office and all schools to analyze data from the Quarterly Reports, MAP (Measures of Academic Progress), Interactive Achievement Benchmarks, and walkthrough data to determine professional development and curriculum alignment and pacing needs. This data was analyzed to determine student groupings and instructional plans as well.
 - Community members participated in the Division Leadership team meetings once each month. The parent involvement committee was formed at the request of parents and community members.
 - The School Improvement team met two times each month with representation from each grade level, building and central office level administration, coaches and non-classroom staff. Actions

taken included: revisions to the Academic Handbook and Assessment Process, realignment of curriculum and pacing guides, creation and analysis of Interactive Achievement Benchmarks, reallocation of resources to better meet student needs during Core Extension, and identification of professional development needs.

- The Data Coach met with grade level teams to review a variety of student performance data including SOL, MAP and Interactive Achievement results to group for remediation and enrichment and to identify student needs.
- During the 2010 – 2011 school year, job-embedded professional development began for 100% of our teachers. A document was created based on the teacher annual goal plans to identify the professional development needs and the schedule to meet the needs. Professional development activities included modeling evidenced based practices, ongoing small-group workshops, whole-group opportunities and individual support when needed.

2011-2012 School Year

3. What are the school's objectives for 2011-12?

- Increase student performance across all sub-groups by meeting the required AMO and/or reducing the failure rate of all student sub-groups by at least 10% in reading and math
- Provide Professional Support to 100% of teachers based upon needs identified in professional goal plans
- Include use of student/classroom data on 100% of meeting agendas
- Increase the number of students making (typical growth) based on Reading and math MAP (Measures of Academic Progress)

4. What additional processes are being planned to meet these goals?

- Use of revised pacing guides and curriculum
- Increased focus on student performance data to enhance instructional decisions through regularly scheduled data meetings
- Expansion of coaching model with increased job-embedded professional development through a reallocation of resources as identified in the 1003g application
- Participation in RTI pilot provided by VDOE
- Participation in Teacher Evaluation Pilot with the College of William and Mary
- Continue providing targeted instruction through the use of
 - Fluid groupings
 - Core Extension
 - Accelerated, Enriched and Remedial Math Opportunities
 - Modified school schedules
 - The Assessment Matrix with fidelity
 - The Academic Handbook to include expectations for all students on all levels
 - 2010-2011 data for the Identification of students in need of remediation for summer school and to allow for instruction to begin at the beginning of the 2011-2012 school year

5. The school should have a school improvement plan on the Indistar® website. This plan will need to be updated based on current 2011 data. Based on the analysis of the school's preliminary Spring 2011 SOL results and any other academic achievement data collected during the 2010-11 school year, which Indistar® indicators will the school modify, add or remove in the current school improvement plan?

Based on the 2011 preliminary SOL data, MAP data, as well as other informal data, the team has decided to modify the Indistar indicators and tasks below in order to meet our stated objectives we will:

- Add **Indicator IE06** to reflect our involvement with the Teacher Evaluation Pilot with the College of William and Mary. Subsequent to training, tasks will be developed for this indicator.
- Continue the use of Indicator **IIIA01**-Emphasize the task of planning for and monitoring the implementation of revised pacing guides. **Indicator IE07** will be subsumed as a task for this indicator.
- Continue the use of **Indicator IE13** -Staff has had frequent opportunities to give feedback and input throughout the year. For instance, the district level Academic Expectations Handbook was modified to reflect input from teachers. Further, an assessment matrix was created with feedback from the staff and reflects teacher input specific to when assessments would be best administered so they have full impact on instruction. Finally, all staff had opportunity during pre-approved stipend work to offer feedback for the 2011 -2012 school year's pacing guides and benchmarks. Additionally, with the feedback we received from parent and community members we have made tremendous strides as a division in the area of community involvement supporting student achievement. A HIP- Highly Involved Parents Committee was formed and meets regularly. Opportunities will be expanded during 2011-2012.
- Continue the use of **Indicator IF06**- All teachers made individual professional development goals for the 2010- 2011 school year. These goals were met by job-embedded professional coaching as well as from a variety of professional development workshops offered after school. The 2011 – 2012 school year will have an even greater emphasis on job-embedded professional development including long-term coaching of teachers (e.g., coaching agreements among the teachers, administration, and the coaches) and use of modeling of evidence-based instruction for teachers.
- Continue the use of **Indicator IIB04**- Our staff continues to require professional

development using pre/ post assessments. We will continue to implement the Teach First formative assessment turn-around training during the 2011 – 2012 school year with emphasis on pre and post tests. **Indicator IID11** will become a task and job-embedded professional development will be given to those teachers who require assistance in using data to make instructional decisions.

