

**Colorado's Unified Improvement Plan for Schools for 2013-14**

Organization Code: 0180 District Name: Adams-Arapahoe 28i School Code: 0131 School Name: Meadowood Child Development Center (CDC) Accountable by: year 3 (2015)

**Section I: Summary Information about the School**

**Directions:** This section summarizes your school's performance on the federal and state accountability measures in 2011-12. 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 expectations as shared through the School Performance Framework (SPF) data. This summary should accompany your improvement plan.

**Student Performance Measures for State and Federal Accountability**

Performance Indicators	Measures/ Metrics	Assessment Data				Assessment Data 2012-2013				Meets Expectations?						
		May 2011-2012				May 2012-2013										
				P3	P4			P3	P4	Meeting 80% or above May 2013? Y/N						
<b>Academic Achievement (Status)</b>	<p>GOLD Assessment System</p> <p><b>Description:</b> % P+A in reading, writing, math</p> <p><b>Expectation:</b> % P+A is at or above the state standards for each objective.</p> <p><b>May to May</b></p>	W	9D	68%	69%	W	9D	72%	60%	W	9D	N	N			
			14A	78%	63%		14A	88%	57%		14A	Y	N			
		R	17A	82%	44%	R	17A	90%	47%	R	17A	Y	N			
			18C	45%	45%		18C	62%	38%		18C	N	N			
		M	20A	85%	76%	M	20A	69%	37%	M	20A	N	N			
			20B	93%	98%		20B	99%	97%		20B	Y	Y			
		<b>Academic Growth</b>	<p>School-Wide Student Growth (P3 &amp; P4)</p> <p><b>Description:</b> Growth in GOLD for reading, writing and math from November 2012 to May 2013</p> <p><b>Expectation:</b> Adequate growth is 50% or above (Nov. to May)</p> <p><i>Preschool data does not provide standardized growth data. Our data reflects change in proficiency over time.</i></p>	Nov 2012-2013				May 2012-2013				Change in overall student proficiency from Nov.-May.				
						P3	P4			P3	P4				P3	P4
				W	9D	40%	5%	W	9D	72%	60%		W	9D	32%	55%
					14A	57%	5%		14A	88%	57%			14A	31%	52%
R	17A			56%	5%	R	17A	90%	47%	R	17A		34%	42%		
	18C			33%	7%		18C	62%	38%		18C		29%	31%		
M	20A			41%	5%	M	20A	69%	37%	M	20A		28%	32%		
	20B			96%	77%		20B	99%	97%		20B		3%	20%		

Student Performance Measures for State and Federal Accountability (cont.)

Performance Indicators	Measures/ Metrics	Assessment Data		Assessment Data 2012-2013	Meets Expectations?																						
		Nov 2012-2013	May 2012-2013																								
<b>Academic Growth Gaps</b>	<p>Student Growth by Disaggregated Groups  <b>Description:</b> Growth for reading, writing and math by <b>disaggregated groups</b>.  <b>Expectation:</b> Adequate growth for disaggregated groups is 50% or above (Nov. to May)</p> <p><i>Preschool data does not provide standardized growth data. Our data reflects change in proficiency over time.</i></p>	Language Overall Proficiency Objective 9D by subgroups		Language Overall Proficiency Objective 9D by subgroups	Difference between the two percentages. The % increase/decrease  9D <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>P4 Subgroups</th> <th>Change Nov. to May 2013</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Overall</td><td>55%</td></tr> <tr><td>Black</td><td>65%</td></tr> <tr><td>White</td><td>60%</td></tr> <tr><td>Hispanic</td><td>52%</td></tr> <tr><td>English</td><td>65%</td></tr> <tr><td>Non-English</td><td>32%</td></tr> <tr><td>Male</td><td>64%</td></tr> <tr><td>Female</td><td>49%</td></tr> <tr><td>Non-IEP</td><td>61%</td></tr> <tr><td>IEP</td><td>28%</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	P4 Subgroups	Change Nov. to May 2013	Overall	55%	Black	65%	White	60%	Hispanic	52%	English	65%	Non-English	32%	Male	64%	Female	49%	Non-IEP	61%	IEP	28%
		P4 Subgroups	Change Nov. to May 2013																								
		Overall	55%																								
		Black	65%																								
		White	60%																								
		Hispanic	52%																								
		English	65%																								
		Non-English	32%																								
		Male	64%																								
		Female	49%																								
Non-IEP	61%																										
IEP	28%																										
P4 Subgroups	Proficiency Nov. 2012	P4 Subgroups	Proficiency May 2013																								
Overall	5%	Overall	60%																								
Black	9%	Black	74%																								
White	2%	White	62%																								
Hispanic	2%	Hispanic	54%																								
English	6%	English	71%																								
Non-English	3%	Non-English	35%																								
Male	4%	Male	67%																								
Female	7%	Female	56%																								
Non-IEP	6%	Non-IEP	67%																								
IEP	0%	IEP	28%																								

