



Colorado's Unified Improvement Plan for Schools for 2015-16

Organization Code: 0880 District Name: DENVER COUNTY 1 School Code: 0408 School Name: VALDEZ ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Official 2014 SPF: 3 Year

Section I: Summary Information about the School

Directions: This section provides an overview of the school's improvement plan. To complete this section, copy and paste the school's Priority Performance Challenges, Root Causes and Major Improvement Strategies from Section III and IV of the 2015-16 UIP once it has been completed. In the UIP online system, this section will populate automatically as the UIP is written.

Executive Summary

How are students performing? Where will school staff be focusing attention?

Priority Performance Challenges: Specific statements about the school's performance challenges (not budgeting, staffing, curriculum, instruction, etc.), with at least one priority identified for each performance indicator (achievement, growth, growth gaps, PWR) where the school did not meet federal, state and/or local expectations.

PARCC data from 2015 was strong. We performed in ELA at 44.3% meets or exceeds expectations across grade levels (50% in 3rd grade, 40.8% in 4th, and 45.2% in 5th). This is higher than the state scores of 40.2% meets or exceeds for elementary ELA (3rd-5th grade). In Math, our overall score for meets and exceeds expectations was 38.1% (35.6% in 3rd grade, 38% in 4th, and 41.9% in 5th). This is higher than the state scores of 26.4% meets and exceeds for elementary (3-5th grade) math. In Social Studies, Valdez students performed at 29% strong and distinguished command. In Science, Valdez students showed 23% strong and distinguished command.

The gaps in our data are still evident. In ELA, only 25.7% of students of color were meeting or exceeding targets, whereas 87.5% of white students were meeting/exceeding (M/E). Similarly, girls performed at 55% meeting/exceeding, but boys performed at 30.4% M/E. Our English Language Learners also showed gaps in performance. Only 6.9% of our ELLs were M/E in ELA, although 58.6% of non-ELLs, and 57.9% of exited ELLs were M/E. These gaps are similar to gaps evident for ELA for the district.

In Math, only 21.3% of students of color were meeting or exceeding targets, whereas 87.5% of white students were meeting/exceeding (M/E). Similarly, girls performed at 45.1% meeting/exceeding, but boys performed at 29.1% M/E. Our English Language Learners also showed gaps in performance. Only 10.2% of our ELLs were M/E in Math, although 58.6% of non-ELLs, and 47.4% of exited ELLs were M/E. These gaps are slightly closer than gaps evident at the district level for math.

Our next steps for closing these gaps must include continuing to focus on our previous UIP goals. Our current scores were supported by our focus on critical thinking skills, rigorous instruction, and focused language supports. These areas will continue to support our strong test scores and the closing of our achievement gaps. We are also working to bring an explicit focus on equity into the classrooms, both with thematic teaching as well as with curriculum designs that promote closing the gap.

Why is the school continuing to have these problems?

Root Causes: Statements describing the deepest underlying cause, or causes, of the performance challenges, that, if dissolved, would result in elimination, or substantial reduction of the performance challenges.





Our students do not perform as well in critical thinking work related to standards of constructed response problem-solving because we have not focused enough as an instructional staff on rigor and critical thinking skills. We also have been inconsistent as instructors when planning our whole and small group instruction to intentionally teach rigorous tasks across content areas. We have had several teacher changes on staff and need to support teachers in structures and systems to ensure rigor across their instruction.

We have not gone deep enough into understanding our data and then applying strategies with the lens of equity across our student populations. We need to continue to tease out the specific strands in which our students struggle and meet sure we are drilling down to each individual student to meet their needs.

Many of our students - especially ELL and FRL students – continue to perform poorly on literacy and math standardized tests. This poor performance is, in part, due to challenges in understanding content and questions and in expressing their ideas and understandings articulately.

What action is the school taking to eliminate these challenges?

Major Improvement Strategies: An overall approach that describes a series of related actions intended to result in improvements in performance.

We will focus our professional development and teacher support on improved instruction with embedded critical thinking and rigorous tasks resulting in increased student learning in reading and math. We will decrease our gaps between our ELL and Non-ELL students and our FRL and Non-FRL students by continually examining our data and re-fining our data cycles through an equity focus and tailoring our instruction to meet our individual students' needs.

We will target our parental outreach and education, with the goals of both building relationships amongst families and better educating parents to support their children at home.

We will focus our professional development and teacher support on improving and increasing the explicit instruction of oral and academic language development.

Access School Performance Frameworks here: http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview/performance





Pre-Populated Report for the School

Directions: This section summarizes program accountability requirements unique to the school based upon federal and state accountability measures. Historically, this report has included information from the School Performance Framework; because of the state assessment transition and passage of HB15-1323, 2015 SPFs will not be created. In the table below, CDE has pre-populated the school's data in blue text. This data shows the school's performance in meeting minimum federal and state accountability program expectations.

Accountability Status and Requirements for Improvement Plan

	October 15, 2015	The school has the option to submit the updated plan through Tracker for public posting on SchoolView.org.
Summary of School	January 15, 2016	The school has the option to submit the updated plan through Tracker for public posting on SchoolView.org.
Plan Timeline		The UIP is due to CDE for public posting on April 15, 2016 through Tracker or the UIP online system. Some program level reviews will occur at the same time. For required elements in the improvement plan, go to the Quality Criteria at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/UIP_TrainingAndSupport_Resources.asp.