6. What specific interventions are being put in place as a result of the data analysis? Using a Response to Intervention model, describe the specific interventions planned next year for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students for each of the following populations:

Tier	Setting	Targeted Participation	Examples	Assessments	Documentation
1	Core program	All students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Differentiated instruction Balanced literacy Classroom teacher directed instruction Word Study Guided reading PALS lessons and activities Four-square writing Skill-based lessons (e.g., context clues) Test-taking strategies Problem-based instruction for mathematics Higher-order questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IA quarterly assessments Running record PALS Rigby Formative assessments (e.g., checklists and pre-tests) Unit tests MAP Writing Rubric 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student watch lists Data meetings Data warehouse Intervention log
2	Targeted intervention *above and beyond*	Those not making benchmark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower student/teacher ratio Direct Instruction Title I Book Buddies Horizons, SOAR Additional guided reading groups Fluency focus Home instruction support packets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tier 1 assessments more frequently Specific probes Skill-driven assessments (e.g., SOAR checks) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tier I Possible child-study documentation
3	Targeted individual intervention	Not responding to Tier 2 Or Not closing gap based on projected growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Daily explicit individual interventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tier 1 and Tier 2 assessments Additional daily curriculum-based measurements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tier 1/Tier 2 Child study Individual student performance data based on intervention

a. Students who failed the SOL reading or mathematics assessment in the previous year

Fluvanna County Public Schools invite students who do not pass the reading and/or math SOL test, as well as those students who did not meet PALS or Rigby benchmarks, to a summer school program. Students are grouped using a variety of informal and formal assessments during summer school and will receive systematic, explicit instruction at their instructional level of reading and at their instructional level of math. Summer school teachers will use an evidence-based program, Summer Success: Math and Reading. A pre and post assessment will be administered to summer school students. Additionally, eligible students may receive supplemental educational services. Fluvanna County Public Schools recently applied to become an SES provider for the 2011 – 2012 school year. If approved, students in this program will receive additional systematic, explicit instruction by trained tutors who will use evidence-based practices (e.g., guided reading, Word Study, and higher-order problem solving in mathematics).

In the classroom, teachers will provide flexible guided reading and Word Study groups based on our preliminary SOL scores, SPBQ, MAP, and prior year IA Benchmark data to Tier II students. “Time with text” with an emphasis on silent reading and comprehension will be the focus of these groups. The SOAR to Success Intervention Program will be implemented in classrooms as a Tier II intervention where appropriate.

b. Students who are/were identified for PALS intervention (K-3), if applicable

In addition to core program instruction, interventions and/or remediation provided by the classroom teacher, students who were identified by PALS, MAP and/or Rigby scores will receive services from Title One as well as from newly funded literacy assistants. Core instruction in literacy includes Word Study, guided reading, vocabulary development, comprehension and writing instruction. Core instruction in math includes conceptual understanding, vocabulary development, problem solving, and developing skills and fluency. The literacy interventions will include PALs interventions, and additional Word Study and guided reading beyond that delivered from the classroom teacher as part of Tier I instruction. Some students will receive Direct Instruction using Reading Mastery, SOAR, or Horizons by the classroom teacher. Math interventions will be provided through small group instruction during Core Extension with a focus on remediating skills and or problem solving deficits identified through formative assessments.

c. Students who are/were below grade-level in reading or mathematics based on a disability

IEPs will be followed. Research based programs, such as Horizons and SOAR will be utilized based on student need (e.g., SOAR for a comprehension focus and Horizons for a decoding focus). Additionally, guided reading, and Word Study will be the focus of the broader Tier I literacy program and may be employed during Core Extension for those requiring additional support (Tier II and/or Tier III). Data discussions with grade-level teams will focus on fluid groupings of students who require additional support in math and reading as well as peer discussions on evidence-based instruction. Higher-order problem solving as well as mastery of basic skills will comprise math intervention and remediation lessons. An Instructional Coach will support resource teachers and classroom teachers during science and social studies instruction to model instructional strategies such as think aloud, vocabulary development, MIND notebooks, and the use of graphic organizers.

There will be a renewed school-wide focus on collaboration between special education teachers and regular education teachers. Professional development will be provided on collaboration and reading in the content area.

7. Describe the school's plan in place to monitor the intervention process. The monitoring process should include, at a minimum, a monthly assessment of student growth. For example, the school should be able to report the MONTHLY grade level increase to a parent of a fifth grader who is reading on a second grade level using a response to intervention model such as Istation, Voyager, etc.