<b>Academic Growth Gaps</b>	(continued) Student Growth by Disaggregated Groups <b>Description:</b> Growth for reading, writing and math by <b>disaggregated groups</b> . <b>Expectation:</b> Adequate growth for disaggregated groups is 50% or above (Nov. to May)	Literacy Overall Proficiency Objective 18C by subgroups	Literacy Overall Proficiency Objective 18C by subgroups	18C																																																																		
		<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%;">P4 Subgroups</th> <th style="width: 50%;">Proficiency Nov. 2012</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Overall</td><td style="text-align: center;">2%</td></tr> <tr><td>Black</td><td style="text-align: center;">3%</td></tr> <tr><td>White</td><td style="text-align: center;">2%</td></tr> <tr><td>Hispanic</td><td style="text-align: center;">2%</td></tr> <tr><td>English</td><td style="text-align: center;">2%</td></tr> <tr><td>Non-English</td><td style="text-align: center;">0%</td></tr> <tr><td>Male</td><td style="text-align: center;">0%</td></tr> <tr><td>Female</td><td style="text-align: center;">4%</td></tr> <tr><td>Non-IEP</td><td style="text-align: center;">2%</td></tr> <tr><td>IEP</td><td style="text-align: center;">0%</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	P4 Subgroups	Proficiency Nov. 2012	Overall	2%	Black	3%	White	2%	Hispanic	2%	English	2%	Non-English	0%	Male	0%	Female	4%	Non-IEP	2%	IEP	0%	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%;">P4 Subgroups</th> <th style="width: 50%;">Proficiency May 2013</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Overall</td><td style="text-align: center;">38%</td></tr> <tr><td>Black</td><td style="text-align: center;">56%</td></tr> <tr><td>White</td><td style="text-align: center;">37%</td></tr> <tr><td>Hispanic</td><td style="text-align: center;">22%</td></tr> <tr><td>English</td><td style="text-align: center;">46%</td></tr> <tr><td>Non-English</td><td style="text-align: center;">18%</td></tr> <tr><td>Male</td><td style="text-align: center;">34%</td></tr> <tr><td>Female</td><td style="text-align: center;">43%</td></tr> <tr><td>Non-IEP</td><td style="text-align: center;">41%</td></tr> <tr><td>IEP</td><td style="text-align: center;">22%</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	P4 Subgroups	Proficiency May 2013	Overall	38%	Black	56%	White	37%	Hispanic	22%	English	46%	Non-English	18%	Male	34%	Female	43%	Non-IEP	41%	IEP	22%	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%;">P4 Subgroups</th> <th style="width: 50%;">Change Nov. to May 2013</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Overall</td><td style="text-align: center;">36%</td></tr> <tr><td>Black</td><td style="text-align: center;">53%</td></tr> <tr><td>White</td><td style="text-align: center;">35%</td></tr> <tr><td>Hispanic</td><td style="text-align: center;">30%</td></tr> <tr><td>English</td><td style="text-align: center;">44%</td></tr> <tr><td>Non-English</td><td style="text-align: center;">18%</td></tr> <tr><td>Male</td><td style="text-align: center;">34%</td></tr> <tr><td>Female</td><td style="text-align: center;">39%</td></tr> <tr><td>Non-IEP</td><td style="text-align: center;">39%</td></tr> <tr><td>IEP</td><td style="text-align: center;">22%</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	P4 Subgroups	Change Nov. to May 2013	Overall	36%	Black	53%	White	35%	Hispanic	30%	English	44%	Non-English	18%	Male	34%	Female	39%	Non-IEP	39%	IEP	22%
		P4 Subgroups	Proficiency Nov. 2012																																																																			
Overall	2%																																																																					
Black	3%																																																																					
White	2%																																																																					
Hispanic	2%																																																																					
English	2%																																																																					
Non-English	0%																																																																					
Male	0%																																																																					
Female	4%																																																																					
Non-IEP	2%																																																																					
IEP	0%																																																																					
P4 Subgroups	Proficiency May 2013																																																																					
Overall	38%																																																																					
Black	56%																																																																					
White	37%																																																																					
Hispanic	22%																																																																					
English	46%																																																																					
Non-English	18%																																																																					
Male	34%																																																																					
Female	43%																																																																					
Non-IEP	41%																																																																					
IEP	22%																																																																					
P4 Subgroups	Change Nov. to May 2013																																																																					
Overall	36%																																																																					
Black	53%																																																																					
White	35%																																																																					
Hispanic	30%																																																																					
English	44%																																																																					
Non-English	18%																																																																					
Male	34%																																																																					
Female	39%																																																																					
Non-IEP	39%																																																																					
IEP	22%																																																																					