Program	Identification Process	Identification for Schoo	Directions for Completing Improvement Plan
State Accountability			
READ Act	All schools that serve students in grades Kindergarten through 3 rd Grade.	Currently serving grades K-3	Schools serving grades K-3 must include targets and strategies that address the needs of K-3 students identified as having significant reading deficiencies (e.g., instructional strategies, parent involvement strategies). Schools and districts looking for the CDE approved scientifically or evidence based instructional programs and professional development to support identified strategies may access the advisory lists at http://www.cde.state.co.us/coloradoliteracy/readact/programming
Plan Type Assignment	Plan type is assigned based on the school's overall 2014 official School Performance Framework rating (determined by performance on achievement, growth, growth gaps, postsecondary and workforce readiness).	Improvement Plan	The school is approaching or has not met state expectations for attainment on the 2014 SPF performance indicators and is required to adopt and implement an Improvement Plan. The plan must be submitted to CDE by April 15, 2016 to be posted on SchoolView.org.
ESEA and Grant Accountabi	lity		
Title I Focus School	Title I school with a (1) low graduation rate (regardless of plan type), and/or (2) Turnaround or Priority Improvement plan type with either (or both) a) low- achieving disaggregated student groups (i.e., minority, ELL, IEP and FRL) or b) low disaggregated graduation rate. This is a three-year designation.	Not identified as a Title I Focus School	This school is not identified as a Focus School and does not need to meet those additional requirements.





Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG)	Competitive grant (1003g) for schools identified as 5% of lowest performing Title I or Title I eligible schools, eligible to implement one of four reform models as defined by the USDE.	Not awarded a TIG Grant	This school does not receive a current TIG award and does not need to meet those additional requirements.
Diagnostic Review and Planning Grant	Title I competitive grant that includes a diagnostic review and/or improvement planning support.	Not awarded a current Diagnostic Review and Planning Grant	This school has not received a current Diagnostic Review and Planning grant and does not need to meet those additional requirements.
School Improvement Support (SIS) Grant	Title I competitive grant that supports implementation of major improvement strategies and action steps identified in the school's action plan.	Not a current SIS Grantee	This school has not received a current SIS grant and does not need to meet those additional requirements.
Colorado Graduation Pathways Program (CGP)	The program supports the development of sustainable, replicable models for dropout prevention and recovery that improve interim indicators (attendance, behavior and course completion), reduce the dropout rate and increase the graduation rate for all students participating in the program.	Not a CGP Funded School	This school does not receive funding from the CGP Program and does not need to meet these additional program requirements.





Section II: Improvement Plan Information

Additional Information about the School

Comprehe	ensive Review and	Selected Grant History						
Related G	irant Awards	Has the school received a grant that supports the school's improvement efforts? When was the grant awarded?	No grants received.					
External E	Evaluator	Has the school partnered with an external evaluator to provide comprehensive evaluation? Indicate the year and the name of the provider/tool used.						
Improvem	ent Plan Informatio	n						
The schoo	ol is submitting this	improvement plan to satisfy requirements for (che	eck all that apply):					
🗆 s	State Accreditation	□ Title I Focus School □ Tiered Intered	ervention Grant (TIG) Diagnostic Review and Planning Grant					
🗆 s	School Improvemen	t Support Grant	ments Dother:					
School Co	ontact Information ((Additional contacts may be added, if needed)						
1 Nan	ne and Title		Jessica Buckley, Principal					
Ema	ail		Jessica_buckley@dpsk12.org					
Pho	one		720-424-3312					
Mail	ling Address		2525 W. 29th Ave Denver, CO					
2 Nan	me and Title		Gwen Frank, Assistant Principal					
Ema	ail		Gwendolyn_frank@dpsk12.org					
Pho	one		720-424-3363					
Mail	ling Address		2525 W. 29th Ave Denver, CO					





Evaluate

FOCUS

Section III: Narrative on Data Analysis and Root Cause Identification

This section corresponds with the "Evaluate" portion of the continuous improvement cycle. The main outcome is to construct a narrative that describes the process and results of the analysis of the data for your school. The analysis should justify the performance targets and actions proposed in Section IV. Two worksheets have been provided to help organize your data analysis for your narrative. This analysis section includes: identifying where the school did not at least meet minimum state and federal accountability expectations; describing progress toward targets for the prior school year; describing what performance data were used in the analysis of trends; identifying trends and priority performance challenges (negative trends); describing how performance challenges were prioritized; identifying the root causes of performance challenges; describing how the root causes were identified and verified and what data were used; and describing stakeholder involvement in the analysis. Additional guidance on how to engage in the data analysis process is provided in Unified Improvement Planning Handbook.

in the analysis. Additional guidance on how to engage in the data analysis process is provided in characteristic and math analysis. Additional guidance on how to engage in the data analysis process is provided in characteristic and math analysis. During the 2014-15 school year, Colorado transitioned from reading, writing and math TCAP assessments to CMAS PARCC English language arts and math assessments. These assessments measure related, but different content standards and are expected to have different proficiency levels. As a result, updating the data analysis this year (particularly the trend statements) may be more challenging. While the school's data analysis is still expected to be updated, some modifications in typical practice may be needed. Refer to the UIP state assessment transition guidance document on the UIP website for options and considerations.