A logic model has been created which outlines what is expected during our Core Extension (i.e., remedial/intervention) block. Frequent unannounced walk-throughs by coaches, principals, and division personnel will take place and data from these walk-throughs will be compiled by our division-level team based on the logic model. This feedback will then be used to focus our professional development for teachers.

Quarterly benchmark assessments (cumulative quarterly assessments) will be administered to all students. The benchmark was set at 80% for the 2011 – 2012 school year. Additionally, PALS, PALS Quick-checks, running records, Rigby reading, MAP, and/or frequent curriculum-based measurements will show student progress or where different interventions/remediations are needed. During our grade-level data meetings, teachers, alongside coaches and administration, will disaggregate the data and group

students for remediation/intervention accordingly. The division level team is in the process of developing a common reporting form that is consistent among our three elementary schools to use for reporting this data to parents in an understandable format.

8. Provide the monthly or weekly scheduled dates to review interventions by student. Include grade level/department

Department/Grade Level	Date(s)
K Grade	Teachers will meet as grade level teams every Thursday and hold discussions around student performance data, team building, and instructional practices.
1 st Grade	Teachers will meet as grade level teams every Thursday and hold discussions around student performance data, team building, and instructional practices.
2 nd Grade	Teachers will meet as grade level teams every Thursday and hold discussions around student performance data, team building, and instructional practices.
3 rd Grade	Teachers will meet as grade level teams every Thursday and hold discussions around student performance data, team building, and instructional practices.
4 th Grade	Teachers will meet as grade level teams every Thursday and hold discussions around student performance data, team building, and instructional practices.
5 th Grade	Teachers will meet as grade level teams every Thursday and hold discussions around student performance data, team building, and instructional practices.

9. Provide the agenda for the meetings

	Agenda Item
1	Review of strategies and data analysis for students who are at-risk of failing a reading or mathematics SOL
2	Review of strategies and data analysis for students who have been identified for PALS intervention (K-3), if applicable
3	Review of strategies and data analysis for students who failed the SOL reading or mathematics assessment in 2010-2011
4	Review of strategies and data analysis for students who are below grade-level in reading or mathematics based on a disability
5	Review of school's Indistar® improvement plan
6	Updates needed to the school's Indistar® improvement plan
7	Disseminate information to wider audience minutes from our school's improvement meetings
8	Team Building
9	Sharing Successes

Must include the items indicated in rows 1-6

School Name: Cunningham Elementary School

Cunningham is a PreK-2 school; therefore the SOL tests are not administered at this school. Our data is analyzed based upon the performance of students who have transitioned to Central School from Cunningham as well as preliminary SOL data for *all* Grade 3 students at Central Elementary. Since all students transition to Central Elementary in Grade 3, the schools typically plan collaboratively in their school improvement efforts.

2010-2011 School Year

1. What objectives did the school meet by June 2011?

- As evidenced by our Indistar minutes, 80% of the School Improvement meetings included an agenda that involved discussions and planning related to student data. Also, weekly PLC meetings were held to further conversation about meeting student needs.
- 100% of teachers developed annual goals that involved job-embedded professional development support and positively impact student performance.
- This year, there were 69 classroom observations by administration to monitor implementation of the Academic Expectation Handbook.
- Preliminary SOL data indicate we have not met the required AMO or reduced our failure rate by 10 % in all subgroups in literacy and/or math. However, we have made student achievement gains based upon preliminary SOL data provided in item 2 (below).

Describe the school's progress with meeting the first year's annual goals proposed in the grant.

- The division-level Academic Expectations Handbook was used to create logic models which focused on remedial programs and the use of the core extension block for remediation and enrichment. The handbook has been developed based upon research-based literacy and mathematics instruction. Coaches, administration, and the division-level improvement team collaborated frequently to analyze student achievement data and walk-through data collected from the logic models and checklists. Frequent professional learning community meetings took place throughout the year and students were grouped fluidly for instruction and remediation as a result of these meetings. The data from these walkthroughs, as well as student achievement data, were used to plan professional development for our teachers. The handbook is being revised with additional instructional focus and use of data.

- Cunningham is a PreK-2 school and our individual school preliminary SOL data for our students who have transitioned to 3rd grade at Central Elementary School show decreases of at least 10% in the failure rate for the following subgroups in the following areas: Reading /white, students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged and Math: Black, students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged. These are data for Cunningham students only. Central Grade 3 as a whole increased total performance in reading from 72% to 79% and in math from 88% to 89% when comparing Spring 2010 to Spring 2011. Preliminary subgroup data for Central Elementary is being analyzed.