**Accountability Status and Requirements for Improvement Plan**

Program	Identification Process	Identification for School	Directions for Completing Improvement Plan
<b>State Accountability</b>			
Preliminary Recommended Plan Type	Plan assigned based on school's overall school performance framework score (achievement, growth, growth gaps, postsecondary and workforce readiness)	District Accountability 2013-2014	[Customized Directions] Once the plan type for the school has been finalized, this report will be re-populated in November 2012. For required elements in the improvement plans, go to the Quality Criteria at: <a href="http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/UIP_TrainingAndSupport_Resources.asp">http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/UIP_TrainingAndSupport_Resources.asp</a>
<b>ESEA and Grant Accountability</b>			
Title I Formula Grant	Program's resources are allocated based upon the poverty rates of students enrolled in schools and districts and are designed to help ensure that all children meet challenging state academic standards.	Does not receive Title I funds	In addition to the general requirements, all schools operating a Title I [Schoolwide/Targeted Assistance] program must complete the [Schoolwide/Targeted Assistance] addendum. Schools identified under another program (e.g., state accountability, Title I Focus School) will need to submit a plan for review by CDE by January 15, 2013. All other Title I schools will submit their plan to CDE for posting on SchoolView.org by April 15, 2013. CDE may require a review of the school's UIP during a monitoring site visit or during a desk review.
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	In addition to the general requirements, Focus Schools must identify the performance challenges for the lowest achieving disaggregated student group(s). The plan must include a root cause(s) and associated action steps that address the performance challenge(s) for the disaggregated student group(s). The UIP must be approved before CDE will release 2013-14 Title IA funds to the LEA. For required elements in the improvement plans, go to the Quality Criteria at: <a href="http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/UIP_TrainingAndSupport_Resources.asp">http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/UIP_TrainingAndSupport_Resources.asp</a>
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 a TIG Awardee	In addition to the general requirements, TIG schools are expected to align activities funded through the grant with overall school improvement efforts in the UIP. All TIG activities must be included in the action steps of the action plan (e.g., activity, resources). All grantees will be expected to submit the school plan for CDE review by January 15, 2013. For required elements in the improvement plans, go to the Quality Criteria: <a href="http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/UIP_TrainingAndSupport_Resources.asp">http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/UIP_TrainingAndSupport_Resources.asp</a>
Improvement Support Partnership (ISP) or TDIP	Competitive Title I grant to support district improvement through a diagnostic review (i.e., facilitated data analysis, SST) or an implementation focus (i.e., Best First Instruction, Leadership, Climate and Culture).	Not a Title I School Improvement Grant Awardee	[If NOT a grantee] n/a [If a grantee] In addition to the general requirements, the school is expected to align activities funded through the grant with overall school improvement efforts in the UIP. All grant activities must be included in the action steps of the action plan (e.g., activity, resources). All grantees will be expected to submit the school plan for CDE review by January 15, 2013. For required elements in the improvement plans, go to the Quality Criteria: <a href="http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/UIP_TrainingAndSupport_Resources.asp">http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/UIP_TrainingAndSupport_Resources.asp</a>

