

Milwaukee Public Schools District Improvement Plan

Final

*Adapted from the Minnesota Department of Education
District Improvement Plan*



1120 East Diehl Road, Suite 200
Naperville, IL 60563-1486
800-356-2735 • 630-649-6500
www.learningpt.org

Copyright © 2007 Learning Point Associates, sponsored under Milwaukee Public Schools contract number C009023. All rights reserved.

This work was originally produced in whole or in part by Learning Point Associates with funds from Milwaukee Public Schools under contract number C009023. The content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of Milwaukee Public Schools, nor does mention or visual representation of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement.

12/07

I. General Information and Instructions

Improvement plans are due: <u>November 1, 2007</u>		
District or Charter School (Multiple Sites) Identification Information		
District name and number Milwaukee Public Schools		Phone 414-475-8001
Superintendent William G. Andrekopoulos	District contact Arleen Dansby-White	Fax 414-475-8585
Site Address 5225 W. Vliet Street, Milwaukee, WI 53208		E-mail
District support team members (for additional members, please attach names to plan)		
Support team member		Position
1.	Phyllis Anderson	Coordinator, Title I
2.	Delorse Cole-Stewart	Reading Curriculum Specialist
3.	Ivy Covert	Director, Bilingual Education
4.	Deborah Ford	Director, Human Resources
5.	Victoria Frazier	Professional Development Supervisor
6.	Aquine Jackson	Chief Officer, School and Community Support
7.	Henry Kranendonk	Mathematics Curriculum Specialist
8.	Martin Lexmond	Director, School Innovation
9.	Deborah Lindsey	Director, Research and Assessment
10.	Michelle Nate	Chief Finance and Operations Officer
11.	Anita Pietrykowski	Director, Administrative Accountability
12.	Sandra Schroeder	Summer School Coordinator
13.	Lynne Sobczak	Director, Board Governance
14.	Catherine Thome	Director, District and School Improvement
15.	Marie Thompson	Grants Manager
16.	Claudia Weaver Henrickson	Special Education Leadership Liaison
17.	Kathy Williams	Director, Teaching and Learning
18.	Tracy Wozniak	Special Education Leadership Liaison
19.	Patricia Yahle	Director, Special Education
DPI USE ONLY		
Final approval signature		Date October 31, 2007
Comments		

District or Charter School (Multiple Sites) Identification Information		
District name and number Milwaukee Public Schools		Phone 414-475-8001
Superintendent William G. Andrekopoulos	District contact Catherine Thome	Fax 414-475-8585
Site Address 5225 W. Vliet Street, Milwaukee, WI 53208		E-mail
District support team members (for additional members, please attach names to plan)		
Core Support Team		Position
1. William Andrekopoulos		Superintendent
2. Arleen Dansby-White		Director, Instructional Leadership and Support
3. Deborah Ford		Director, Human Resources
4. Aquine Jackson		Chief Officer, School and Community Support
5. Michelle Nate		Chief Finance and Operations Officer
6. Anita Pietrykowski		Director, Administrative Accountability
7. Catherine Thome		Director, District and School Improvement
8. Patricia Yahle		Director, Special Education

Districts identified for consequences of not making Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) are required to develop (or revise) and implement an improvement plan based on the eight elements prescribed under PL 107–110, Section 1116. This can be accomplished as follows:

- Districts must **develop** an improvement plan using the current format and submit the completed and signed form to the assigned agency (see page one of this form for instructions) **OR**
- Districts with an **existing improvement plan** may attach their previous plan and indicate where each required element is embedded within the attached plan. The completed and signed form and assurances, along with the attached plan, is submitted to the assigned agency (see page one of this form for instructions).
- Use the attached rubric (Appendix A) to guide your school improvement planning.

Eight elements to be included in the needs improvement plan:

- Ensure all students are proficient in core academic subjects by 2013-14.
- Establish annual measurable objectives for continuous and substantial progress to achieve proficiency.
- Incorporate strategies based on scientifically based research to strengthen core academic subjects.
- Ensure the professional development needs of instructional staff are met by providing opportunities to participate in high-quality professional development.
- Address the fundamental teaching and learning needs in the district.
- Promote effective parent involvement strategies.
- Incorporate extended day and extended school year activities as appropriate.
- Outline the responsibility of the school, Local Education Agency (LEA), and State Education Agency (SEA) including technical assistance provided by the LEA.

II. Executive Summary Introduction

District Demographics

Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) was incorporated as a public school district in February 1846. It is the 29th largest school district in the nation and the largest school district in Wisconsin. MPS is a large urban decentralized school district serving approximately 87,000 students with about 10,000 educators, administrators and other staff in over 200 locations. MPS demographics reflect the following diversity: 57.8% of the students are African-American; 21% Hispanic; 12.8% White; 4.4% Asian; 0.9% Native American; and 3.1% other non-White. About 16.6% of the students have identified special education needs and 8.8% of students have limited English proficiency. District wide, over 75% of the students are eligible for free or reduced price lunch, an indicator of the number of children living in poverty. Individually, 36 schools have free or reduced lunch rates over 90% and half of the 171 regular school sites have rates over 80%.

While the student population is predominately minority, the teaching and administrative staff is predominately White. The following are the ethnic distribution for the teachers, educational assistants and administrators: 60.4% White; 26.1% African-American; 7.6% Hispanic; 1.9% Asian; 0.6% American Indian; 3.4% other non-White (2006-2007 data).

We know what it takes to create schools that serve all students. We think it is important to be clear about what “good work looks like.” The Characteristics of a High Performing Urban Classroom (CHPUC) is the vehicle by which we will achieve our student learning goals. In order to be more focused, we have reframed the Capacity Builders to be more specific so that they represent the district’s current standards of expectations. Improving instruction in the classroom, and focusing on the efficient, effective operations of a school, will enable us to build a school system focused on student achievement.

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

Special education needs in reading and mathematics, grades 3-12, will be addressed with access to the general curricular, appropriate accommodations, and collaboration between regular and special education educators regarding alignment of learning services.

English Language Learners (ELLs) in reading and mathematics, grades 6-12, will be addressed with access to the general curricular, appropriate accommodations, and collaboration between regular and bilingual education educators regarding alignment of learning services.

Low-income students in reading and mathematics, grades 6-12, will be addressed with the use of high-yield instructional strategies while accessing the general curricular, appropriate differentiation of instruction, and collaboration between regular and special education educators regarding accommodation and alignment of learning services.

Testing participation, grades 6-12, will be addressed with enhanced monitoring of testing administration and follow-up. Further, analysis of testing schedules, procedures, and environments will be conducted, adjusted, and implemented to ensure best possible testing environment and participation.

Regarding all of the above, scheduling of instruction and testing will be adjusted based upon best practice.

Expected Outcomes

Expect the following to be reflected in the district's DIFI plan and implemented in schools that are identified as in need of improvement:

For all students in K-8 schools: There will be a 90 minute block of reading instruction for kindergarten through fifth grade; and a 60 minute block of reading instruction for sixth through eighth grade effective Monday, January 28, 2008.

For all students in K-8 schools: There will be a 60 minute block of mathematics instruction for kindergarten through eighth grade effective Monday, January 28, 2008.

All middle school students will have a 60 minute block of mathematics instruction effective Monday, January 28, 2008.

All middle school students, who are not proficient in reading, will take a reading intervention class effective Monday, January 28, 2008.

All high school students in grade nine, who are not proficient in reading, must be enrolled in a reading intervention class by Monday, January 28, 2008.

The district will develop summer school programs in reading and mathematics for all SIFI schools for the summer of 2008.

By September 2008, all high schools listed as SIFI status must be programmed in a block schedule that has extended time for mathematics instruction.

By September 2008, all high schools listed as SIFI status must have reading instruction for all students who are not proficient in reading.

In all SIFI schools that are year round, the district and school will create and implement a strong intercession programs that are academically focused on reading and mathematics.

Expect the following to be reflected in the district's DIFI plan and implemented in all schools that have ELL or special education students:

- All students enrolled in special education whose Individual Education Plan (IEP) requires them to take reading in special education classrooms will have research-based programs in reading by Monday, January 28, 2008, to drive instructional improvement.
- All students enrolled in English Language Learner (ELL) programs, who are below proficiency in reading, must have research-based reading programs.
- Our first priority of the DIFI plan is to ensure that any barrier for special needs students and ELL students to the regular education curriculum be identified and eliminated immediately.

Expect the following to be reflected in the district's DIFI plan and implemented in all schools:

- The DIFI plan should increase the level of support, monitoring, and compliance to our district's Capacity Builders and the Characteristics of the High Performing Classroom based on a differentiated approach connected to the school's academic performance.
- Complete SIFI section of the Educational Plan to address below proficiency in reading and mathematics for targeted student subgroups.

III. Needs Assessment

October, 2007, a review of the MPS AYP district worksheet indicated that MPS has missed AYP in both reading and mathematics for three consecutive years, leading to the Level II DIFI status. The only student group that missed AYP in all three grade spans in both reading and mathematics is students with disabilities. However, many other student groups missed AYP at the high school level, including the All Students group as well as Black, Hispanic, ELL, and Economically Disadvantaged students. In the middle grades, ELLs and Black students met AYP via safe harbor and confidence interval applications in reading and mathematics, respectively.

Data for students with disabilities was further disaggregated by disability category in order to better understand performance within specific diagnostic groups. Students with learning disabilities represented nearly a third of all students with disabilities, but their performance in both reading and mathematics is very low; fewer than 20% of the students with learning disabilities across all tested grades were proficient in reading or mathematics in 2006-07 on the WKCE-CRT.