Data Narrative for School

Directions: In the narrative, describe the process and results of the data analysis for the school, including (1) a description of the school and the process for data analysis, (2) a review of current performance, (3) trend analysis, (4) priority performance challenges and (5) root cause analysis. A description of the expected narrative sections are included below. The narrative should not take more than five pages. Two worksheets (#1 *Progress Monitoring of Prior Year's Performance Targets* and #2 *Data Analysis*) have been provided to organize the data referenced in the narrative.

Description of School	Review Current Performance:	Trend Analysis: Provide a description	Priority Performance	Root Cause Analysis: Identify at least
Setting and Process for	Review recent state and local	of the trend analysis that includes at	Challenges: Identify notable	one root cause for every priority
Data Analysis: Provide a	data. Document any areas	least three years of data (state and	trends (or a combination of trends)	performance challenge. Root causes
very brief description of the	where the school did not at	local data), if available. Trend	that are the highest priority to	should address adult actions, be under th
school to set the context for	least meet state/federal	statements should be provided in the	address (priority performance	control of the school, and address the
readers (e.g.,	expectations. Consider the	four performance indicator areas and	challenges). No more than 3-5	priority performance challenge(s). Provid
demographics). Include the	previous year's progress	by disaggregated groups. Trend	are recommended. Provide a	evidence that the root cause was verified
general process for	toward the school's targets.	statements should include the direction	rationale for why these challenges	through the use of additional data. A
developing the UIP and	Identify the overall magnitude	of the trend and a comparison (e.g.,	have been selected and address	description of the selection process for th
participants (e.g., School	of the school's performance	state expectations, state average) to	the magnitude of the school's	corresponding major improvement
Accountability Committee).	challenges.	indicate why the trend is notable.	overall performance challenges.	strategy(s) is encouraged.

Narrative:

Description of School Setting and Process for Data Analysis:

We are a dual language ECE-5th grade school with 380 students located in Central Denver. Valdez has a dual language immersion (Spanish and English) program throughout all of our grade levels. We strive to start with about 50% Native Spanish speakers and 50% Native English speakers and graduate all students from our program bilingual and bi-literate.





Review Current Performance

At the beginning of the school year, we spent a ½ day digging into and analyzing our data as a whole staff. Under the guidance of the principal, assistant principal and facilitator, we looked at DRA/EDL scores, READ Act data, last year's interim scores, Access data, and our Science and Social Studies CMAS data. We identified growth in our past status scores in reading, writing and math in TCAP as areas to celebrate and our growth scores as an area to improve. We also noted that we need to continue to improve our gaps in all 3 areas: reading, writing, and math.

After that work with the whole staff, we worked as our leadership team to identify trends and re-visit root causes. We also met as a Collaborative School Committee (CSC) including parents and teachers and analyzed trends, priorities, and root causes.

We concluded the following:

We believe that our positive trends are a result of the effective and consistent practices implemented since August 2007, especially in our dual-language classes. In the past three years, we have placed a great emphasis on effective reading instruction, including differentiated small-group instructional strategies. Through our in-school and district-led professional development, we have improved the quality and consistency of instruction in all grade levels. Our dual-language program provides language-rich instruction and classroom environments which support students learning to speak, read, and write in English and Spanish. Our dual-language practice lies in our research-based beliefs, that students should become literate in their primary language first. As a result, we introduce students to text in their primary language – English or Spanish. As students become literate in their primary language, they begin to acquire oral skills in their second language. By second grade, most students receive formal literacy instruction in their second language. We aim to graduate students who are fluent speakers, readers and writers of both English and Spanish.

Since August 2007, we have begun to transition our instructional program from a transitional bilingual program (TNLI) to a dual-language immersion program. The program grew into 5th grade in August 2012. We believe that our dual-language model offers a superior educational experience for students. In February and March 2011, our first dual-language class took the CSAP. These students experienced strong growth and increased status on this test: 3rd grade reading in English grew about 33 percentage points to 53% proficient or advanced; 3rd grade reading in Spanish grew about 50 percentage points to 50% proficient or advanced. These scores indicate that our 3rd grade students performed equally well in their native languages on CSAP. The growth was the second highest growth in DPS on that test. Unfortunately, those scores dipped in 2012. Given the challenges that this particular group of students presented, we knew there would be a dip in scores. We have flooded this group of students with intensive math and literacy support. In 2013 in 3rd grade, we again celebrated very similar scores in Spanish and English on TCAP, and also hit the 60% proficiency mark in reading and math, with 35% advanced in math.

In 2014, in reading, we increased 16% from the prior year, from 38% to 54% of students being Proficient and Advanced. We increased our Advanced students from 5% to 11%. In writing, we increased 3% this past year and 15% overall from 2012, from 17% to 32% Proficient and Advanced. We increased our Advanced students from 3% to 6%. The state and district are also lower overall in writing. In math, we increased 13% from the prior year, from 39% to 52% of students being Proficient and Advanced. We increased our Advanced. In Reading in 3rd grade we had 69% Proficient/Advanced in English, and 67% Proficient/Advanced in Spanish.