**Section II: Improvement Plan Information**

**Directions:** This section should be completed by the school or district.

**Additional Information about the School**

Comprehensive Review and Selected Grant History		
Related Grant Awards	Has the school received a grant that supports the school's improvement efforts? When was the grant awarded?	Colorado Preschool Program (on-going)
School Support Team or Expedited Review	Has (or will) the school participated in an SST review or Expedited Review? When?	no
External Evaluator	Has the school partnered with an external evaluator to provide comprehensive evaluation? Indicate the year and the name of the provider/tool used.	no

**Improvement Plan Information**


The school is submitting this improvement plan to satisfy requirements for (check all that apply):

- State Accountability    
  Title IA (Targeted Assistance or Schoolwide)    
  Title I Focus School    
  Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG)  
 Implementation Support Partnership Grant (ISP) or Title I School Improvement Grant    
 X Other: District Accountability

School Contact Information (Additional contacts may be added, if needed)		
1	Name and Title	Stephanie Gianneschi, Coordinator
	Email	ssgianneschi@aps.k12.co.us
	Phone	303-400-0863
	Mailing Address	3333 Norfolk Way, Aurora, CO 80013
2	Name and Title	Kim Pippenger, Administrative TOSA
	Email	kspippenger@aps.k12.co.us
	Phone	303-400-0863
	Mailing Address	3333 Norfolk Way, Aurora, CO 80013

**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.



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

**Directions:** This chart supports analysis of progress made towards performance targets set for the 2011-12 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 2012-13 school year (Targets set in last year’s plan)	Performance in 2012-13? Was the target met? How close was school in meeting the target?	Brief reflection on why previous targets were met or not met.
Academic Achievement (Status)	80% on writing objectives (9d and 14a)	No	
	80% on reading objectives (17a and 18c)	No	
	80% on math objectives (20a and 20b)	Yes on 20b, No on 20A	
Academic Growth	50% increase in proficiency in writing objectives (9d and 14a)	Yes	
	50% increase in proficiency in reading objectives (17a and 18c)	No	
	50% increase in proficiency in math objectives (20a and 20b)	No	
Academic Growth Gaps	??	N/A	

Performance Indicators	Targets for 2012-13 school year (Targets set in last year's plan)	Performance in 2012-13? Was the target met? How close was school in meeting the target?	Brief reflection on why previous targets were met or not met.
Post Secondary Readiness	N/A	N/A	

**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 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. Furthermore, schools are encouraged to consider observations recorded in the “last year’s targets” worksheet. Finally, provide a brief description of the root cause analysis for any priority performance challenges. Root causes may apply to multiple priority performance challenges. You may add rows, as needed.