Data for students who are ELL was disaggregated by Lau level. This revealed that level 6 students (formerly ELL) outperform students who have never been ELL in both reading and mathematics on the WKCE-CRT. However, students with Lau levels of 1 and 2 perform much lower than the district average on the WKCE-CRT, with rates of proficiency in mathematics only around 27%.

Altogether, the district has 25 schools on the SIFI list, 13 of which are level 1 schools. Another 23 schools missed AYP in at least one component in 2006-07.

This two-year plan will accomplish the following:

- Restructure the district through the MPS District and School Improvement Accountability Model under the NCLB.
- Extend reading and mathematics opportunities in all SIFI schools starting Monday, January 28, 2008, and throughout the 2008-2010 school years.
- Provide individually tailored, differentiated SIFI principal leadership professional development and technical support.
- Provide summer school in all SIFI schools starting summer of 2008, with a reading and mathematics focus for students achieving basic or minimal on the WKCE-CRT assessment tool.
- Develop and implement a plan for extended calendars in 2008-2009 for one to two SIFI schools.

IV. Elements

1. Ensure all students are proficient in core academic subjects by 2013–14.

A. The identified barriers that have prevented the district from making AYP are:

- 1) Special education teachers do not have reasonable access to the teachers' guides, manuals, and resources related to the District Reading and Mathematics Curriculum in grades K-12. District and school will make available the necessary manuals and resources to special education teachers.
- 2) Special education teachers are not necessarily knowledgeable about District Reading and Mathematics Curriculum Guides and are not implementing district goals in grades K-12. Special education teachers will have access to district and school level professional development opportunities for reading and mathematics instruction.

- 3) We have a shortage of licensed, certified special education teachers who are trained in reading and mathematics instruction skills and strategies and differentiation of instruction in grades K-12. Human Resources will continue to recruit certified special education teachers.
- 4) Special education and regular education teachers need professional development to build knowledge of tools, strategies, and assessments that support reading and mathematics instruction and high-quality collaboration between the two groups in grades K-12. Reading and mathematics professional development opportunities will be scheduled to take place during the second semester of the 2007-2008 school year. Additional trainings for the 2008-2009 school year will be developed based upon the current needs of the special and regular education teacher.
- 5) We do not provide consistency in instruction in the reading and mathematics curricular areas in grades K-12. Teaching and Learning will communicate via meetings, trainings, and district publications the need for consistency of instruction in reading and mathematics through definitions, descriptions, and documents that provide clear understanding and expectations.
- 6) Special education students' needs are not consistently addressed by regular education teachers. District and school level staff will need to change policies and procedures regarding implementation of students' Individual Educational Plan.
- 7) We lack focused intervention at targeted skill levels for all identified low- performing student subgroups. Each school will have to identify current strategies effectiveness.
- 8) A pullout instructional procedure is used at the middle and high school level for English Language Learners (ELLs). This model will need to be analyzed to determine impact and make necessary changes to best meet the students' academic areas of concern.
- 9) We lack reading instruction for non-literate students, regardless of ELL status in grades 6-12. A reading intervention class will begin Monday, January 28, 2008 for all middle and high school students who are not proficient. Students will be identified by Research and Assessment and given to the school programmer for scheduling. The parents will receive notification of the academic program change.
- 10) We lack content-based instruction, consistency of services, collaboration between ELL and non-ELL staff, and collaborative analysis of student learning. District and school staffs will develop a consensus on content-based instruction, consistency of services, collaboration between ELL and non-ELL staff, and collaborative analysis of student learning through monthly dialogue, development of instructional delivery protocol, and monitoring its effectiveness.
- 11) We lack a state alternative assessment for ELL students. District level Research and Assessment will investigate and will work with DPI to address this need.
- 12) ELL with special needs assessment data is not disaggregated for analysis. Research and Assessment will investigate this barrier and implement a process of disaggregating the ELL data.
- 13) District's involvement of parents/guardians in understanding and using data to advocate for their child(ren). The Title I office will begin the process of better connecting the parents/guardians understanding and using of data to support their child(ren) through district and school level parent/guardian meetings and learning opportunities.
- 14) There are a multitude of factors that contribute to students not participating in testing at high school. These include:

- a. Attendance rate
 - b. Maturity level
 - c. Student involvement
 - d. Suspension rate
 - e. Transportation\truancy
 - f. Parent participation
 - g. At-Risk criteria (i.e. School aged parent, adjudicated, below grade level)
 - h. Student incentive
 - i. High school proficiency graduation requirement
 - j. Non-consistency of testing practices, instructional practices and etc...
 - k. Teacher licensure
- B. These barriers are being addressed through the design targets and strategies that are appropriately set for all students to be on track for 100 percent proficiency by 2013-14 in reading and mathematics are specifically listed within the action plan of this plan on pages 18-20. The strategies listed address targeted student subgroups. The strategies listed in the district's Instructional Improvement Plan support efforts in meeting the 100% proficiency by 2013-2014 in reading and mathematics ([Appendix D](#)).

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

- A. Provide annual measurable goals, which are clearly stated, and objectives for identified student group(s).

Annual measurable goals are clearly stated with specific strategies for each identified student group:

- 1) By November 2008, 60% of students with disabilities will be proficient or above in reading as measured by the WKCE-CRT (Nov 06 AYP worksheet results = 42%).
- 2) By November 2008, 75% of students who are English Language Learners (ELLs) will be proficient or above in reading as measured by the WKCE-CRT (Nov 06 AYP worksheet results = 66%).
- 3) By November 2008, 75% of students who are low SES will be proficient or above in reading as measured by the WKCE-CRT (Nov 06 AYP worksheet results = 70%).
- 4) By November 2008, 48% of students with disabilities will be proficient and above in mathematics as measured by the WKCE-CRT (Nov 06 AYP worksheet results = 30%).
- 5) By November 2008, 60% of students who are English Language Learners (ELLs) will be proficient and above in mathematics as measured by the WKCE-CRT (Nov 06 AYP worksheet results = 53%).
- 6) By November 2008, 60% of students who are low SES proficient and above in mathematics as measured by the WKCE-CRT (Nov 06 AYP worksheet results = 50%).
- 7) In November 2007, the percentage of high school students participating in the WKCE-CRT will increase from 94% to 95%.

8) In November 2008, the percent of high school students participating in the WKCE-CRT will increase to 96%.

B. Develop goals with the intended outcome of identified student group(s) making AYP.

The developed goals with intended outcomes of identified student groups making AYP have been identified with measurable outcomes. The measurable outcomes are listed within the action plan of the District's Improvement Plan.

C. Provide goals with a means of tracking the district's progress over the two years of the plan.

The provided goals and strategies have a means of tracking the district's progress over the two years for the identified student groups making AYP listed within the action plan of the District's Improvement Plan.

1) The district's Capacity Builders will serve as our rubric in measuring the district's progress over the two-year period and beyond along with the improvement plan's rubric(see Appendix C for the District's Capacity Builder Rubric).

3. Incorporate scientific research-based strategies to strengthen core academic subjects.

A. The identified, scientific research-based strategies are clearly stated and aligned to performance goals within the action plan of the District's Improvement Plan.

B. District Improvement Plan developers reviewed and analyzed the student data related to the subgroups identified within the DIFI status criteria. Goals were set by the district. The district Improvement Plan developers identified barriers which contributed to the process of the district moving into a DIFI level 2 status. Strategies were then listed to address each targeted student subgroup.

C. The strategies that were listed to address each targeted student subgroup's goals will improve student achievement in the following manner:

1) Special education in reading and mathematics, grades 3-12, will demonstrate increased proficiency by 18% as measured by the WKCE-CRT, November 2009.

2) English Language Learners in reading and mathematics, grades 6-12, will demonstrate increased proficiency by 9% as measured by the WKCE-CRT, November 2009.

3) Low-income students in reading and mathematics, grades 6-12, will demonstrate increased proficiency by 10% as measured by the WKCE-CRT, November 2009.

4) Testing participation, grades 6-12, will demonstrate increased proficiency by 2% as measured by the WKCE-CRT participation rate, November 2009.

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

A. Ten percent of the district's Title I funds will be reserved and spent for the purpose of providing high-quality professional development to meet the needs of the instructional staff in the following manner:

1. Reading and mathematics professional development opportunities will be provided on a monthly basis where designated school staff will attend and take back the information, strategies, and resources shared and provided to the school staff to learn and implement in a timely manner to bring about desired results.