PARCC data from 2015 was strong in comparison to other Colorado and DPS schools. We performed in ELA at 44.3% meets or exceeds expectations across grade levels (50% in 3rd grade, 40.8% in 4th, and 45.2% in 5th). This is higher than the state scores of 40.2% meets or exceeds for elementary ELA (3rd-5th grade). In Math, our overall score for meets and exceeds expectations was 38.1% (35.6% in 3rd grade, 38% in 4th, and 41.9% in 5th). This is higher than the state scores of 26.4% meets and exceeds for elementary (3-5th grade) math. In Social Studies, Valdez students performed at 29% strong and distinguished command. In Science, Valdez students showed 23% strong and distinguished command.

Based on this strong set of data, we know our dual immersion program is working.

Trend Analysis and Priority Needs:

PARCC data from 2015 was strong. We performed in ELA at 44.3% meets or exceeds expectations across grade levels (50% in 3rd grade, 40.8% in 4th, and 45.2% in 5th). This is higher than the state scores of 40.2% meets or exceeds for elementary ELA (3rd-5th grade). In Math, our overall score for meets and exceeds expectations was 38.1% (35.6% in 3rd grade, 38% in 4th, and 41.9% in 5th). This is higher than the state scores of 26.4% meets and exceeds for elementary (3-5th grade) math. In Social Studies, Valdez students performed at 29% strong and distinguished command. In Science, Valdez students showed 23% strong and distinguished command.

The gaps in our data are still evident. In ELA, only 25.7% of students of color were meeting or exceeding targets, whereas 87.5% of white students were meeting/exceeding (M/E). Similarly, girls performed at 55% meeting/exceeding, but boys performed at 30.4% M/E. Our English Language Learners also showed gaps in performance. Only 6.9% of our ELLs were M/E in ELA, although 58.6% of non-ELLs, and 57.9% of exited ELLs were M/E. These gaps are similar to gaps evident for ELA for the district.

In Math, only 21.3% of students of color were meeting or exceeding targets, whereas 87.5% of white students were meeting/exceeding (M/E). Similarly, girls performed at 45.1% meeting/exceeding, but boys performed at 29.1% M/E. Our English Language Learners also showed gaps in performance. Only 10.2% of our ELLs were M/E in Math, although 58.6% of non-ELLs, and 47.4% of exited ELLs were M/E. These gaps are slightly closer than gaps evident at the district level for math.

Our next steps for closing these gaps must include continuing to focus on our previous UIP goals. Our current scores were supported by our focus on critical thinking skills, rigorous instruction, and focused language supports. These areas will continue to support our strong test scores and the closing of our achievement gaps. We are also working to bring an explicit focus on equity into the classrooms, both with thematic teaching as well as with curriculum designs that promote closing the gap.

Root Cause Analysis:

Our students do not perform as well in critical thinking work related to standards of constructed response problem-solving because we have not focused enough as an instructional staff on rigor and critical thinking skills. We also have been inconsistent as instructors when planning our whole and small group instruction to intentionally teach rigorous tasks across content areas. We have had several teacher changes on staff and need to support teachers in structures and systems to ensure rigor across their instruction.





We have not gone deep enough into understanding our data and then applying strategies with the lens of equity across our student populations. We need to continue to tease out the specific strands in which our students struggle and meet sure we are drilling down to each individual student to meet their needs.

Many of our students - especially ELL and FRL students – continue to perform poorly on literacy and math standardized tests. This poor performance is, in part, due to challenges in understanding content and questions and in expressing their ideas and understandings articulately.

9





Worksheet #1: Progress Monitoring of Prior Year's Performance Targets

Directions: This chart supports analysis of progress made towards performance targets set for the 2014-15 school year (last year's plan). While this worksheet should be included in your UIP, the main intent is to record your school's reflections to help build your data narrative.

Performance Indicators	Targets for 2014-15 school year (Targets set in last year's plan)	Performance in 2014-15? Was the target met? How close was the school to meeting the target?	Brief reflection on why previous targets were met or not met.
Academic Achievement (Status)	3 rd -5 th grade students will score 25% Strong Command and Distinguished Command on the PARCC/CMAS ELA test in 2015. 3 rd -5 th grade students will score 25% Strong Command and Distinguished Command on the PARCC/CMAS Math test in 2015.	PARCC data from 2015 was strong in comparison to the state and district. We performed in ELA at 44.3% meets or exceeds expectations across grade levels (50% in 3 rd grade, 40.8% in 4 th , and 45.2% in 5 th). This is higher than the state scores of 40.2% meets or exceeds for elementary ELA (3 rd -5 th grade). In Math, our overall score for meets and exceeds expectations was 38.1% (35.6% in 3 rd grade, 38% in 4 th , and 41.9% in 5 th). This is higher than the state scores of 26.4% meets and exceeds for elementary (3-5 th grade) math. In Social Studies, Valdez students performed at 29% strong and distinguished command.	We exceeded our targets in both ELA and Math on CMAS PARCC. This was a direct reflection on the strength of our Dual Language program and targeted, differentiated and personalized learning. Our focus on critical thinking and rigor is reflected in this score. We will continue to hone our small-group, individualized-learning focus, and tighten up our data cycles to support this work. We are focusing on explicitly bringing equity issues into teaching and the curriculum to increase teacher awareness of the gaps we have shown, and to decrease them.
		Increase the percentage of K-3 rd grade students reading at or above grade level by 10%.	
Academic Growth		Will be updated upon receipt of CMAS data (summer of 2016) While we cannot state with statistical accuracy the increase in growth between the TCAP and PARCC- CMAS tests, we can acknowledge our	