Performance Indicators	Description of Notable Trends (1 year of GOLD data-November 2012-May 2013)	Priority Performance Challenges	Root Causes																																												
Academic Achievement (Status)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall P4 student proficiency in GOLD Objective 18C: Retells stories is 38%.</li> <li>Proficiency for our P4 non-English speakers in GOLD Objective 18C: Retells stories is 18%, while 44% of our English speakers are proficient.</li> <li>The average change in proficiency overall is 36%. Non-English speakers changed in proficiency by 18%. The lowest subgroup change in proficiency.</li> </ul> <p>Overall Proficiency Objective 18C</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>P4 Subgroups</th> <th>Proficiency Nov. 2012</th> <th>Proficiency May 2013</th> <th>Change Nov-May 2013</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Overall</td><td>2%</td><td>38%</td><td>36%</td></tr> <tr><td>Black</td><td>3%</td><td>56%</td><td>53%</td></tr> <tr><td>White</td><td>2%</td><td>37%</td><td>35%</td></tr> <tr><td>Hispanic</td><td>2%</td><td>22%</td><td>30%</td></tr> <tr><td>English</td><td>2%</td><td>46%</td><td>44%</td></tr> <tr><td>Non-English</td><td>0%</td><td>18%</td><td>18%</td></tr> <tr><td>Male</td><td>0%</td><td>34%</td><td>34%</td></tr> <tr><td>Female</td><td>4%</td><td>43%</td><td>39%</td></tr> <tr><td>Non-IEP</td><td>2%</td><td>41%</td><td>39%</td></tr> <tr><td>IEP</td><td>0%</td><td>22%</td><td>22%</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	P4 Subgroups	Proficiency Nov. 2012	Proficiency May 2013	Change Nov-May 2013	Overall	2%	38%	36%	Black	3%	56%	53%	White	2%	37%	35%	Hispanic	2%	22%	30%	English	2%	46%	44%	Non-English	0%	18%	18%	Male	0%	34%	34%	Female	4%	43%	39%	Non-IEP	2%	41%	39%	IEP	0%	22%	22%	<p>In Literacy, GOLD Objective 18: Comprehends and responds to books and other texts, dimension C: Retells stories; Non-English speakers changed in proficiency by 18%. The lowest subgroup change in proficiency.</p>	<p>We do not use the Teaching Learning Cycle to plan intentionally for second language learners.</p> <p>We do not understand how oral language develops or how to teach students whose first language is not English.</p> <p>Teachers do not provide individual or small group opportunities for students to retell stories.</p> <p>Some of students’ IEP goals are not aligned with the building UIP goals.</p>
P4 Subgroups	Proficiency Nov. 2012	Proficiency May 2013	Change Nov-May 2013																																												
Overall	2%	38%	36%																																												
Black	3%	56%	53%																																												
White	2%	37%	35%																																												
Hispanic	2%	22%	30%																																												
English	2%	46%	44%																																												
Non-English	0%	18%	18%																																												
Male	0%	34%	34%																																												
Female	4%	43%	39%																																												
Non-IEP	2%	41%	39%																																												
IEP	0%	22%	22%																																												




Performance Indicators	Description of Notable Trends (1 year of GOLD data-November 2012-May 2013)	Priority Performance Challenges	Root Causes																																												
<p>Academic Achievement (Status) (continued)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall P4 student proficiency in GOLD Objective 20A: Counts is 37%.</li> <li>The lowest performing subgroup in GOLD Objective 20A: Counts for P4 students is Hispanic and Non-English speakers; both achieving at 24%, and students with IEPs achieving at 17%.</li> </ul> <p>Overall Proficiency Objective 20A</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">P4 Subgroups</th> <th style="width: 15%;">Proficiency Nov. 2012</th> <th style="width: 15%;">Proficiency May 2013</th> <th style="width: 15%;">Change Nov-May 2013</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Overall</td><td>5%</td><td>37%</td><td>32%</td></tr> <tr><td>Black</td><td>9%</td><td>56%</td><td>47%</td></tr> <tr><td>White</td><td>2%</td><td>38%</td><td>36%</td></tr> <tr><td>Hispanic</td><td>4%</td><td>24%</td><td>20%</td></tr> <tr><td>English</td><td>5%</td><td>44%</td><td>39%</td></tr> <tr><td>Non-English</td><td>6%</td><td>24%</td><td>18%</td></tr> <tr><td>Male</td><td>2%</td><td>31%</td><td>29%</td></tr> <tr><td>Female</td><td>9%</td><td>46%</td><td>29%</td></tr> <tr><td>Non-IEP</td><td>6%</td><td>42%</td><td>36%</td></tr> <tr><td>IEP</td><td>0%</td><td>17%</td><td>17%</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	P4 Subgroups	Proficiency Nov. 2012	Proficiency May 2013	Change Nov-May 2013	Overall	5%	37%	32%	Black	9%	56%	47%	White	2%	38%	36%	Hispanic	4%	24%	20%	English	5%	44%	39%	Non-English	6%	24%	18%	Male	2%	31%	29%	Female	9%	46%	29%	Non-IEP	6%	42%	36%	IEP	0%	17%	17%	<p>In Math GOLD Objective 20A: Counts; our overall P4 student proficiency is 37%. Non-English speakers and students with IEPs had the lowest changes in proficiency and performed significantly below other sub-groups on this objective.</p>	<p>We do not use the Teaching Learning Cycle to plan intentionally for whole group or differentiated small group math instruction to develop mathematical understandings in our students.</p> <p>We do not understand how young students develop understandings in math or what the learning trajectory in math looks or sounds like.</p> <p>We do not understand how oral language develops for second language learners or how to teach students whose first language is not English.</p>
P4 Subgroups	Proficiency Nov. 2012	Proficiency May 2013	Change Nov-May 2013																																												
Overall	5%	37%	32%																																												
Black	9%	56%	47%																																												
White	2%	38%	36%																																												
Hispanic	4%	24%	20%																																												
English	5%	44%	39%																																												
Non-English	6%	24%	18%																																												
Male	2%	31%	29%																																												
Female	9%	46%	29%																																												
Non-IEP	6%	42%	36%																																												
IEP	0%	17%	17%																																												