2. The school administrator and learning team will provide ongoing support.

3. The DIFI team will monitor implementation and gather evidence of impact on student achievement.
- B. The professional development plan directly addresses the academic achievement problems that caused the district to be identified as DIFI. Mandatory trainings which focus upon research-based instructional strategies in reading and mathematics have been identified and scheduled for school staff to attend. The expected outcome will result in increased teacher proficiency in the delivery of instruction and increased student performance on the WKCE-CRT.
- 5. Address the fundamental teaching and learning needs in the district.**
- A. The fundamental teaching and learning needs in the designated areas cited that contributed to the identification of the needs improvement status are:
- 1) Mathematics with the largest gap is mathematics processes. The percent proficient in mathematics processes is nearly 20% less than the state levels for most grade levels and for all subgroups within those grade levels.
 - 2) In reading, our district has not achieved mastery in any of the four reading objectives on the WKCE. This indicates that the delivery of the curriculum has not been grounded in research-based strategies aligned to the standards influenced by formative assessment.
- B. Describe the teaching and learning needs that will be addressed, such as choice of instructional programs and materials, use of instructional time, improved use of assessments.
- 1) Instruction in mathematics and reading has not been adequately aligned to the standards or adjusted based on formative feedback about student learning for all students.
 - 2) There is a fundamental need to provide consistency in teaching and learning across the district to facilitate alignment of the curriculum. Professional development for implementation of the curriculum pacing guides will address alignment of instruction, assessment and the standards. District consistency will facilitate our ability to deliver effective professional development, and maximize benefits from curriculum resources to improve learning for the targeted groups.
 - 3) In reading, the use of Marzano's Academic Vocabulary Six Step Process will address the targeted objectives on the WKCE-CRT.
 - 4) In mathematics, the use of the constructed response item included on the ThinkLink Benchmark assessments will be the basis of district professional development focused on differentiated instruction utilizing formative assessment.
 - 5) These are the research based practices that will be implemented:
 - a. District Curriculum Pacing Guides for mathematics and reading.
 - b. Marzano's Academic Vocabulary Six Step Process across the content areas.
 - c. Differentiating instruction based on the constructed response on the ThinkLink Benchmark Assessment for mathematics.
 - d. Extending the time for instructional blocks for reading and mathematics.
- 6. Promote effective parent involvement strategies.**
- A. The identified strategies that will be used to promote effective parent involvement are:

- 1) Every school will be responsible for electing two parents to represent their school on the District Advisory Council. The meetings are monthly and each representative serves a two year term.
 - 2) Promote family literacy in every school by holding monthly district-level family literacy trainings in the evening that focus on mathematics and reading across grade levels.
 - 3) Every school will assign a district level Title I paraprofessional to work with their parent coordinator, or designee, on parental involvement and educational activities for parents so they will be able to assist their child(ren) academically.
- B. The strategies identified will effectively involve parent(s) in meeting students' academic goal(s) through the following:
- 1) At the meetings, parents will be given pertinent information to share with other parents and assist them with helping their child(ren) succeed academically.
 - 2) The family literacy trainings will help parents understand the Learning Targets and state standards as they relates to mathematics and reading.
 - 3) Parents will be provided tools to use and share with other parents in order to build capacity.
 - 4) The Title I support will help schools focus their efforts on the needs identified in the Educational Plan under Family Involvement.
- C. By providing parents with opportunities to understand the Learning Targets and state standards in reading and mathematics, parents will be able to understand skills addressed in the classroom, understand task performance requirements in the classroom, and products produced in the classroom as they relate to the skills taught. All additional support given to the school by the district will enhance parental involvement at the school level in all cited areas.

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

- A. Identify how these activities help students meet the measurable goals set to improve achievement in the cited area(s).
- 1) Targeted population for summer school is currently students identified as minimal and basic based on the WKCE and SPS scores. Curricular decisions will be focused on the core skills that need remediation. Schools will use formative benchmark data to align the strategies and materials to address the needed interventions.
 - 2) The reading department will develop, for each subject and grade level, a standard vocabulary across grade levels with horizontal and vertical alignment (based on the Marzano's Six Step Process). This strategy is research-based and will strengthen the core academic program.
- B. Describe the activities to be conducted before or after school, during the summer, or during an extension of the school year to meet student needs.
- 1) Inter-sessions held for the year-round school will have an academic focus. Schools will determine the skills and the intervention strategies needed based on the WKCE and district benchmark data.
 - 2) Interventions based on the data from the quarterly benchmark assessments should have a direct impact on the students due to the fact that the skill areas identified as needing improvement will be addressed in a timely manner.

- 3) Supplemental Education Services (SES) vendors must align their services and curriculum to the MPS Learning Targets, state standards, and the Characteristics of High Performing Urban Classrooms, in order to be selected as a provider. This information must be submitted with the Request for Proposal (RFP) and reviewed by MPS Department of Teaching and Learning for alignment.
 - 4) Summer school will focus on the academic areas of reading and mathematics. The three hour timeframe will be divided equally into an hour and thirty minutes of time for each subject. Utilizing the supplemental materials for reading and mathematics, schools will implement a curriculum that is focused in the specific targeted areas that are identified from the WKCE and benchmark data for each school.
 - 5) In addition, supplemental and extended school year curriculum activities focused around the reading and mathematics series, comprehensive literacy framework, and Marzano's Six Step Vocabulary Process to vocabulary building will be implemented in the classrooms. The mathematics teachers leaders will develop a guide for grade level activities that align to the curriculum.
 - 6) Community Learning Centers also provide support for reading and mathematics.
- C. Describe how staff are identified and trained to provide effective services and activities to improve achievement within the cited area(s).
- 1) District-wide inservice training on Marzano's Six Step Vocabulary Process will be conducted by the reading department.
 - 2) Inservice training on differentiation and scaffolding designed to meet the learning needs of each student will be provided during the school year.
 - 3) Literacy coaches will provide professional development for teachers on how to communicate students reading performance to parents in parent-friendly language (parent conferences).
 - 4) The literacy coach or curriculum generalist will provide workshops to parents on a variety of reading strategies which can be used with their child(ren).
 - 5) Staff hired to participate in the intersessions and summer school programs are hired by seniority, and are encouraged to participate in the inservice activities.

8. Outline the responsibility of the school, Local Education Agency(LEA), and State Education Agency(SEA), including technical assistance provided by the LEA.

Describe the responsibilities of the SEA and the LEA under the plan, including specifying the technical assistance to be provided by the SEA under paragraph (9) and the LEA's responsibilities under section 1120A.

Address the following:

- A. Describe the technical assistance that has been provided or is needed to effectively implement the district improvement plan.
 - 1) The district will need technical assistance on various levels to reach the goals set in the district's improvement plan.

Type of technical assistance needed/provided	By whom	Time Line	Measure of Impact	Funding Source and Amount
Reading staff for high school reading support	MPS district	January 2008-June 2009	Increased 10 th grade student proficiency on the WCKE-CRT by May 2009.	Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction \$450,00
Reading program staff	MPS district	January 2008-June 2009	Increased 3rd and 4th grade reading proficiency on the WCKE-CRT by May 2009.	Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction \$1,450,000
Reading program for grades 6-12 low proficiency student reader – READ 180 Corrective Reading	MPS district	January 2008-June 2009	Increased 8 th and 10 th grade reading proficiency on the WCKE-CRT by May 2009.	Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction \$1,450,000
Mathematics teachers	MPS district	January 2008-June 2009	Efficient support and services provided for targeted student subgroups and staff.	TBD
Professional development center	MPS district	January 2008-June 2009	District Level increased Professional Development aligned to plan and district initiative.	TBD
Mentoring services (district/school-based)	MPS district/school-based mentors	Weekly		TBD
Each school will review school-based assessment data and complete the SIFI section of the school's Educational Plan with research-based instructional strategies that will support and bring about an increase in that particular student subgroup achievement.	Schools	January 2008-June 2009	Increased school achievement for identified subgroups.	TBD
Each school's learning team (principal, literacy coach/curriculum generalist, mathematics teacher leader, special education lead teacher, ELL lead teacher will conduct quarterly academic monitoring conferences to identify, plan, implement, monitor support and services for students not proficient on ThinkLink benchmark assessments and WKCE-CRT	District/school improvement team	January 2008-June 2009	Increased school achievement for identified subgroups	TBD

B. After consultation with the regional service cooperatives or SEA, identify the technical assistance that will be provided.

Type of technical assistance needed	By whom	Frequency	Measure of Impact	Funding Source and Amount
TBD				

V. Highly Qualified Teachers—Public Law 107–110, the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act

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

Yes
 No

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

HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS

Ensure all students receive instruction from HQT by 2013-2014					
Strategies (3-5)	Professional Development	Responsible Support/Services	Measurement	Timeline	Funding
<i>Focus:</i> Adequacy of highly qualified teachers – recruitment.			Design to be completed by Human Resources	January 28, 2008	TBD
<i>Strategy:</i> Design and implement a comprehensive recruitment program.			Program to be implemented	January 28, 2008	TBD
<i>Focus:</i> Adequacy of highly qualified teachers – retention.					
<i>Strategy:</i> The District will reduce teacher turnover through an expanded induction program which includes a district mentoring program.	In-service district mentors		Mentors employed Mentors in-serviced Evaluation by new teachers as to effectiveness Turnover of new teachers reduced by 10% in	February 2008 May 2009 May 2009 June 2009	TBD

HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS

Ensure all students receive instruction from HQT by 2013-2014					
Strategies (3-5)	Professional Development	Responsible Support/Services	Measurement	Timeline	Funding
<i>Focus:</i> Adequacy of highly qualified teachers – preparation.					
<i>Strategy:</i> Complete a comprehensive review of intern training programs to insure the availability of special education, bilingual and other hard-to-fill area teachers who are committed to the urban environment.			Review is complete with contracts in place.	March 2008	TBD
<i>Focus:</i> Access to information on certification of highly qualified staff.					
<i>Strategy:</i> Establish a data management system to support decisions for recruitment and assigning of highly qualified staff with a special emphasis on teachers.			Information on certification and status as Initial Educator will be available to Central services and building administrators.	August 1, 2008	TBD