Performance Indicators	Targets for 2014-15 school year (Targets set in last year's plan)	Performance in 2014-15? Was the target met? How close was the school to meeting the target?	Brief reflection on why previous targets were met or not met.
		percentile ranking and the growth in that comparison. For TCAP Reading and Writing in 2014 we were in the 46 th percentile. In 2015 on PARCC-CMAS we scored in the 73 rd percentile, showing a 27 point increase. In math in 2014 on TCAP we were in the 41 st percentile, but in 2015 on PARCC-CMAS we showed up in the 76 th percentile. This was a 35 point increase.	
		Increase Access MGP by 3 percentile points.	
Academic Growth Gaps		Will be updated upon receipt of CMAS data (summer of 2016)	
Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness			





Worksheet #2: Data Analysis

Directions: This chart supports planning teams in recording and organizing observations about school-level data in preparation for writing the required data narrative. Planning teams should describe positive and negative trends for all of the four performance indicators using at least three years of data, when available, and then prioritize the performance challenges (based on notable trends) that the school will focus its efforts on improving. The root cause analysis and improvement planning efforts in the remainder of the plan should be aimed at addressing the identified priority performance challenge(s). A limited number of priority performance challenges is recommended (no more than 3-5); a performance challenge may apply to multiple performance indicators. At a minimum, priority performance challenges must be identified in any of the four performance indicator areas where minimum state and federal expectations were not met for accountability purposes. In most cases, this should just be an update to the plan from 2014 since the SPF has not changed for 2015. Finally, provide a brief description of the root cause analysis for any priority performance challenges. Nou may add rows, as needed.

Performance Indicators	Description of Notable Trends (3 years of past state and local data)	Priority Performanc e Challenges	Root Causes
Academic Achievement (Status)	 -Valdez had a 38 percentage point gap in 2015 between ELLs and non-ELLs, and a 48 percentage point gap between FRL and Non-FRL students, in terms of K-3 students reading at or above grade level. -The percent of K-3 students reading at or above grade level decreased by 8 percentage point's from2014 to 2015. -Valdez had no students who scored SBGL in Fall/Midyear test move to At or Above grade level by spring. -23% of students scored Strong or Distinguished on the CMAS science test in5th grade in 2015, and 29% on the CMAS Social Studies test in 4th grade in2015. 	See executive summary	Combined READ Act Spring % At or Above Grade Level 75% 70% 69% 69% 69% 61% 61% 61% 60% 55% Valdez Region District





















































Academic Growth Gaps Will be updated upon receipt of CMAS data (summer of 2016) Postsecondary & Workforce NA		70 - 60 - 50 - 40 - 30 - 20 - 10 - 0 - 2013 2014 2015	Grac All Gra 53 32 58 46 50 52	15 A 15 A 16 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	nd 3 04 7 38 7 58 7 32	By 05 60 44	06 0 0	07 0 0	e 08 0 0 0	09	10 0 0	111 0 0 0			~~~~						
Postsecondary & Workforce	Academic Growth Gaps	Will be up	dated u	pon rece	ipt of	CMA	<mark>S da</mark>	ta (s	umm	<mark>ier o</mark>	f 201	6)							 		
Readiness NA	Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness	L																			



FORM # OFP-135 EDAC APPROVED Approved 6/17/2015 for 2015-2016

Evaluate

FOCUS

Implement

Section IV: Action Plan(s)

This section addresses the "Plan" portion of the continuous improvement cycle. First, identify annual performance targets and the interim measures. This will be documented in the required *School Target Setting Form* on the next page. Then move into action planning, which should be captured in the *Action Planning Form*.

School Target Setting Form

Directions: Complete the worksheet below. Schools are expected to set their own annual targets for the performance indicators (i.e. academic achievement, academic growth, academic growth gaps, and postsecondary and workforce readiness). At a minimum, schools should set targets for each of the performance indicators where state expectations were not met; targets should also be connected to prioritized performance challenges identified in the data narrative (section III). Consider last year's targets (see Worksheet #1) and whether adjustments need to be made. For each annual performance target, identify interim measures that will be used to monitor progress toward the annual targets at least quarterly during the school year.

Implications of Colorado Measures of Academic Success (CMAS) on Target Setting: During the 2014-15 school year, Colorado transitioned from reading, writing and math TCAP assessments to CMAS PARCC English language arts and math assessments. These assessments measure related, but different content standards and are expected to have different proficiency levels. As a result, setting targets based on the percent of students scoring proficient and advanced on TCAP is not appropriate. Furthermore, CDE does not yet know if student growth percentiles and median student growth percentiles will be available for accountability, planning or reporting use. It is known that adequate growth percentiles will not be available this school year for 2014-15 results. Target setting is still expected to occur in the UIP process during this transition period. However, some modifications in typical practice may be needed. Refer to the UIP state assessment transition guidance document on the UIP website for options and considerations.