2. What processes were initiated during the 2010-11 year to support the school with accomplishing the stated goals?

- The principal and instructional coach from Cunningham were represented on the division leadership team. The team met twice monthly with representation from the central office and all schools. Specific agendas included the analysis of data from the Quarterly Reports, MAP (Measures of Academic Progress), Interactive Achievement Benchmarks, and walkthroughs. These data were analyzed to determine student groupings and for instructional planning purposes. Agenda items also included the determination of professional development and curriculum alignment and pacing needs. All agenda and meeting minutes are posted on Indistar.
- Community members participated in the division leadership team meetings once each month. The parent involvement committee was formed at the request of parents and community members.
- Curriculum pacing guides were revised in the spring of 2011 with teacher, coach, and administrator representation from all schools. The revisions to the guides were partially an outcome of data analysis from Interactive Achievement which indicated the need for a closer alignment between the written, taught, and tested curriculum. Benchmark tests will be completed during the summer of 2011 in order to be aligned with the revised guides.
- The school level improvement team met two times each month with representation from each grade level, building- and division-level administration, coaches and non-classroom staff. In addition to revisions to the pacing guides, actions taken included: revisions to the Academic Handbook and assessment matrix, creation and analysis of Interactive Achievement benchmark

tests, the reallocation of resources and identification of instructional programs and/or strategies to better meet student needs during core extension, and the identification of professional development needs.

- The data coach met with grade level teams to review a variety of student performance data including SOL, MAP and Interactive Achievement for the purpose of grouping for remediation and enrichment and to identify student instructional needs.
- Job-embedded professional development continued for 100% of our teachers. A document was created based on the teacher annual goal plans to identify the professional development needs and a schedule to meet those needs. Professional development activities included modeling evidenced based practices by instructional coaches, collegial learning, visitations to higher-performing schools and classrooms, providing ongoing small-group workshops and whole-group opportunities, and providing individual support when needed.

2011-2012 School Year

3. What are the school's objectives for 2011-12?

The main objective of the school will be to continue to increase student performance in all subgroups by meeting the required AMO and/or reducing the failure rate by at least 10% in reading and math. The school will also increase the number of students making (typical) growth based on reading and math Measures of Academic (MAP) data.

Additionally, the school will:

- Provide professional development/support to 100% of teachers based upon needs identified in professional goal plans
- Include use of student/classroom data on 100% of meeting agendas

4. What additional processes are being planned to meet these goals?

- Utilizing student math data available from Interactive Achievement (IA) and the Measures of

Academic Progress (MAP) to provide interventions to assist students not making adequate progress in math.

- Increasing the administration of IA and MAP in reading and math to include students in Grades K and 1.
- Expanding the coaching model to provide a greater emphasis on students with disabilities.
- Fully implementing an RtI model with regular and frequent progress monitoring of struggling students.
- Utilizing core extension time for corrective action.
- Participating in the Teacher Evaluation Pilot with the College of William and Mary.

5. The school should have a school improvement plan on the Indistar® website. This plan will need to be updated based on current 2011 data. Based on the analysis of the school's preliminary Spring 2011 SOL results and any other academic achievement data collected during the 2010-11 school year, which Indistar® indicators will the school modify, add or remove in the current school improvement plan?

- Continue with **Indicator IIB04**. We have made progress on this indicator. However, based on our data, we must continue to focus on individualizing instruction based upon pre-test results (this need is also supported by Indicators IIB03 and IID11).
- **Add Indicator IE06** to reflect our involvement with the Teacher Evaluation Pilot with the College of William and Mary. Subsequent to training, tasks will be developed for the help accomplish the indicator to ensure classroom observations are appropriately aligned with teacher performance standards. With the recent changes to our curriculum and pacing guides, it is going to be important that the instruction is effectively monitored. Intervention programs also need to be more closely monitored for student growth.
- **Indicator IIB03** will be addressed in the development of unit with pre-test and post-tests following the revised pacing guides work. Results of these assessments will be reviewed by the Instructional team.
- **Continue IID11-** Instructional Teams review the results of unit pre/post tests to make decisions about the curriculum and instructional plans and to "red flag" students in need of interventions (both students in need of tutoring or extra help and students needing enhanced learning opportunities because of early mastery of objectives).