Performance Indicators	Description of Notable Trends (1 year of GOLD data-November 2012-May 2013)	Priority Performance Challenges	Root Causes																																												
Academic Growth Gaps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall P4 student proficiency in GOLD Objective 9D: Tells about another time and place is 60%.</li> <li>Proficiency for our P4 non-English speakers in GOLD Objective 9D: Tells about another time and place is 35%, while 71% of our English speakers are proficient.</li> <li>The average change in proficiency overall is 55%. Non-English speakers changed in proficiency by 32%. The lowest subgroup change in proficiency.</li> <li>28% of our students on IEPs were proficient compared to 60% of our overall student population.</li> </ul> <p>Overall Proficiency Objective 9D</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>P4 Subgroups</th> <th>Proficiency Nov. 2012</th> <th>Proficiency May 2013</th> <th>Change Nov-May 2013</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Overall</td><td>5%</td><td>60%</td><td>55%</td></tr> <tr><td>Black</td><td>9%</td><td>74%</td><td>65%</td></tr> <tr><td>White</td><td>2%</td><td>62%</td><td>60%</td></tr> <tr><td>Hispanic</td><td>2%</td><td>54%</td><td>52%</td></tr> <tr><td>English</td><td>6%</td><td>71%</td><td>65%</td></tr> <tr><td>Non-English</td><td>3%</td><td>35%</td><td>32%</td></tr> <tr><td>Male</td><td>4%</td><td>67%</td><td>64%</td></tr> <tr><td>Female</td><td>7%</td><td>56%</td><td>49%</td></tr> <tr><td>Non-IEP</td><td>6%</td><td>67%</td><td>61%</td></tr> <tr><td>IEP</td><td>0%</td><td>28%</td><td>28%</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	P4 Subgroups	Proficiency Nov. 2012	Proficiency May 2013	Change Nov-May 2013	Overall	5%	60%	55%	Black	9%	74%	65%	White	2%	62%	60%	Hispanic	2%	54%	52%	English	6%	71%	65%	Non-English	3%	35%	32%	Male	4%	67%	64%	Female	7%	56%	49%	Non-IEP	6%	67%	61%	IEP	0%	28%	28%	<p>In Language, GOLD Objective 9: Uses language to express thoughts and needs, dimension D: Tells about another time and place; Non-English speakers changed in proficiency by 32%; Students with an IEP changed in proficiency by 28%. Both subgroups are significantly below the overall achievement.</p>	<p>We do not use the Teaching Learning Cycle to plan intentionally for second language learners.</p> <p>We do not understand how oral language develops for second language learners or how to teach students whose first language is not English.</p> <p>Teachers are not providing opportunities for students to write more than once per week with an intentional teaching objective.</p> <p>Some of students' IEP goals are not aligned with the building UIP goals.</p>
P4 Subgroups	Proficiency Nov. 2012	Proficiency May 2013	Change Nov-May 2013																																												
Overall	5%	60%	55%																																												
Black	9%	74%	65%																																												
White	2%	62%	60%																																												
Hispanic	2%	54%	52%																																												
English	6%	71%	65%																																												
Non-English	3%	35%	32%																																												
Male	4%	67%	64%																																												
Female	7%	56%	49%																																												
Non-IEP	6%	67%	61%																																												
IEP	0%	28%	28%																																												
Post Secondary & Workforce Readiness	N/A	N/A	N/A																																												

**Data Narrative for School**

**Directions:** Building on the data organized in Worksheet #1 and Worksheet #2, describe the process and results of the data analysis for the school, including review of prior years' targets, trends, priority performance challenges and root cause analysis. The narrative should address each aspect of the descriptions below. The narrative should not take more than five pages.