VI. District Improvement Action Plan

District Improvement Action Plan for AYP				
READING AYP GOAL	By November 2008, 60% of students with disabilities will be proficient or above in reading as measured by the WKCE-CRT (Nov 06 AYP worksheet results = 42%).			
#1 TARGET STUDENT GROUP	Special Education			
Instructional Strategies	Professional Development	Measurement	Date or Timeline	Funding Source
<p>By January 28, 2008, two 60 minute (grades 6th-9th) and one 90 minute (grades PreK5-5th) reading instruction block will be established. Students with special education needs will follow the general reading curriculum based on the MPS Reading Curriculum Pacing Guide of their same-age peers with appropriate accommodations or modifications as mandated by the IEP. One or more of the following strategies will be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • direct instruction in phonemic awareness • phonics • practice in applying skills in reading and writing • fluency training • enriched language experiences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Co-teaching model - Differentiated instruction incorporating technology - Scheduled collaboration between regular ed and special ed teachers 	<p>All special education teachers will receive ongoing professional development in the area of teaching of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension).</p> <p>All regular education and special education teachers and administrators will receive ongoing professional development for reading in the areas of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi-tiered Accommodations • Collaboration • Team teaching/Co-teaching • Differentiated instruction • Technology supports for Differentiated Instruction • Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pre-assessment - formative - summative 	<p>The learning team will analyze the following data to determine effectiveness of the strategies and future professional development needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade level/ content area CABS • Think Link – Benchmark Assessments (Progress Monitoring at instructional level) • Targeted IPI walk-throughs during reading blocks • WKCE • Collaborative planning staff survey <p>Principals/assistant principals/curriculum generalists will be required to conduct two formal observations of each teacher’s work during the reading block utilizing the MPS observation tool and provide specific, descriptive feedback to teachers.</p> <p>The learning team or special education supervisor will analyze the following data to determine effectiveness of the strategies and future professional development needs:</p>	<p>Two times each semester beginning January 2008-June 2009</p> <p>CABS – Baseline data in January, Monthly</p> <p>Benchmarks – four times a year</p> <p>January, 2008-June 2009</p> <p>WKCE – Annually</p> <p>One time each semester beginning January 2008 – June 2009</p> <p>Two times each school year beginning January 2008-June 2009</p> <p>Two times each semester beginning January 2008-June 2009</p> <p>November 2007-January 2009</p> <p>Continuous training to increase understanding and obtain mastery and implementation 2008-2009</p>	<p>School-based or Title I professional development funds.</p>

VI. District Improvement Action Plan

District Improvement Action Plan for AYP				
READING AYP GOAL	By November 2008, 60% of students with disabilities will be proficient or above in reading as measured by the WKCE-CRT (Nov 06 AYP worksheet results = 42%).			
#1 TARGET STUDENT GROUP	Special Education			
Instructional Strategies	Professional Development	Measurement	Date or Timeline	Funding Source
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CBM • Research-based reading program assessments • Targeted IPI walk-throughs during reading blocks • WKCE 		
Current reading intervention programs within the district, when implemented with fidelity, that have evidence of success are: Read 180, Direct Instruction, Distar, Corrective Reading.		Increased student achievement of student subgroup as evident by Benchmark Assessment and WKCE-CRT results.	January 2008-June 2009	TBD
Between now and January 28, 2008 research-based reading intervention programs will be reviewed and selected.		Programs identified will be implemented August 2008.	August 2008-June 2011	TBD
By January 28, 2008, all special education students in middle or high school who are not proficient in reading will participate in content area instruction implementing research-based instructional strategies and on-going summative assessment.	<p>Prior to January 28, 2008 special education teachers will receive training on the selected research-based program(s).</p> <p>Ongoing professional development will be provided to special education staff.</p>	Principals/assistant principals/special education supervisors will be required to conduct two formal classroom observations of each teacher's work during the reading block utilizing the MPS observation tool and provide specific, descriptive feedback to teachers.	<p>WKCE - Annually</p> <p>Two times each school year beginning January 2008-June 2009</p>	TBD
Academic rich vocabulary across grade levels with horizontal and vertical alignment (based on Marzano's Six Step Process pre/post test assessments.	Teachers trained on how to choose and integrate vocabulary across the curriculum.	Pre/post testing of students' achievement will be done for students involved in the summer programs. Achievement in mathematics will be used to revise and continue programs.	March 2008-June 2009	TBD

VI. District Improvement Action Plan

District Improvement Action Plan for AYP				
READING AYP GOAL	By November 2008, 75% of students who are English Language Learners (ELLs) will be proficient or above in reading as measured by the WKCE-CRT (Nov 06 AYP worksheet results = 66%).			
#2 TARGET STUDENT GROUP	English Language Learners			
Instructional Strategies	Professional Development	Measurement	Date or Timeline	Funding Source
For non-literate and minimal/basic level ELL students, develop middle and high school reading courses aligned with Reading Learning Targets, Reading Pacing Guide and the WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards; co-taught by ESL and content/mainstream teacher.	District professional development for ESL and content/classroom teachers in the areas of Reading Learning Targets, Reading Curriculum Pacing Guide and World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) English Language Proficiency Standards. Co-teaching strategies and models; follow-up sessions with teachers on differentiated instruction and English Language proficiency standards.	CABS ThinkLink benchmark testing (Progress Monitoring at instructional level) WKCE ACCESS for ELL students	CABS- Baseline Data, Monthly Benchmarks- 4 times a year WKCE and ACCESS -Annually	Categorical funds Board funds Common school funds
Provide professional development for teachers and para-professionals who work with ELL students on differentiated instruction and English Language Proficiency Standards (“WIDA” ELP Standards)	Contract WIDA professional development sessions on understanding the basis for and structure of the English Language Proficiency Standards and how these help to differentiate instruction. Follow up sessions by the district on an overview of the language acquisition process and best practices. Professional Development offered to school-based learning teams on meeting the academic needs of ELLs 2-4 days (WIDA).	Assessing Content and Comprehension in English State to State (ACCESS) testing Classroom walk through data Student work samples	ACCESS- Annually December, 2007 – February, 2009 Work Samples - 2-4 times a year i.e. middle/high schools during their quarterly report card periods Elementary: once at the end of each semester	Categorical funds Board funds Common school funds
Parent Involvement Strategies: Provide ongoing informational sessions for parents of ELL students in their native language (when available) to understand and analyze assessment data (formative and summative) as it pertains to their children.	Professional development for school-based staff, including the Title I staff that will facilitate the parent sessions on data analysis.	Agenda and sign in sheets submitted to Title 1 office for monitoring purpose; Satisfaction surveys to be administered to parents in Spanish and in Hmong.	Minimum of twice per year at the school level and once a year at the district Parent Technology Resource Centers	Title I Title III

VI. District Improvement Action Plan

District Improvement Action Plan for AYP				
READING AYP GOAL	By November 2008, 75% of students who are English Language Learners (ELLs) will be proficient or above in reading as measured by the WKCE-CRT (Nov 06 AYP worksheet results = 66%).			
#2 TARGET STUDENT GROUP	English Language Learners			
Instructional Strategies	Professional Development	Measurement	Date or Timeline	Funding Source
Extended School Year Strategy: For non-literate and minimal/basic level ELL students, develop Middle and high school reading summer school courses aligned with Reading Learning Targets, Reading Pacing Guide and the WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards; co-taught (where possible) by ESL and content/mainstream teacher.	District professional development for ESL and content/classroom teachers in the areas of Reading Learning Targets, Reading Curriculum Pacing Guide and WIDA English Language Proficiency Standards. Co-teaching strategies and models At least one session with teachers on Differentiated Instruction and English Language Proficiency Standards	CABS David Test for ELL Students	CABS- Baseline Data, (pre and post) David Test for ELL students (pre and post)	Categorical funds Board funds Supplemental funds (NCLB)

VI. District Improvement Action Plan

District Improvement Action Plan for AYP				
READING AYP GOAL	By November 2008, 75% of students who are low SES (Supplemental Education Services) will be proficient or above in reading as measured by the WKCE-CRT (Nov 06 AYP worksheet results = 70%).			
#3 TARGET STUDENT GROUP	Low Income			
Instructional Strategies	Professional Development	Measurement	Date or Timeline	Funding Source
By January 28, 2008, all schools with low SES students will increase the reading instruction given to students by providing a minimum of a 90 minute block of reading instruction for K5 through 5 th grades, and a minimum of a 60 minute block of reading instruction for 6 th -8 th grades utilizing the MPS Reading Curriculum Guide, and Marzano's Academic Vocabulary Six Step Process within the MPS Comprehensive Literacy Framework.	<p>Staff at all schools will receive professional development that emphasizes the MPS Reading Curriculum Guide, and Marzano's Academic Vocabulary Six Step Process within the MPS Comprehensive Literacy Framework for implementation within 60 or 90 minute block periods.</p> <p>Align all contracted service professional development (i.e., CLCs, SES, instructional coaches) to district standards (i.e., professional development standards, standards for delivery, standards for content, etc.).</p>	<p>Targeted IPI walks during reading blocks.</p> <p>The Learning Team will analyze benchmark data, grade level summative assessments, and walk through data to determine effectiveness of the strategies and professional development needs.</p> <p>Principal/assistant principal/curriculum generalist will be required to conduct two formal classroom observations of each teacher's work during the reading block utilizing the MPS observation tool and provide specific, descriptive feedback to teachers.</p>	<p>Monthly</p> <p>Twice between January and June, 2008</p>	School-based or Title I Professional Development funds
By January 28, 2008, all students, including low SES students, in grades 6-9 who are not proficient in reading will be enrolled in an intervention class based on the MPS Reading Curriculum Guide and utilize high yield reading strategies embedded across all content areas in grades 6-12.	<p>Targeted professional development on reading and vocabulary strategies (i.e., Marzano's Vocabulary Development "Six Steps Process", Marzano's Nine Categories of Instructional Strategies, Analogy Graphic Organizers, Structured Note Taking and Summarization).</p> <p>Develop standard vocabulary across all grade levels and content areas with vertical and horizontal alignment. High school content area teachers need to be trained in core reading strategies.</p>	<p>Assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-assessment • Formative • Summative • School-based assessments 	January 2008-June 2009	Title I