School Target Setting Form

Performance Indicators	Measures/ Me	etrics	Priority Performance Challenges	Annual Perfori 2015-16	nance Targets 2016-17	Interim Measures for 2015-16	Major Improvement Strategy
Academic Achievement (Status)	CMAS/PARCC, CoAlt, K-3 literacy measure (READ Act), local measures	ELA	See executive summary	We will increase our ELA PARCC school average from 44% meets/exceeds to 49% meets/exceeds, continuing to be stronger than the state average.	We will increase our ELA PARCC school average another 5% in the meets/exceeds category, continuing to be stronger than the state average.	Our students will score an average of 50% meets/exceeds in both ELA and math on the ANet interim measures during the winter and spring administrations of the tests.	We will focus our professional development and teacher support on <u>improved instruction</u> with embedded critical thinking and rigorous tasks resulting in increased student learning in reading and math. We will decrease our gaps between our ELL and Non-ELL students and our FRL and Non- FRL students by continually examining our data and re-fining our data cycles through an <u>equity focus</u> and tailoring our instruction to meet our individual students' needs. We will target our parental outreach and education, with the goals of both building <u>relationships amongst</u> families and better educating parents to



						support their children at home. We will focus our professional development and teacher support on improving and increasing the explicit instruction of <u>oral and academic</u> <u>language development</u> .
		REA D				
		М	Will be set upon receipt of CMAS data (summer of 2016)	We will increase our Math PARCC school average from 38% meets/exceeds to 43% meets/exceeds, continuing to be stronger than the state average.	We will increase our Math PARCC school average another 5% in the meets/exceeds category, continuing to be stronger than the state average.	
		S				
	Median Growth Percentile,	ELA	See executive summary	Will be set upon receipt of CMAS data (summer of 2016)		
Academic Growth	CMAS/PARCC , ACCESS, local measures	М	See executive summary	Will be set upon receipt of CMAS data (summer of 2016)		
		ELP	See executive summary		School Codo: 0409	







Academic	Madian Onweth	ELA		Will be set upon receipt of CMAS data (summer of 2016)		
Growth Gaps		М		Will be set upon receipt of CMAS data (summer of 2016)		
	Graduation Rate		NA			
Postsecondary	Disag. Grad Rate	;	NA			
& Workforce	Dropout Rate		NA			
Readiness	Mean CO ACT		NA			
	Other PWR Measures		NA			



Action Planning Form for 2015-16 and 2016-17

Directions: Identify the major improvement strategy(s) for 2015-16 and 2016-17 that will address the root cause(s) determined in Section III. For each major improvement strategy, identify the root cause(s) that the major improvement strategy will help to dissolve. Then, indicate which accountability provision or grant opportunity it will address. In the chart below, provide details about key action steps necessary to implement the major improvement strategy. Details should include the action steps that will be taken to implement the major improvement strategy, a general timeline, resources that will be used to implement the actions, and implementation benchmarks. Additional rows for action steps may be added. While the template provides space for three major improvement strategies, additional major improvement strategies may also be added. To keep the work manageable, however, it is recommended that schools focus on no more than 3 to 5 major improvement strategies.

Major Improvement Strategy #1: We will focus our professional development and teacher support on improve instruction with embedded critical thinking and rigorous tasks resulting in increased student learning in literacy and math. Root Cause(s) Addressed: Not all of our students perform well in critical thinking work related to standards of constructed response problem-solving because we have not focused enough as an instructional staff on rigor and critical thinking skills. We also have been inconsistent as instructors when planning our differentiated whole and small group instruction to intentionally teach rigorous tasks across content areas. We have some new teachers on staff, many returning teachers, and a new literacy curriculum, so we need to support all teachers in structures and systems to ensure rigor across their instruction.

Accountability Provisions or Grant Opportunities Addressed by this Major Improvement Strategy (check all that apply):

State Accreditation

Title I Focus School

□ Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG) □ Diagnostic Review Grant

□ School Improvement Support Grant

READ Act Requirements

Other: _____

Description of Action Steps to Implement	Timeline		Кеу	Resources (Amount and Source: federal, state,	Implementation Benchmarks	Status of Action Step* (e.g.,
the Major Improvement Strategy	2015-16	2016-17	Personnel*	and/or local)	implementation benchmarks	completed, in progress, not begun)
Align math and literacy assessment tools to Common Core State Standards and those identified as priority standards. Utilize the ANet system to adapt/develop both ongoing and interim assessments and to manage data. Align interim assessment checks to PARCC.	ongoing	ongoing	Principal Assistant Principal Facilitator Teacher Leaders	We will plan and implement professional development and teacher support to this, facilitated by our facilitator and school leaders.	We will check three times a year (October, December/January, and March) during interim testing cycles.	In progress
Regularly analyze data and plan for differentiated instruction side by side with administration and facilitators.	ongoing	ongoing	Principal Assistant Principal	We will schedule time every week for teachers to analyze data and plan for instruction in consistent data cycles.	By the end of September 2015, teachers will engage in one formal analysis of math data and one formal analysis	In progress