6. What specific interventions are being put in place as a result of the data analysis? Using a Response to Intervention model, describe the specific interventions planned next year for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students for each of the following populations:

Tier	Setting	Targeted Participation	Examples	Assessments	Documentation
1	Core program	All students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Differentiated instruction Balanced literacy Classroom teacher directed instruction Word Study Guided reading PALS lessons and activities Four-square writing Skill-based lessons (e.g., context clues) Test-taking strategies Problem-based instruction for mathematics Higer-order questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IA quarterly assessments Running record PALS Rigby Formative assessments (e.g., checklists and pre-tests) Unit tests MAP Writing Rubric 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student watchlists Data meetings Data warehouse Intervention log
2	Targeted intervention *above and beyond*	Those not making benchmark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower student/teacher ratio Direct Instruction Title I Book Buddies Horizons, SOAR Additional guided reading groups Fluency focus Home instruction support packets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tier 1 assessments more frequently Specific probes Skill-driven assessments (e.g., SOAR checks) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tier I Possible child-study documentation
3	Targeted individual intervention	Not responding to Tier 2 Or Not closing gap based on projected growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Daily explicit individual interventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tier 1 and Tier 2 assessments Additional daily curriculum-based measurements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tier 1/Tier 2 Child study Individual student performance data based on intervention

a. Students who are/were at-risk of failing a reading or mathematics SOL

Students at risk of failing a reading SOL will receive Title I instruction in reading by providing additional guided reading, SRA Reading Mastery, SRA Horizons, and/or SOAR to Success based on their individual needs. In addition, based on pre- and post-tests, those students at risk of failing a math SOL will receive remediation during the core instructional block and during the extension block based on their needs. The progress of these students will be frequently monitored by the RTI committee and Resource PLC as well as Cunningham's SIP Team.

b. Students who are/were identified for PALS intervention (K-3), if applicable

Daily targeted assistance will be provided to students who are identified by PALS. These students receive 30 to 45 minutes of literacy instruction in addition to the core instruction provided during the two-hour language arts block. As appropriate, they will also receive 20 minutes daily of Imagine Learning English computer-based instruction to support vocabulary development and phonemic awareness.

c. Students who failed the SOL reading or mathematics assessment in the previous year:

Though this is not applicable to our PreK-2 school, we are going to use the information that we receive through MAP (Measures of Academic Progress) and Interactive Achievement to identify early and monitor those students identified at risk of failing an SOL. We are also going to target those students with interventions during our core instructional blocks and extension blocks.

d. Students who are/were below grade-level in reading or mathematics based on a disability:

In reading, the specific interventions used are PALS targeted assistance, SRA Reading Mastery, SRA Horizons, and/or SOAR to Success reading. Students receive these interventions based on their individual needs. These interventions are used in addition to core classroom instruction. We will more closely monitor during PLC meetings, the students' progress in these programs. In addition, the students with disabilities receive daily computer based instruction in Imagine Learning English which targets vocabulary and phonemic awareness as appropriate.

In math, we are going to develop research-based interventions to target students who are below-grade level based on a disability. They will receive regular math instruction and they will receive interventions based on their particular area of need. These interventions will be provided during core math and extension time and can also be done in a collaborative setting during the math block. Particular attention will be given to providing accommodations and teaching specific math strategies so students will be more successful. We will select these strategies during the SPED PLC meetings. In addition, we will be looking at intervention programs that target math.

7. Describe the school's plan in place to monitor the intervention process. The monitoring process should include, at a minimum, a monthly assessment of student growth. For example, the school should be able to report the MONTHLY grade level increase to a parent of a fifth grader who is reading on a second grade level using a response to intervention model such as Istation, Voyager, etc.

The RTI team will be meeting weekly to monitor interventions and progress. The SPED/Resource PLC team will also be meeting weekly to monitor progress with all special education and Title I students. Interventions will then be continued or adjusted based on data presented in the meetings. The results of the progress monitoring will then be reported to the grade level teams. The small group SIP meeting will then discuss the progress of these students monthly at their regularly scheduled meetings. Parents of students receiving interventions will be informed at least monthly of student progress through progress reports. The division level team is in the process of developing a common reporting form that is consistent among our three elementary schools to use for reporting this data to parents in an understandable format.

Quarterly benchmark assessments (cumulative quarterly assessments) and MAP will be administered to all students. Additionally, PALS, PALS Quick-checks, running records, Rigby reading, MAP, and/or frequent curriculum-based measurements will show student progress or where different interventions/remediation are

needed. During our grade-level data meetings, teachers, alongside coaches and administration, will disaggregate the data and group students for remediation/intervention accordingly.