VI. District Improvement Action Plan

District Improvement Action Plan for AYP				
READING AYP GOAL	By November 2008, 75% of students who are low SES (Supplemental Education Services) will be proficient or above in reading as measured by the WKCE-CRT (Nov 06 AYP worksheet results = 70%).			
#3 TARGET STUDENT GROUP	Low Income			
Instructional Strategies	Professional Development	Measurement	Date or Timeline	Funding Source
By January, 28, 2008, all schools with low SES K3/K4 students will utilize a reading curriculum aligned with the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards, and strengthen and emphasize the inclusion of instruction in reading.		Targeted IPI walks during reading block Grade level/content area CABS, Marzano's 6 step vocabulary pre/post assessments.		TBD
Parent Involvement Strategies: Implement monthly reading and literacy cafes and expand upon successful parent involvement strategies for the early grades (preK-3 rd) (e.g., Home instruction for parents of preschool youngsters)	Literacy training opportunities will be provided for all parents/families to support classroom achievement. The literacy coach or curriculum generalist will provide monthly workshops to parents on a variety of reading strategies which can be used with their child.	Survey/evaluation forms	Monthly beginning January 28, 2008.	Title I
Every teacher will discuss reading with data/student work at conferences to show the progress children are making.	Literacy coaches will provide professional development for teachers on how to communicate students' reading performance in parent friendly language.	School-based leadership Parent conferences Survey of effectiveness	Second semester parent conferences	Current funding
Extended Year Strategies: The district will develop summer school, year round intercessions and after school programs for low SES students that provide consistency in programs and address the needs for reading instruction. Credit recovery after school for high school students	Targeted professional development on reading and vocabulary strategies (i.e., Marzano's Vocabulary Development "Six Steps Process", Marzano's Nine Categories of Instructional Strategies, Analogy Graphic Organizers, Structured Note Taking and Summarization)	Marzano's six step vocabulary pre/post assessments.	Pre/post testing of students' achievement will be done for students involved in the summer programs. Achievement in mathematics will be used to revise and continue programs.	Title I

VI. District Improvement Action Plan

District Improvement Action Plan for AYP				
MATH AYP GOAL	By November 2008, 48% of students with disabilities will be proficient and above in Math as measured by the WKCE-CRT (Nov. 06 AYP worksheet results = 30%)			
#1 TARGET STUDENT GROUP	Special Education			
Instructional Strategies	Professional Development	Measurement	Date or Timeline	Funding Source
The district will ensure that schools will implement a policy, as mandated by the Board of School Directors, to provide special education students equitable access to the regular education mathematics curriculum within the 60 minute block in grades K-5, the 60 minute block in grades 6-8, and extended block in high school as well as additional focused individualized interventions in mathematics as mandated by the IEP.	<p>Mathematics teaching specialists will provide content training for special education teachers in mathematics.</p> <p>Embedded professional development to ensure that special education teachers are provided and understand the curriculum guides, supported through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mathematics teaching specialists • Mathematics teacher leaders • Learning teams 	<p>Teacher evaluation via Instructional Observation Form to monitor teachers' implementation of strategies.</p> <p>Review instructional practices survey data to identify ongoing content area deficits of special education teachers.</p>	Implement instructional strategy by Monday, January 28, 2008.	<p>Board funds and/or school-based grants</p> <p>Board funds</p>
<p>The district will require that high-priority schools implement the following strategies for mathematics instruction to special education students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-teaching model • Differentiated instruction incorporating technology • Scheduled collaboration between regular education and special education teachers 	<p>Provide training on co-teaching models, differentiated instruction, and collaborative planning time.</p> <p>Instructional technology teacher leader training to access technology-based learning sites and programming.</p>	Pre/post observation conference.	Collaborative planning time per collective bargaining contract.	Tuition reimbursement
Teachers will be required to provide descriptive feedback to special education students through the use of formative mathematics assessments via data analysis that monitor progress toward proficiency and informed instructional decisions.	The district will provide training and additional support in formative assessment for special education teachers.	<p>All special education teachers will administer district model mathematics CABS.</p> <p>Benchmark Mathematics Assessment: Constructed Response</p>	<p>Bi-Weekly starting February 2008.</p> <p>Four times per year starting February 2008.</p>	<p>Title I</p> <p>Board funds P-5</p>

VI. District Improvement Action Plan

District Improvement Action Plan for AYP				
MATH AYP GOAL	By November 2008, 48% of students with disabilities will be proficient and above in Math as measured by the WKCE-CRT (Nov. 06 AYP worksheet results = 30%)			
#1 TARGET STUDENT GROUP	Special Education			
Instructional Strategies	Professional Development	Measurement	Date or Timeline	Funding Source
Parent Involvement Strategies: All parents of special education students will be provided written mathematics strategies and given the opportunity to learn how to implement the strategies through teacher led modeling at school-sponsored events.	Mathematics coach will collaborate with teachers to identify effective strategies and train/support teachers on how to model the strategies to parents	Parent feedback forms Parent sign-in sheets	Monthly school-sponsored events starting February 2008	Title I P-5 funds Board funds
Extended Year: Special education students will receive differentiated instruction based upon student's grade level academic content during <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summer school • Intercession • CLC to build mathematics skills that are targeted within their IEPs.	All staff working with special education teachers will be provided training to correctly implement IEP based in students grade level academic content.	Observation of teacher progress reports for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEP specific mathematics goals • aligned interventions 	Training will begin April 2008 Implementation will begin Summer 2008	ESY funds

VI. District Improvement Action Plan

District Improvement Action Plan for AYP				
MATH AYP GOAL	By November 2008, 60% of students who are English Language Learners (ELLs) will be proficient and above in Math as measured by the WKCE-CRT (Nov. 06 AYP worksheet results = 53%)			
#2 TARGET STUDENT GROUP	English Language Learners			
Instructional Strategies	Professional Development	Measurement	Date or Timeline	Funding Source
Monthly curriculum alignment in mathematics will be mandated in all schools to ensure that curriculum presented to students who are ELLs is aligned to the MPS mathematics curriculum and Wisconsin State Standards.	District sponsored professional development in curriculum alignment	Learning team monitoring monthly Monitored monthly by schools learning team's learning walks	Curriculum alignment professional development completed by June 2008.	Board funds Categorical funds
Differentiated instruction in all mathematics classes with students who are ELLs needs during a 60 minute sustained mathematics instruction block ensuring that language is not a barrier to understanding. Instruction will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marzano's Six Step Vocabulary Process Use of non-linguistic representations such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Graphs Models Visuals 	Targeted <u>Sheltered Instructional Observational Protocol</u> (SIOP) training for use with ELL Mathematics students to inform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mathematics teachers of students who are ELLs School-based leaders (training of trainers) Learning teams District personnel Training in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learning walks Instruction Assessment procedures 	Performance-based mathematics assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ThinkLink benchmark testing Embedded SIOP assessment tools Learning walk data work Locally developed CABS MPS District Mathematics Classroom Assessments Based on Standards-CABS 	Training: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> January, 2008 a cohort of teachers will be trained by University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee grantees in SIOP through the Content and Language Integration as a means of Bridging Success (CLIMBS) Course. By the end of 2009, an additional 70 teachers will receive training in SIOP. Implementation in ESL supported classrooms by March 2008. On-going district-wide training for mainstream teachers of ELLs for expanded SIOP implementation.	Board funds Categorical funds UWM Milwaukee and Green Bay Integrated Curriculum Project(MAGIC Grant) Local Board funds for salaries
Cooperative learning will be used in mathematics classes with students with ELL needs to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> promote speaking skills allow students to articulate understanding of mathematics concepts 	Basics of cooperative learning aligned with the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment(WIDA) Consortium Standards training through district/on-site training from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mathematics teaching specialists /teacher leaders Literacy specialists/coaches 	MPS oral communication rubric (on Portal)	Professional development for literacy specialists and mathematics teaching specialists in November 2007. Training in cooperative learning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> January 2008 literacy coach training to be presented to mathematics teachers of ELL 	MPA(Milwaukee Partnership Academy) funding for Literacy Coach Initiative Milwaukee Mathematics

VI. District Improvement Action Plan

District Improvement Action Plan for AYP				
MATH AYP GOAL	By November 2008, 60% of students who are English Language Learners (ELLs) will be proficient and above in Math as measured by the WKCE-CRT (Nov. 06 AYP worksheet results = 53%)			
#2 TARGET STUDENT GROUP	English Language Learners			
Instructional Strategies	Professional Development	Measurement	Date or Timeline	Funding Source
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On-line professional development courses 		students by March 2008 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On-line course in cooperative learning posted by January 2008 Mathematics teaching specialist training for MTL's complete by January 2008 Students engaged in cooperative learning by March 2008 	Partnership (MMP) Grant funding for Mathematics Teaching Specialists Title I funds
Parent Involvement Strategies: Support parents of mathematics students with ELL needs by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using multiple approaches (in person, written, through children) to reach parents as well as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> informing parents of goals for embedding SIOP for mathematics students with ELL needs and providing weekly at home interactive mathematics activities for families sharing expectations in mathematics for all grade levels at least once a month providing examples of proficient mathematics work at all grade levels 	Targeted training for school leaders to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion facilitation training SIOP training Using the Mathematics Pacing Guide and CABS to develop/collect samples of proficient mathematics skills at all grade levels Targeted training parents to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving student achievement through the use of exemplars Literacy training and vocabulary instruction Using technology to locate resources and interact with other parents 	Attendance figures Parent surveys	SIOP training articulated in strategy #2 above	State technical group to develop support for parent participation and funding of materials Title I funds