**Data Narrative for School**



**Narrative:**

**Description of School:**

Meadowood Child Development Center was newly opened in the fall of 2011.

Profile of the students, Fall 2013:

Gender: Male: 51%  
Female: 49%

Race/Ethnicity:  
White: 53%  
Black or African American: 29%  
Hispanic: 35%  
Other: 18 %

IEP Status: Children with an IEP: 20%

Age: Preschool age 3: 42%  
Preschool age 4: 58%

Primary Language: English: 73%  
Non-English: 27%  
Spanish: 15%

**Process:**

The Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) consists of staff serving in various capacities; Coordinator, Administrative TOSA, classroom facilitators, classroom para-educator, Early Childhood Special Educator, ECE Literacy Coach, English Language Acquisition Consultant, Math Teacher Coach, and the Assistant Director of Early Childhood Education. The ILT examined and analyzed the data below to determine areas of growth and areas of challenge. ILT members also facilitated conversations with other staff at a professional development meeting. Staff members' responses to the data were compiled and reviewed at a later ILT meeting. Members synthesized staff responses and determined priority needs for the building.

**Analyzing Trends and Priority Needs:**

Student performance data for 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 were examined and analyzed to determine trends over that period. We used Teaching Strategies GOLD to compare proficiency at the end of the year and also to look at the % of growth overall and by subgroups from November 2012 to May 2013. The data used to identify trends was Teaching Strategies GOLD Objectives for Development and Learning. The specific objectives analyzed were: Writing Objective 9d: Tells about another time or place; Writing Objective 14a: Thinks symbolically; Reading Objective 17a: Uses and appreciates books; Reading Objective 18c: Retells stories; Math Objective 20a: Counts; Math Objective 20b: Quantifies. We compared the indicators in Teaching Strategies GOLD to the Colorado Academic Standards for Preschool to determine what was proficient at the end of the year (May). General findings in the data are stated below.

**Priority Performance Challenges:**

Based on our overall proficiency data of P4 students in GOLD, we have identified the need to improve academic achievement in Objectives 18C: Retells stories (reading) and 9D: Tells about another time and place (writing) as our highest priorities. These objectives are similar in content and would help teachers create an aligned focus in both reading and writing. In addition, we have identified the need to improve the academic growth of all P4 students on Objective 20A: Counts, because we are significantly below the target of 80% proficiency. We also determined, through our subgroup analysis that our Second Language Learners as well as our Students with Disabilities need to be a target group due to the significant lag in proficiency.

**Root Cause Analysis:**

Root Cause--Academic Achievement and Academic Growth:

It was determined that we do not understand how oral language develops or how to teach students whose first language is not English. Teachers do not provide individual or small group opportunities for students to retell stories. We do not use the Teaching Learning Cycle to plan intentionally for whole group or differentiated small group instruction in reading, oral language or math. Furthermore, we do not understand how young students develop understandings in math or what the learning trajectory in math looks or sounds like.

Verification of this root cause was found using the Teaching Strategies GOLD data reported out to the state and the district three times per year (November, February, and May). We focused on overall P4 achievement reported out for Literacy Objectives 18c and 9d, as well as Math Objective 20a. We also used data collected during learning walks and analyzed the number and content of observation notes entered into GOLD for Objectives 18c, 9d and 20a. Furthermore, lesson plans do not reflect planning of small group or individualized instruction in any content area.

Root Cause--Academic Growth Gaps:


ILT members determined that two subgroups, Non-English speakers and students with an IEP are not reaching the same proficiency as other subgroups. It was determined that we do not use the Teaching Learning Cycle to plan intentionally for second language learners. We do not understand how oral language develops or how to teach students whose first language is not English. Additionally, some of students' IEP goals are not aligned with the building UIP goals.

Verification of this root cause for subgroups not reaching proficiency at the same rate was found using the Teaching Strategies GOLD data reported out to the state and the district three times per year (November, February, and May). We focused on growth of P4 subgroups reported out for Objectives 18c (reading), 9d (writing) and 20a (math). We also used data collected during learning walks and analyzed the number and content of observation notes entered into GOLD for target objectives. Furthermore, lesson plans do not

reflect planning of small group or individualized instruction in any content area.