School Code: 0408





			Facilitator Teacher Leaders All Teachers	The principal, Assistant Principal, and the facilitator will oversee this process. We have revised the annual DPS calendar to better meet our needs in this area.	of literacy data, supported by administrative staff. These meetings will continue in a weekly cycle, focused on data and planning facilitated by school leaders.	
Implement small group instruction based on differentiated groups determined by individual students' needs in literacy and math.	ongoing	ongoing	Principal Assistant Principal Facilitator Teacher Leaders All Teachers	We will utilize professional development, data cycles, and teacher planning time to accomplish this work.	By mid-October, 100% of teachers will be using small groups for instruction in reading and math. At every major data-analysis and planning juncture 3X a year, teachers will group and re-group students according to their learning needs.	In progress
Implement Professional Development focused on rigorous tasks and critical thinking skills using the Common Core. Utilize resources such as <u>Core Six</u> , Kathy Richardson and Engage New York as supports. Implement targeted Professional Development for teachers using the Literacy EL curriculum.	Fall 2014	ongoing	Principal Assistant Principal Facilitator Teacher Leaders All Teachers	We will utilize professional development and teacher planning time to accomplish this work.	We will have whole group professional development about rigorous tasks using the Common Core at least 1 time a month on Thursday morning. We will continue to develop teachers through targeted development during weekly data cycle meetings.	In progress
Support individual teachers through observation and feedback cycles and regular coaching. Leaders will model, co-teach, and provide videos, show exemplars, etc. to support teachers in implementation.	ongoing	ongoing	Principal Assistant Principal Facilitator Teacher Leaders All Teachers	Observations will take place weekly or every other week. We will utilize professional development and teacher planning time to reflect on the observations, provide bite size feedback, and plan next steps.	By the beginning of October, 100% of teachers will have received at least one full observation using the LEAP framework to provide baseline data for feedback. Following this initial observation, teachers will receive observation and feedback on a regular basis.	In progress





Enroll 50% of K-2 literacy teachers in district led targeted intervention Guided Reading Plus training. Principal to take training as well to support and coach teachers.	Fall 2015		Principal 50% of K-2 literacy teachers	Training course supported by district. Literacy funds.	50% of K-2 literacy teachers and principal will have completed training by May 2016.	In progress
Professional Development sessions to support teachers to write targeted goals through their Student Learning Objectives in literacy and math.	Ongoing	ongoing	Principal Assistant Principal Facilitator Teacher Leaders All Teachers	Leadership will host 2 sessions to support teachers in writing really targeted goals. Leadership will monitor and check in with teachers through data cycles weekly to ensure goals are being met.	By the end of October, all teachers will have 2 targeted Student Learning Objectives.	Completed
					All teachers will be using small groups for instruction in reading and math. At every major data-analysis and planning juncture 3X a year, teachers will group and re-group students according to their learning needs.	

* Note: These two columns are not required to meet state or federal accountability requirements, though completion is encouraged. "Status of Action Step" may be required for certain grants.



Major Improvement Strategy #2: We will decrease our gaps between our ELL and Non-ELL students and our FRL and Non-FRL students by continually examining our data and re-fining our data cycles through an <u>equity focus</u> and tailoring our instruction to meet our individual students' needs. We will target our parental outreach and education, with the goals of both building <u>relationships amongst families and better educating parents</u> to support their children at home.

Root Cause(s) Addressed: We have not gone deep enough into understanding our data and then applying strategies with the lens of equity across our student populations. We need to continue to tease out the specific strands in which our students struggle and meet sure we are drilling down to each individual student.

Accountability Provisions or Grant Opportunities Addressed by this Major Improvement Strategy (check all that apply):

		, , ,		
State Accreditation	□ Title I Focus School	☐ Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG)	Diagnostic Review Grant	□ School Improvement Support Grant

Other:

READ Act Requirements

Description of Action Steps to	Timeline		Key	Resources		Status of Action Step* (e.g.,
Implement the Major Improvement Strategy	2015-16	2016-17	Personnel*	(Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local)	Implementation Benchmarks	completed, in progress, not begun)
Regularly analyze data and plan for differentiated instruction, paying close attention to our gap data. Test in hand analysis on a consistent basis.	Ongoing	Ongoing	Principal Assistant Principal Facilitator Teacher Leaders Facilitator	We will schedule time weekly for teachers to analyze data and plan for instruction. We have revised the annual DPS calendar to better meet our needs, focused on regular data analysis.	By the end of September 2015, teachers will engage in one formal analysis of math data and one formal analysis of literacy data, supported by administrative staff. These meetings will continue in a weekly cycle, focused on data and planning facilitated by school leaders. Every 6-9 weeks, teachers will have a half day release plan day to analyze data and backwards plan out the next 6 or 9 week cycle.	In progress
Structure math and reading intervention based on most current data cycles to meet real time needs.	Ongoing	Ongoing	Principal Assistant Principal	We will schedule time weekly for teachers to analyze data and plan for instruction. We have revised the annual DPS	By the end of September 2015, teachers will engage in one formal analysis of math data and one formal analysis	In progress

School Code: 0408





			Facilitator Teacher Leaders Facilitator	calendar to better meet our needs, focused on regular data analysis.	of literacy data, supported by administrative staff. These meetings will continue in a weekly cycle, focused on data and planning facilitated by school leaders. Every 6-9 weeks, teachers will have a half day release plan day to analyze data and backwards plan out the next 6 or 9 week cycle. We will use this data analysis to re-structure intervention supports and structures to meet every child's needs.	
Use time markers (including but not limited to DRA/EDL, DRA/EDL progress monitoring passages, writing prompts, ANet created quizzes, interim data, exit slips, math interviews, etc.) to make sure we are meeting our targets. Pay special attention to gaps and students who have not met achievement goals in the past.	Ongoing	Ongoing	Principal Assistant Principal Teacher Leaders Facilitator	We will schedule time weekly for teachers to analyze data and plan for instruction. We have revised the annual DPS calendar to better meet our needs, focused on regular data analysis.	By the end of September 2015, teachers will engage in one formal analysis of math data and one formal analysis of literacy data, supported by administrative staff. These meetings will continue in a weekly cycle, focused on data and planning facilitated by school leaders. We examine real time data at weekly meetings and re- adjust to support instruction so students meet their goals.	In progress
Hold parent trainings focused on how parents can support their children academically at home.	6 trainings	6 trainings	Principal Assistant Principal Facilitator	Parent funds	We will implement 6 trainings over the course of the year to target specific academic areas and the change in standards, tests, and testing formats.	In progress