VI. District Improvement Action Plan

District Improvement Action Plan for AYP				
MATH AYP GOAL	By November 2008, 60% of students who are English Language Learners (ELLs) will be proficient and above in Math as measured by the WKCE-CRT (Nov. 06 AYP worksheet results = 53%)			
#2 TARGET STUDENT GROUP	English Language Learners			
Instructional Strategies	Professional Development	Measurement	Date or Timeline	Funding Source
Extended Year Goal: Continue SIOP model for ELL students in mathematics during summer school, intercession (year round schools), and after school programs.	SIOP training articulated in professional development #2 above. Two hour SIOP training for summer school, intercession or after school program staff members who will teach mathematics to ELL students who have not been previously trained.	Embedded SIOP assessment tools Learning walk data	Timeline same as articulated in timeline #2 above Additional training in June 2008 for summer school teachers working with ELL students in mathematics and not previously trained.	Funding same as articulated in funding #2 above Additional funding from summer school office and Title I

VI. District Improvement Action Plan

District Improvement Action Plan for AYP				
MATH AYP GOAL	By November 2008, 60% of students who are low SES proficient and above in mathematics as measured by the WKCE-CRT (Nov 06 AYP worksheet results = 50%).			
#3 TARGET STUDENT GROUP	Low Income			
Instructional Strategies	Professional Development	Measurement	Date or Timeline	Funding Source
Develop and implement district mathematics assessment for three-year old kindergarten through 2 nd grade low income students to identify and address the mathematic knowledge and understanding of these students not currently available under the assessment system.	K3–grade 2 teachers will be trained to use assessments developed or identified by the district for determining intervention strategies.	Assessment results will be recorded by teachers and collected by the mathematics coach.	Develop/or identify a district assessment by January 3, 2008. In-service and implementation beginning late January 2008.	TBD
Use quarterly constructed response problems from benchmark assessments for low income students in grades 3-10 to plan instruction based on these formative assessments.	Mathematics teachers leaders will be trained by the district in providing a consistent implementation of rubrics for professional development at schools. Teachers will complete a school summary of the students' achievement on the constructed response to provide direction on their next steps in modifying and revising instruction.	Summary sheets will be collected by the mathematics coach and discussed at the weekly learning team meetings. Learning team will be expected to provide summary of school's implementation to the district level administrators in Teaching and Learning	Implementation will begin November 2007.	Local Board and Title 1 funds. Local Board and Title 1 funds.
Train and provide a full- time, highly qualified mathematics coach to support each school targeted for extended mathematics instruction for low income students (a 60-minute block of mathematics instruction for K8 students and a 90-minute block for all middle school students	Create a job description and provide training for identified mathematics coaches. Place Mathematics coaches in schools by January 28, 2008.	Monthly meetings with mathematics teaching specialists will be held to update district on progress of strategy and training for support of classroom teachers. Mathematics Coaches will provide principals and Learning Team updates of strategies by summarizing assessments and students' work samples.		TBD

VI. District Improvement Action Plan

District Improvement Action Plan for AYP				
MATH AYP GOAL	By November 2008, 60% of students who are low SES proficient and above in mathematics as measured by the WKCE-CRT (Nov 06 AYP worksheet results = 50%).			
#3 TARGET STUDENT GROUP	Low Income			
Instructional Strategies	Professional Development	Measurement	Date or Timeline	Funding Source
Parent Involvement Strategies: Monthly activities for parents of low income that emphasize instructional strategies in mathematics will be provided and logged (at minimum 8 per year) to address the lack of parent understanding of the expectations of mathematics.	Mathematics teaching specialists and the Title I parent coordinators will start with meetings the beginning of January, 2008.	Schools will create an action plan outlining implementation, timeline, and reporting process to the district Title I Office and the Milwaukee Mathematics Partnership	January, 2008 – June, 2009	TBD
Extended Year: The district will develop summer school and intercession programs in mathematics for low income students attending SIFI schools, along with other schools, that will require consistency in programs that address the needs of this population.	District summer school office and Teaching and Learning will facilitate schools in developing their summer school proposals by using their K8 mathematics programs and appropriate supplementary mathematics programs to address students' areas of weakness as identified by benchmarks, constructed response assessments, WCKE, CABS, and other district assessments.	Implementation will begin with the development of summer programs starting in Spring, 2008 Professional development for summer programs will begin in April 2008.	Pre/post testing of students' achievement will be done for students involved in the summer programs. Achievement in mathematics will be used to revise and continue programs.	TBD

District Improvement Action Plan for AYP

TESTING AYP GOAL	In November 2007, the percentage of high school students participating in the WKCE-CRT will increase from 94% to 95%. In November 2008, the percent of high school students participating in the WKCE-CRT will increase to 96%.			
TARGET STUDENT GROUP	High School Students 10th Graders			
Instructional Strategies	Professional Development	Measurement	Date or Timeline	Funding Source
Focus strategy: SDIS participation 1) District wide procedures for testing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District-wide testing schedule per subject area, date, time • Testing environment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proctor - Number of students in testing room - Time of day District wide public relations	District staff involved in the testing process, administrators, school assessment coordinators, school counselors, literacy coaches, teachers, administrators, teacher leaders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best practices in testing • Testing protocol • Develop a student-teacher relationship 	Monitor schools' implementation of the process at end of testing period. Research and Assessment will develop a process for collecting, and analyzing data to impact instruction process.	February 2008 – June 2009	Title I
	Information session for all Board members	Actual Meeting	Advance to Superintendent November 1, 2008	None

Appendix Attachments

Appendix A: Scoring Rubrics

Appendix B: End Notes Correlating to Instructional Strategies or Professional Development

Appendix A: Scoring Rubrics

A Rubric for District Improvement Plans

The essential requirements in the school or district improvement applications have been incorporated (general information, executive summary, needs assessment, highly qualified teachers and improvement action plan)	
<i>Completed</i>	<i>Not Completed</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> General and contact information is included <input type="checkbox"/> Area(s) for identification on specific target student group(s) are included <input type="checkbox"/> Overview of improvement plan for 2007-2008 school year is provided <input type="checkbox"/> Demographics are included in executive summary <input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive needs assessment summary for 2007-2008 school year is provided <input type="checkbox"/> Elements are addressed and easily located in the plan <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Qualified Teachers section is completed on the plan <input type="checkbox"/> District or school improvement action plan is included with all sections completed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> General information is not correctly or incompletely filled out <input type="checkbox"/> Area(s) for identification on specific target student group(s) are not included <input type="checkbox"/> Overview of improvement plan for 2007-2008 school year is incomplete <input type="checkbox"/> Demographics are not included in executive summary <input type="checkbox"/> Elements are not addressed or are incomplete <input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive needs assessment summary is incomplete or not provided for 2007-2008 school year <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Qualified Teachers section is incomplete <input type="checkbox"/> District or school improvement action plan is or incomplete or not included

District Improvement Plan Rubric

(DISTINGUISHED ← PROFICIENT ← NEEDS REVISION)

1. Ensure all students are proficient in core academic subjects by 2013–14.

Distinguished	Proficient	Needs Revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Barriers preventing the school or district from not making AYP are identified; actions, including policies and practices, are evident in the plan to address barriers.	<input type="checkbox"/> Barriers preventing the school or district from not making AYP are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Barriers preventing the school or district from not making AYP are not identified or are not clearly presented.
<input type="checkbox"/> Targets and/or objectives are specific, clear, measurable and appropriately set for all students to be on track for 100% proficiency by 2013–14 in reading and mathematics.	<input type="checkbox"/> Targets and/or objectives are set for all students to be on track for 100% proficiency by 2013–14 in reading and mathematics.	<input type="checkbox"/> Targets and/or objectives are not provided or are unclear.

MPS Capacity Builders Accountability Document
Six Capacity Builders to Improve Academic Achievement

1. **Instructional Focus**
Each school should have a school-wide instructional focus chosen from the Characteristics of a High Performing Urban Classroom (CHPUC). The principal and staff must continually learn and use high quality instruction that reflects current research for enhanced learning for all students.
2. **Aligned Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction**
Curriculum in a high performing school is aligned to Learning Targets and state standards, paced, and mapped. Formative and summative assessment results are integral parts of determining instruction within the classroom.
3. **Professional Learning Community**
A school functions as a Professional Learning Community (PLC) when all of its stakeholders demonstrate a shared mission, vision, and values; and, participate in collective inquiry and collaborative teams with an orientation toward action and research regarding instructional changes with a clear focus on student learning.
4. **Shared Decision-Making**
Shared Decision-Making (SDM) is a process of making educational decisions in a collaborative manner. The school must have a clearly defined process and structure focused on student learning and fiscal responsibility.
5. **Effective Educational Plan**
Each school designs an Educational Plan that focuses on the school's efforts to improve student achievement. This means that the school's adults focus on what they are willing to learn and do differently during the upcoming school year in order to implement best practices regarding instruction, alignment, and assessment.
6. **Fiscal Responsibility**
Each school must be managed in a fiscally responsible way to ensure that all of its resources are allocated to support classroom performance.

1. Instructional Focus

There is obvious evidence that the school is “living” a solid school-wide focus through its words, actions, systems, and culture which translates into high quality instruction, student engagement, and student learning in every classroom. The curriculum is taught through best practices that reflect current research for enhanced learning for all students. There is also evidence that Central Services personnel support the instructional focus at the school sites.