8. Provide the monthly or weekly scheduled dates to review interventions by student. Include grade level/department

Department/Grade Level	Date(s)
Ex. 2 nd grade team	First Friday of the Month
Leadership SIP Team	First Thursday of every month 3:00-4:00
Whole School SIP Team	Third Thursday of every month 3:00-4:00
RTI Committee	Every Monday 3:30-4:30
PreKindergarten PLC	Every Wednesday
Kindergarten PLC	Every Tuesday
First Grade PLC	Every Tuesday
Second Grade PLC	Every Tuesday
SPED/Resource PLC	Every Wednesday

9. Provide the agenda for the meetings

	Agenda Item
1	Review of strategies and data analysis for students who are at-risk of failing a reading or mathematics SOL
2	Review of strategies and data analysis for students who have been identified for PALS intervention (K-3), if applicable
3	Review of strategies and data analysis for students who failed the SOL reading or mathematics assessment in 2010-2011 (not applicable to our school)
4	Review of strategies and data analysis for students who are below grade-level in reading or mathematics based on a disability
5	Review of division's Indistar® improvement plan
6	Updates needed to the division's Indistar® improvement plan

Must include the items indicated in rows 1-6

School Name: Columbia Elementary School

Columbia is a PreK-2 school; therefore the SOL tests are not administered at this school. Our data is analyzed based upon the performance of students who have transitioned to Central School from Columbia as well as preliminary SOL data for all Grade 3 students at Central Elementary. Since all students transition to Central Elementary in Grade 3, the schools typically plan collaboratively in their school improvement efforts. Columbia and Cunningham Schools share a principal.

2010-2011 ool Year

1. What objectives did the school meet by June 2011?

- As evidenced by our Indistar minutes, 80% of the School Improvement meetings included an agenda that involved discussions and planning related to student data. Also weekly PLC meetings were held to further conversation about meeting student needs.
- 100% of teachers developed annual goals that involved job-embedded professional development support and positively impact student performance.
- This year there were 59 classroom observations to monitor implementation of the Academic Expectation Handbook.
- Preliminary SOL data indicate we have not met the required AMO or reduced our failure rate by 10 % in all sub groups in literacy and or math. However, we have made student achievement gains based upon preliminary data provided in item 2.

Describe the school's progress with meeting the first year's annual goals proposed in the grant.

- The division-level Academic Expectations Handbook was used to guide the development of logic models which focused on remedial programs and the use of core extension for remediation and enrichment. Coaches, administration, and the division-level improvement team collaborated frequently to analyze student achievement data and walk-through data collected from the logic models and other monitoring tools. Frequent grade-level data meetings took place throughout the year and students were grouped fluidly for instruction and remediation as a result of these meetings. The data from these walkthroughs, as well as student achievement data, were used to plan professional

development for our teachers. The handbook is being revised with additional instructional focus and use of data.

- Columbia is a PreK-2 school and our individual school's preliminary SOL data for our students who have transitioned to 3rd grade at Central Elementary School show decreases of at least 10% in the failure rate for the following subgroups in the following areas: Reading/ Black, white, students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged and Math/ White, students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged. These are data for Columbia students only. Central Grade 3 as a whole increased total performance in reading from 72% to 79% and in math from 88% to 89% when comparing Spring 2010 to Spring 2011 SOL results. Preliminary subgroup data for Central Elementary is being analyzed.

2. What processes were initiated during the 2010-11 year to support the school with accomplishing the stated goals?

- The principal and instructional coach from Columbia were represented on the division leadership team. The team met twice monthly with representation from the central office and all schools. Agendas included the analysis of data from the Quarterly Reports, MAP (Measures of Academic Progress), Interactive Achievement Benchmarks and walkthroughs. Data were analyzed to determine student groupings and guide recommendations for instructional planning. Agendas also included identifying professional development needs and curriculum alignment and pacing needs. All agenda and meeting minutes are posted on Indistar.
- Community members participated in the division leadership team meetings once each month. The parent involvement committee was formed at the request of parents and community members.
- Curriculum pacing guides were revised in the spring of 2011 with teacher, coach, and administrator representation from all schools. The revisions to the guides were partially an outcome of data analysis from Interactive Achievement which indicated the need for a closer alignment between the written, taught, and tested curriculum. Benchmark tests will be completed during the summer of 2011 with implementation of the revised guides beginning in the fall of 2011.

- Columbia's school improvement team met two times each month with representation from each grade level, division- and building-level administration, coaches and non-classroom staff. In addition to revisions to the pacing guide actions taken included: revisions to the Academic Handbook and Assessment Process, creation and analysis of Interactive Achievement Benchmarks, reallocation of resources to better meet student needs during Core Extension, and identification of and meeting professional development needs.
- The data coach met with grade level teams to review a variety of student performance data including SOL, MAP and Interactive Achievement to group for remediation and enrichment and to identify student needs.
- During the 2010 – 2011 school year, job-embedded professional development began for 100% of our teachers. A document was created based on the teacher annual goal plans to identify the professional development activities and a PD schedule. Professional development activities included instructional coaching, peer observations/collegial learning, ongoing small-group workshops, and whole-group trainings. On-going individual support was provided where needed.