			Teacher Leaders Teachers Parents			
Hire family liaison to work with our school in building community and to work with targeted families	Ongoing	Ongoing	Principal Family Liaison	Parent funds PTO money	We will hire and train a parent liaison to support our families in supporting their children academically as well as build community.	Completed
Each school leader and many teachers will "adopt" a target student to build a relationship and support their social/emotional growth to support their academics. Named the "Power of Five", the goal is to spend at least 5 minutes a week doing something special with target students.	Ongoing	Ongoing	Principal Assistant Principal Facilitator Teacher Leaders School Psychologist	Psychologist	Each leader and many teachers will support a target student by spending individual time with them to support their social emotional development.	In progress
Specific trainings and events focused on understanding and celebrating our cultures. For example, Spanish Night, Day of the Dead celebration and altar, Las Posadas, etc.						
Focus on Personal Success Factors						

* Note: These two columns are not required to meet state or federal accountability requirements, though completion is encouraged. "Status of Action Step" may be required for certain grants.

School Code: 0408



Major Improvement Strategy #3: We will focus our professional development and teacher support on improving and increasing the explicit instruction of <u>oral and academic</u> <u>language development</u>.

Root Cause(s) Addressed: Many of our students - especially ELL and FRL students – continue to perform poorly on literacy and math standardized tests. This poor performance is, in part, due to challenges in understanding content and questions and in expressing their ideas and understandings articulately.

Accountability Provisions or Grant Opportunities Addressed by this Major Improvement Strategy (check all that apply):

		, , ,		
State Accreditation	Title I Focus School	☐ Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG)	Diagnostic Review Grant	School Improvement Support Grant

Other: _____

READ Act Requirements

Description of Action Steps to	Timeline		Key Dereennel*	Resources	Implementation Danahmarka	Status of Action Step* (e.g.,
Implement the Major Improvement Strategy	2015-16	2016-17	Key Personnel*	(Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local)	Implementation Benchmarks	completed, in progress, not begun)
Support teachers to increase opportunities for students to engage orally every day. Support teachers to plan for and implement targeted oral language goals, including vocabulary usage and language structures. Focus will be on social and academic language structures. Focus will be on targeted instructional practices as outlined in Valdez documents, including: turn and talk; targeted questioning; instructional conversations; TPRS; and presentations of learning.	Continuing	Continuing	Principal Assistant Principal Facilitator Teacher Leaders Teacher Effectiveness Coach All Teachers	Professional development and teacher support by administrators and facilitator will focus on training and implementing the targeted strategies.	Weekly Classroom Observations Professional Development focused on language development at least 2X a month in whole group settings and through weekly data teams	In progress
Analyze ACCESS data with leaders and teachers to drill down to students' language levels to support	Ongoing	Ongoing	Principal Assistant Principal Facilitator	Professional development and teacher support by administrators and facilitator will focus on	We will use professional development time and data cycle time to drill down into	In progress





them instructionally across subject areas.			Teacher Leaders All Teachers	training and implementing the targeted strategies.	data to truly understand students' language levels.	
Use formalized Valdez documents and assessments based on research to support language development such as what we expect as students' L1 and L2 grow in different grade levels and stages.	Ongoing	Continuing	Principal Assistant Principal Facilitator Teacher Leaders Teacher Effectiveness Coach All Teachers	Facilitator	Documents that are used regularly by teachers to support dual language instruction	Underlying foundation in progress; documents were created in spring 2013, implementation will be fall 2013-spring 2016
Facilitate learning labs and peer observations to support teachers learning from each other about best practices in language development, especially second language development.	Ongoing	Ongoing	Principal Assistant Principal Facilitator Teacher Leaders All Teachers	Professional development and teacher support by administrators and facilitator will focus on training and implementing the targeted strategies.	Rotations every 2 months or as necessary Classroom Observations	Begun in spring 2013, continuing through 2016
Focus on developing language in all parts of the day, including during arts and physical education instruction.	Ongoing	Ongoing	Principal Assistant Principal SpecialsTeachers	Professional development and teacher support by administrators and Title I facilitators will focus on training and implementing the targeted strategies.	Observation of Specials' classes at least 2X a month	In progress

* Note: These two columns are not required to meet state or federal accountability requirements, though completion is encouraged. "Status of Action Step" may be required for certain grants.

Section V: Appendices





Some schools will need to provide additional forms to document accountability or grant requirements:

- Additional Requirements for Turnaround Status Under State Accountability (Required)
- Tiered Intervention Grantee (TIG) (Required)
- Title I Schoolwide Program. Important Notice: The schoolwide addendum is one of several ways to document how a school is meeting the Title I schoolwide requirements. While schools operating a Title I schoolwide program must have a plan, use of the UIP addendum is optional. The Federal Programs Unit and the Improvement Planning Unit will be offering training in fall 2015 on schoolwide requirements and the possible pathways to meet those requirements.