Dimensions	Not Initiated	Initiation (starting)	Implementation (doing)	Institutionalization (embedding)
<p>Implement a school-wide instructional focus as defined in the Educational Plan as one of the characteristics of <i>The Characteristics of a High Performing Urban Classroom (CHPUC)</i>. The school’s Educational Plan focuses on improvement of instruction by focusing on what the adults can learn together that will be different from what they currently do.</p>	<p>The staff has not chosen a characteristic from the Characteristics of a High Performing Urban Classroom. Therefore evidence cannot be seen in the any classroom.</p>	<p>Initial staff development and discussion regarding the high performing urban classroom is occurring.</p> <p>Staff has chosen and is exploring a characteristic which is to become its instructional focus area for the Educational Plan for that school year.</p> <p>Implementation of the school’s focus occurs in over half of the classrooms.</p>	<p>The entire staff has participated in choosing the characteristic that the school has chosen for improvement.</p> <p>All teachers can articulate the focus of the school regarding the high performing urban classroom.</p> <p>Training and networking occur for the principal, learning team, and staff to develop deeper understanding regarding the chosen “lens.”</p> <p>Staff bulletins and school newsletters strongly reinforce the focus.</p> <p>Staff implements regular learning walks to monitor and chart progress of its instructional focus.</p> <p>Teachers network around the chosen characteristic (from CHPUC) and new instructional strategies within their school and across the district.</p> <p>Classroom practices, set up, and materials reflect the characteristic chosen by the school as their instructional</p>	<p>The chosen instructional characteristic is seen throughout the school on learning walks conducted by school and visiting personnel.</p> <p>Practices that support the instructional focus are consistent across all classrooms and are sustainable despite staff turnover.</p> <p>Parents are aware of the instructional focus and their role in supporting it. Implementation of the school’s focus occurs in all classrooms.</p>

			<p>focus.</p> <p>Staff employs various assessments on a continual basis to check for student progress and to adapt instructional practice to meet changing levels of student achievement.</p> <p>Parents are aware of the instructional focus and their role in supporting it.</p>	
<p>Principal as Instructional Leader The principal is meeting the goal of spending 50% of the instructional day in classrooms – observing, demonstrating, and modeling – to promote and ensure the use of effective instructional practices and to provide teachers follow-up feedback in direct connection to those classroom visits.</p>	<p>Little or no evidence that the principal is spending 50% of the instructional day in classrooms.</p>	<p>Principal is recognized as a strong supporter of the Educational Plan focus or lens.</p> <p>Principal supports the instructional focus through classroom visits, coaching and modeling at least one hour per day.</p> <p>Principal provides feedback to teachers on classroom visits either through formal observations or non-evaluative learning walk data.</p> <p>Principal meets with teachers either individually or in groups to discuss what was observed during classroom visits.</p>	<p>Principal looks at student work with teachers.</p> <p>Principal meets with teacher teams to review student performance data and discuss adjustments to instruction based on the data.</p> <p>Principal is seen as an instructional leader, knowledgeable about current instructional practice in every classroom.</p> <p>Principal conducts a walkthrough of all classrooms at least once per week and collects, analyzes and uses the data to inform decisions about his/her own instructional leadership.</p>	<p>Principal sets specific instructional leadership goals that focus on monitoring and improving instruction and student learning throughout the year and shares them with the staff.</p> <p>Principal is seen as a collaborative, supportive coach committed to excellent teaching in every classroom.</p> <p>Principal is seen as an instructional leader committed to excellent teaching in every classroom.</p> <p>Principal supports high performing classroom and instructional focus through classroom visits, coaching, modeling, and providing follow-up feedback at least 2.5 hours per day.</p>
<p>Identify, Learn, and Use Effective Research-based Teaching Practices Marzano’s 9+1 strategies have been identified as best practices. Progress is being made at school-wide implementation of 3-5 best practices in each and every classroom, for each and every student, by each and every teacher.</p>	<p>There is little to no evidence that the classroom teachers are using effective research-based teaching practices.</p>	<p>Site visits to similarly focused schools have occurred in search of effective implementation of identified instructional strategies.</p> <p>Inter-classroom visitation to observe best practices is in use.</p> <p>Focused discussion and reflection about effective instruction occurs among groups of teachers.</p>	<p>Principal assures involvement of all faculty in the study of best practices and actively participates as well.</p> <p>Best practices are identified, shared, and modeled for the express purpose of improving student learning.</p> <p>Staff measures the impact of key strategies on student learning.</p> <p>School’s focused high</p>	<p>School-based professional development on selected best practices includes modeling, demonstrations, and coaching by literacy coaches, mathematics teacher leaders, and others.</p> <p>School’s focused high performing classroom “lens” is implemented consistently in every classroom.</p> <p>Principal provides supportive supervision through frequent classroom visitations, coaching, and modeling on</p>

			<p>performing classroom “lens” is implemented consistently in every classroom.</p>	<p>the focused best practices and high performing classroom “lens.”</p> <p>Mechanism is in place for the ongoing support of best practices (i.e. mentor/coaching of staff members by learning team, orientation and induction for new staff).</p>
--	--	--	--	---

2. Aligned Curriculum, Assessment and Instruction (CAI)

Curriculum alignment brings together curriculum, instruction, and assessment. It coordinates the Learning Targets, the Classroom Assessments Based on Standards (CABS), and the instruction in the classroom.

Dimensions	Not Initiated	Initiation (starting)	Implementation (doing)	Institutionalization (embedding)
Clear Expectations and Standard Alignment The curriculum is based upon clear Learning Targets that are aligned with standards.	Clear Learning Targets do not exist or are not aligned with the standards.	Clear Learning Targets are being developed and will be aligned with standards.	A written curriculum is taught based upon clear Learning Targets aligned with standards.	Learning Targets are updated based upon student performance data on a regular basis; alignment with standards is maintained.
School-wide Assessment A system of school-wide student assessment collects ongoing student performance data to inform decision-making in the classroom/school.	Little or no evidence exists of a school-wide student assessment plan.	A school-wide student assessment plan, based on clear Learning Targets and Classroom Assessments Based on Standards (CABS), has been developed.	A school-wide student assessment plan, based on clear Learning Targets and Classroom Assessments Based on Standards (CABS), is fully implemented.	The school-wide student assessment process continuously provides student performance data that drives program decisions and classroom instruction, and is reported to the school community.
Aligned and Clear Assessments Student assessments are aligned with the Learning Targets based on standards and clear criteria for expected student performance.	Little or no evidence exists of student assessments that are clearly aligned with student Learning Targets and standards.	Student assessments have been developed to assess Learning Targets based on standards with clear criteria for student performance.	Ongoing student assessment is implemented with clear criteria measuring the Learning Targets based on standards.	The student assessment data results in revisions/upgrading of Learning Targets and assessments to better reflect standards and improve student performance.
Best Instructional Practices The curriculum is taught through best practices that reflect current research for enhanced learning for all students.	Little or no evidence exists of use of best practices to improve student learning.	Best practices to improve student learning are evident in some classrooms.	Best practices to improve student learning are evident in most classrooms.	Best practices are utilized in all classrooms on an ongoing basis and are used to assess student and staff performance.
Focused Professional Development Professional development for staff incorporates best practices related to Characteristics of a High Performing Urban Classroom and its success is measured by improved student learning and engagement.	Little or no evidence exists of a plan for professional development that includes best practices in CAI.	A professional development plan has been developed that includes best practices in CAI.	Staff members participate in the professional development plan based on best practices in CAI.	All staff have participated in the professional development program and consistently use best practices in the classroom; the professional development plan is continually refined and has improved student learning.
Assessment of Effectiveness Systematic assessment of the curriculum, assessment, and instructional program occurs based on student performance data.	Little or no evidence exists of assessment of the CAI programs.	A plan has been developed for assessing the effectiveness of the CAI instructional program.	Data has been collected to assess the effectiveness of the CAI instructional program.	The system of data collection and analysis has resulted in revisions/upgrading of the CAI instructional programs.

3. Professional Learning Community

A school functions as a Professional Learning Community (PLC) when all of its stakeholders demonstrate a shared mission, vision and values, and participate in collective inquiry and collaborative teams with an orientation toward action and research, a commitment to continuous improvement, and a clear focus on results.

Using protocols and strategies, teacher teams meet regularly to talk about student work, teacher assignments, and effective instructional practices within the Educational Plan focused characteristics from the *Characteristics of a High Performing Urban Classroom*. The principal participates in these meetings. These meetings drive improvements in teaching and learning. The learning team meets regularly and provides strong leadership around the instructional focused characteristics (for the purposes of this rubric, regularly means at least 80%).