2011-2012 School Year

3. What are the school's objectives for 2011-12?

The main objective of the school will be to continue to increase student performance in all subgroups by meeting the required AMO and/or reducing the failure rate by at least 10% in reading and math. The school will also increase the number of students making (typical) growth based on reading and math MAP data.

Additionally, the school will:

- Provide professional development/support to 100% of teachers based upon needs identified in professional goal plans
- Include use of student/classroom data on 100% of meeting agendas

4. What additional processes are being planned to meet these goals?

- Utilizing student math data available from Interactive Achievement (IA) and the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) to provide interventions to assist students not making adequate progress in math.
- Increasing the administration of IA and MAP in reading and math to include students in Grades K and 1.
- Expanding the coaching model to provide a greater emphasis on students with disabilities.
- Fully implementing an RTI program with regular and frequent progress monitoring of struggling students. We are currently part of an Rtl pilot with the VDOE.
- Improving core extension time for corrective action.
- Increasing the use of student/classroom data to be included in 100% of meeting agendas.
- Participating in the Teacher Evaluation Pilot with the College of William and Mary.

5. The school should have a school improvement plan on the Indistar® website. This plan will need to be updated based on current 2011 data. Based on the analysis of the school's preliminary Spring 2011 SOL results and any other academic achievement data collected during the 2010-11 school year, which Indistar® indicators will the school modify, add or remove in the current school improvement plan?

- Continue with **Indicator IIB04**. We have made progress on this indicator. However, based on our data, it is important that we continue to refine the use of unit pre-tests to plan instruction. This need will also be reflected in Indicators IIB03 and IID11 (see below).
- **Add Indicator IE06** to reflect our involvement with the Teacher Evaluation Pilot with the College of William and Mary. Subsequent to training, tasks will be developed for the help accomplish the indicator to ensure classroom observations effectively monitor curriculum and classroom instruction. With the recent changes to our curriculum and pacing guides, it is going to be important that the instruction is monitored. Intervention programs also need to be more closely monitored so that students are demonstrating acceptable growth.
- **Indicator IIB03** will be addressed in the development of unit with pre-test and post-tests following the revised pacing guides work. Results of these assessments will be reviewed by the Instructional team.

- **Continue IID11-** Instructional Teams review the results of unit pre/post tests to make decisions about the curriculum and instructional plans and to “red flag” students in need of interventions (both students in need of tutoring or extra help and students needing enhanced learning opportunities because of early mastery of objectives.)

6. What specific interventions are being put in place as a result of the data analysis? Using a Response to Intervention model, describe the specific interventions planned next year for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students for each of the following populations:

Tier	Setting	Targeted Participation	Examples	Assessments	Documentation
1	Core program	All students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differentiated instruction • Balanced literacy • Classroom teacher directed instruction • Word Study • Guided reading • PALS lessons and activities • Four-square writing • Skill-based lessons (e.g., context clues) • Test-taking strategies • Problem-based instruction for mathematics • Higher-order questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IA quarterly assessments • Running record • PALS • Rigby • Formative assessments (e.g., checklists and pre-tests) • Unit tests • MAP • Writing Rubric 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student watchlists • Data meetings • Data warehouse • Intervention log
2	Targeted intervention	Those not making benchmark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower student/teacher ratio • Direct Instruction • Title I • Book Buddies • Horizons, SOAR • Additional guided reading groups • Fluency focus • Home instruction support packets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 1 assessments more frequently • Specific probes • Skill-driven assessments (e.g., SOAR checks) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier I • Possible child-study documentation
3	Targeted individual intervention	Not responding to Tier 2 Or Not closing gap based on projected growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daily explicit individual interventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 1 and Tier 2 assessments • Additional daily curriculum-based measurements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 1/Tier 2 • Child study • Individual student performance data based on intervention

a. Students who are/were at-risk of failing a reading or mathematics SOL

Students at risk of failing a reading SOL will receive Title I instruction in reading using extra guided reading, SRA Reading Mastery, SRA Horizons, and/or SOAR to Success based on their individual needs. In addition, based on pre and post tests, those students at risk of failing a math SOL will receive remediation during the core instructional block and during extension time based on their needs. The progress of these students will be frequently monitored by the RTI committee and Resource PLC as well as Columbia's SIP Team.