Dimensions	Not Initiated	Initiation (starting)	Implementation (doing)	Institutionalization (embedding)
Shared and Supportive Leadership Administrators share power, authority, and decision making while promoting and nurturing leadership.	Leadership is held by school administrators; staff are not empowered around issues of teaching and learning.	Pockets of leadership exist beyond school administrators; some staff are empowered around issues of teaching and learning.	Leadership is prevalent across the school; staff are empowered around issues of teaching and learning.	Leadership is fully shared and empowerment exists around issues of teaching and learning across the entire school community.
Collective Learning and Application The staff share information and work collaboratively to plan, solve problems, and improve learning opportunities.	Collective learning does not exist; staff does not show evidence of learning from one another to meet diverse student needs.	Staff rarely meet to discuss issues of teaching and learning, staff occasionally act on their learning to meet diverse student needs.	Staff meet regularly to share information and discuss issues around teaching and learning; staff show evidence of learning from one another to meet diverse student needs.	Staff share information and work together to seek new knowledge, skills and strategies; staff apply new learning to their work, and search for solutions to address diverse student needs.
Shared Personal Practice Peers meet and observe one another to provide feedback on instructional practices to assist in student learning to increase human capacity.	Staff work in isolation, do not observe one another, offer feedback of share practices with one another.	Some staff work collaboratively, but seldom observe one another, offer feedback, or share practices with one another.	Staff work collaboratively, observe one another, offer feedback and informally share practices to improve student learning.	Formal and informal mentoring and coaching programs exist; staff observe one another and provide feedback, staff regularly review student work together and share instructional practices.
Supportive Conditions (Structures) School structures support student achievement, school size, proximity of staff, communication systems, and the time and space for staff to meet and examine practices.	Time, technology, communication systems, and fiscal resources are not sufficient to promote staff learning.	The need for time, technology, communication systems, and fiscal resources is considered to address staff learning.	Time, technology, communication systems, and fiscal resources are appropriate in most cases, to increase learning.	Innovative efforts result in time, technology, communication systems, and significant fiscal resources that impact continual staff learning.
Supportive Conditions (Relationships) The entire school community exhibits respect, trust, caring relationships, and norms of critical inquiry and improvement.	Efforts do not exist that promote change in the culture of the school, such as: caring, trust, respect, a sense of safety, and recognition and celebration of efforts and achievement.	Some efforts exist that promote change in the culture of the school, such as: caring, trust, respect, a sense of safety, and recognition and celebration of efforts and achievement.	Staff and students are committed to promote change in the culture of the school, such as: caring, trust, respect, a sense of safety, and recognition and celebration of efforts and achievement.	The entire school community promotes sustained and unified efforts to embed change in the culture of the school, such as: caring, trust, respect, a sense of safety, and recognition and celebration of efforts and achievement.

4. Shared Decision Making

Shared Decision Making (SDM) is a process of making educational decisions in a collaborative manner at the school level. The purpose of SDM is to improve school effectiveness and student learning by increasing staff commitment and insuring that schools are more responsive to the needs of their students and community. In a shared decision-making model, teachers, parents, school staff, and the community will have more say about policies affecting their school and children's success. The school should be able to demonstrate clear evidence that it is involving families and the community with the school-wide instructional focus and with district and school-wide expectations.

Dimensions	Not Initiated	Initiation (starting)	Implementation (doing)	Institutionalization (embedding)
Clearly Defined Process The decision-making model has clearly defined processes that engage stakeholders.	Little or no evidence exists of a decision-making model with clear purposes and processes.	The decision-making model has been developed to include clear purposes and processes that engage stakeholders.	A decision-making model is regularly utilized regarding decisions that affect the school community.	The decision-making model is part of the ongoing school operation over time; revisions in purposes and processes have been made as necessary.
Structure for Decision Making An organizational structure which includes a learning team is in place; and roles and responsibilities for participants have been clearly defined for the decision-making model.	Little or no evidence exists of an organizational structure for decision-making. Roles and responsibilities in decision-making are not defined.	An organizational structure, roles and responsibilities have been developed, but are not yet implemented in decision-making.	An organizational structure for decision-making has been implemented, including clear roles and responsibilities.	An organizational structure for decision-making are part of the overall school structure; roles and responsibilities are regularly assessed.
Focus of Decision Making The decision-making model focuses on accomplishing the school's vision for student learning, improving school programs, policies and procedures, and allocating fiscal and human resources to enhance student success.	Little or no evidence exists that the decision-making model has targeted the established focus areas.	A data driven decision-making model has stated focus areas dealing with vision and student learning, instructional programs, and policies and procedures for allocation of fiscal and human resources.	A data driven decision-making model has been implemented for school-based decisions, and consistently targets established focus areas with priority given to student learning.	The data-driven decision-making model is utilized regularly to make decisions in all of the focus areas with clear priorities given to student learning; revisions are regularly made.
Accountability for Results The decision-making model includes accountability for results via ongoing data collection and analysis with priority given to student learning.	Little or no evidence exists that accountability for decisions has been determined within the decision-making model.	The decision-making process and structure include accountability for results in their design.	Use of the decision-making model has demonstrated results, as reported by those accountable, in at least one of the focus areas.	Ongoing assessment of the decision-making model includes regular reporting of results by those accountable in all of the focus areas.
Evaluation of Effectiveness The decision-making model includes periodic review and assessment of effectiveness in improving student learning results.	Little or no evidence exists of an evaluation process to assess the effectiveness of the decision-making model.	An evaluation component, detailing the evaluation process, has been included in the decision-making model.	An initial evaluation of the decision-making model has been conducted and modifications have been made and implemented.	Evaluation of the decision-making model is an annual process; revisions have been made based upon results in the focus areas.

*Stakeholders: professional staff, non-certified staff, parents, students, and community members

5. Effective Educational Plan

Each school designs an Educational Plan that focuses on the school’s efforts to improve student achievement. Goals and objectives detailing instructional strategies and performance measures are tied to a comprehensive needs analysis. Involvement of the stakeholders in the development and ongoing review of the Educational Plan is critical. The school’s professional development plan supports the instructional focus by building teacher expertise and promoting high expectations for all students. As expertise is developed, teachers are held increasingly accountable for implementation of strategies.

Dimensions	Not Initiated	Initiation (starting)	Implementation (doing)	Institutionalization (embedding)
Collaborative Vision and Values The school’s vision, values, and Educational Plan are established collaboratively and communicated to the entire school community. The focus is on student learning and instruction.	A school vision, values, and plan do not exist, or do not involve stakeholders.	A process for determining a school vision, values, and plan is being readied, and the process involves stakeholders.	The school vision, values, and plan have been completed and implemented, and the process involves key stakeholders.	The school vision, values and plan are the basis for ongoing decision-making and resource allocation, and stakeholder involvement is a critical component of the process.
Clear and Measurable Goals The plan includes clear and measurable goals based on collected data and the school vision; student learning goals are included.	No goals are evident or goals are not clear, measurable, or data based.	A process for goal development exists and some goals are evident. Goals are somewhat clear, measurable, and data driven.	Clear and measurable goals are in place, and goals are based upon stakeholder involvement and student achievement data.	Goals are regularly assessed, updated, and revised, based upon input from stakeholders and student performance data.
Regular Data Collection The plan includes ongoing data collection from stakeholders regarding student and instructional program performance.	Little or no data are collected related to student or instructional program performance.	A system for data collection is being readied for implementation, but only limited data are being collected.	Systematic data collection has been implemented, which includes stakeholders and focuses on student and instructional program performance.	Systematic data collection is ongoing, involves stakeholders, and is used to make decisions concerning the instructional program and student learning.
Student Learning Focus The plan focuses on instructional strategies that will improve student learning and achievement at the classroom and school level.	The plan is not focused on student learning and achievement at either the classroom or school level.	A plan has been developed that focuses on student learning and achievement at both the classroom and school level.	A plan has been implemented with demonstrable actions and progress to improve student learning and achievement.	The Educational Plan is systematically refined based on results from efforts to improve student learning and achievement.
Assessment of Plan Effectiveness Periodic review, based on collected data, assesses the effectiveness of the education plan and updates that enhance student success are made to the plan regularly.	Little or no assessment of plan effectiveness is evident.	The plan includes a process for assessing effectiveness and is based upon data collection and analysis.	Assessment of plan effectiveness occurs with revisions based on data collection and analysis.	Assessment of the plan is ongoing at periodic intervals, and includes a systematic review process based upon data collection and analysis.

6. Fiscal Responsibility

A school is managed in a fiscally responsible way when all of its resources are allocated to support classroom performance. Fiscal responsibility is demonstrated through a budget that aligns resources with a comprehensive, long-range Educational Plan and spending is in accordance with such a plan. The school can demonstrate clear evidence that it is making decisions so that its resources are aligned with the school-wide instructional focus.

Dimensions	Not Initiated	Initiation (starting)	Implementation (doing)	Institutionalization (embedding)
Distributed Responsibility The school has distributed responsibility in allocating resources.	School administrators make all decisions allocating resources.	School administrators understand the need to distribute responsibility in allocating resources, but do so sporadically.	School administrators consistently distribute responsibility in allocating resources.	School administrators consistently distribute responsibility in allocating resources, and examine and refine established processes for assessing and distributing responsibility.
Allocation Supports Vision, Values, and Goals The school effectively and fairly allocates resources supporting the school's vision, values, and goals.	School leaders allocate resources inconsistent with school's vision, values, and goals.	School leaders understand the need to allocate resources in support of the school's vision, values, and goals, but only do so sporadically.	School leaders effectively and fairly allocate resources supporting the school's vision, values, and goals.	School vision, values, and goals drive the allocation of resources.
Decisions Support Vision, Values, and Goals School leaders make fiscal and management decisions that support the school's vision, values, and goals.	School leaders make fiscal and management decisions without regard to the school's vision, values, and goals.	School leaders understand the need to make fiscal and management decisions that support the school's vision, values, and goals; but only do so sporadically.	School leaders make fiscal and management decisions that support the school's vision, values, and goals.	School vision, values, and goals drive fiscal and management decisions to provide highly creative and a unique synthesis of information-moving the school to new level of effectiveness.
Stakeholders Involvement School administrators include stakeholders in providing input for decision making related to resource allocation.	School leaders do not include stakeholders in making fiscal decisions.	School leaders understand the need to include stakeholders in decision-making related to resource allocation; but only do so sporadically.	School leaders include stakeholders in decision-making related to resource allocation.	Stakeholder participation is a critical and expected component of the fiscal decision-making process.
Effective Fund Management School administrators effectively manage funds within budget parameters.	School leaders ineffectively match resource needs to available funds.	School leaders understand the relationship between needs and funds, and effectively manage some line items.	School leaders effectively match needs to available funds across entire budget.	School leaders effectively manage funds to meet current and future needs, and manage budget support for the school's needs.