b. Students who are/were identified for PALS intervention (K-3), if applicable

We will continue to provide daily targeted assistance to those students who are identified by PALS. These students received 30 to 45 minutes of reading instruction in addition to instruction provided during the core two-hour literacy block. They also received 20 minutes daily Imagine Learning English computer-based instruction to support vocabulary development and phonemic awareness.

c. Students who failed the SOL reading or mathematics assessment in the previous year:

Though this is not applicable to our PreK-2 school, we are going to use the information that we receive through MAP (Measures of Academic Progress) and Interactive Achievement to identify early and monitor those students identified at risk of failing an SOL. We are also going to target those students with interventions during our Core and Extension time.

d. Students who are/were below grade-level in reading or mathematics based on a disability:

Students will be provided instruction based upon the goals and objectives identified in their IEPs. In reading, the specific interventions used are PALS targeted assistance, SRA Reading Mastery, SRA Horizons, and/or SOAR to Success reading. The students receive these interventions based on their individual needs. These interventions are used in addition to core classroom instruction. We will more closely monitor during PLC meetings, the students' progress in these programs. In addition, the students with disabilities receive daily computer based instruction in Imagine Learning English which targets vocabulary and phonemic awareness. In addition, based on pre and post tests, math SOL instruction will be provided will during the

core instructional block and during the extension block.

6. Describe the school's plan in place to monitor the intervention process. The monitoring process should include, at a minimum, a monthly assessment of student growth. For example, the school should be able to report the MONTHLY grade level increase to a parent of a fifth grader who is reading on a second grade level using a response to intervention model such as Istation, Voyager, etc.

The RTI team will be meeting weekly to monitor interventions and progress. The SPED/Resource PLC team will also be meeting weekly to monitor progress with all special education and Title I students. Interventions will then be adjusted, if needed, based on data presented in the meetings. The results of the progress monitoring will then be reported to the grade level teams. The small group SIP meeting will then discuss the progress of these students monthly at their regularly scheduled meetings. Parents of students receiving interventions will be informed at least monthly of student progress through progress reports. The division level team is in the process of developing a common reporting form that is consistent among our three elementary schools to use for reporting this data to parents in an understandable format.

Quarterly benchmark assessments (cumulative quarterly assessments), PALS, and MAP will be administered to all students. Additionally, PALS Quick-checks, running records, Rigby reading, and/or frequent curriculum-based measurements will show progress of students receiving interventions or where different interventions/remediation are needed. During our grade-level data meetings, teachers, alongside coaches and administration, will disaggregate the data and group students for remediation/intervention accordingly.

7. Provide the monthly or weekly scheduled dates to review interventions by student. Include grade level/department

Department/Grade Level	Date(s)
Ex. 2 nd grade team	First Friday of the Month
Leadership SIP Team	First Thursday of every month 3:00-4:00
Whole School SIP Team	Second Thursday of every month 3:00-4:00
RTI Committee	Every Monday 3:00-4:00
PreKindergarten PLC	Every Wednesday
Kindergarten PLC	Every Wednesday
First Grade PLC	Every Wednesday
Second Grade PLC	Every Wednesday
SPED/Resource PLC	Every Wednesday

8. Provide the agenda for the meetings

	Agenda Item
1	Review of strategies and data analysis for students who are at-risk of failing a reading or mathematics SOL (emphasis will be on second grade students)
2	Review of strategies and data analysis for students who have been identified for PALS intervention (K-3), if applicable
3	Review of strategies and data analysis for students who failed the SOL reading or mathematics assessment in 2010-2011 (not applicable to our school)
4	Review of strategies and data analysis for students who are below grade-level in reading or mathematics based on a disability
5	Review of division's Indistar® improvement plan
6	Updates needed to the division's Indistar® improvement plan

Must include the items indicated in rows 1-6

Application Submission

Applications are due on **Friday, June 17, 2011**.

The application must be submitted to the Office of School Improvement via the Virginia Department of Education's Single Sign-On for Web Systems (SSWS) Drop Box from the division's Superintendent's office to Janice Pierson by Friday, June 17 2011.

In the subject line, indicate the division name and application type (e.g., Portsmouth 1003g Continuation Application).
(If there is a need for a drop box user name and password, please contact the division's SSWS division administrator.)

Retain the original application in the division's files.

The application must be submitted to the Office of School Improvement via the Virginia Department of Education's Single Sign-On for Web Systems (SSWS) Drop Box from the division's Superintendent's office to Janice Pierson by Friday, June 17 2011.

In the subject line, indicate the division name and application type (e.g., Portsmouth 1003g Continuation Application).
(If there is a need for a drop box user name and password, please contact the division's SSWS division administrator.)

Retain the original application in the division's files.