**Section IV: Action Plan(s)**

This section addresses the “plan” portion of the continuous improvement cycle. First, you will identify your annual performance targets and the interim measures. This will be documented in the required School Target Setting Form below. Then you will move into action planning, which should be captured in the Action Planning Form.



**School Target Setting Form**

**Directions:** Complete the worksheet below. While schools may set targets for all performance indicators, at a minimum, they must set targets for those priority performance challenges identified in Section III (e.g., by disaggregated student groups, grade levels, subject areas).

Schools are expected to set their own annual targets for 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 are not met – in each area where a priority performance challenge was identified; targets should also be connected to prioritized performance challenges. 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.

**School Target Setting Form**

Performance Indicators	Measures/ Metrics	Priority Performance Challenges		Annual Performance Targets						Interim Measures for 2013-14	Major Improvement Strategy		
				2013-14		2014-15							
Academic Achievement (Status)	GOLD Assessment System	R	9D	72%	60%	9D	76%	70%	9D	80%	80%	Q2- October 25, 2013 Q3 – February 5, 2014 Q4 – May 16 <sup>th</sup> , 2014	#1, #2, #3
			14A	88%	57%	14A	94%	68%	14A	100%	80%		
		W	17B	90%	47%	17B	95%	64%	17B	100%	80%		
			18B	62%	38%	18B	71%	59%	18B	80%	80%		
		M	20A	69%	37%	20A	75%	59%	20A	80%	80%		
			20B	99%	97%	20B	99.5%	98.5%	20B	100%	100%		

Academic Growth	School-Wide Student Growth (P3 & P4)										Q2- October 25, 2013 Q3 – February 5, 2014 Q4 – May 16 <sup>th</sup> , 2014	#1, #2, #3	
			P3	P4		P3	P4		P3	P4			
		R	9D	72%	60%	9D	76%	70%	9D	80%			80%
			14A	88%	57%	14A	94%	68%	14A	100%			80%
		W	17B	90%	47%	17B	95%	64%	17B	100%			80%
			18B	62%	38%	18B	71%	59%	18B	80%			80%
		M	20A	69%	37%	20A	75%	59%	20A	80%			80%
			20B	99%	97%	20B	99.5%	98.5%	20B	100%			100%

Academic Growth Gaps	Student Growth by Disaggregated Groups	% Growth Objective 17b.		% Growth Objective 17b.		% Growth Objective 17b.		Q2- October 25, 2013 Q3 – February 5, 2014 Q4 – May 16 <sup>th</sup> , 2014	#1, #2, #3
		P4 Subgroups	Growth (Nov. to May)	P4 Subgroups	Growth (Nov. to May)	P4 Subgroups	Growth (Nov. to May)		
		Overall	20%	Overall	50%	Overall	50%		
		Black	22%	Black	50%	Black	50%		
		Non-black	18%	Non-black	50%	Non-black	50%		
		White	24%	White	50%	White	50%		
		Non-white	18%	Non-white	50%	Non-white	50%		
		English	20%	English	50%	English	50%		
		Non-English	19%	Non-English	50%	Non-English	50%		
		Male	-3%	Male	50%	Male	50%		
Female	25%	Female	50%	Female	50%				

**Action Planning Form for 2012-13 and 2013-14**

**Directions:** Identify the major improvement strategy(s) for 2012-13 and 2013-14 that will address the root causes determined in Section III. For each major improvement strategy, identify the root cause(s) that the action steps 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. Add rows in the chart, as needed. While space has been provided for three major improvement strategies, the school may add other major strategies, as needed.

**Major Improvement Strategy #1:** If teachers intentionally plan for oral language development, then all students will receive instruction at their point of need that will accelerate them towards proficiency.

**Root Cause(s) Addressed:**

- We do not use the Teaching Learning Cycle to plan intentionally for second language learners.
- We do not understand how oral language develops or how to teach students whose first language is not English.
- Teachers do not provide individual or small group opportunities for students to retell stories.
- Some of students' IEP goals are not aligned with the building UIP goals.

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

- School Plan under State Accountability   
  Title I Schoolwide or Targeted Assistance plan requirements   
  Title I Focus School Plan requirements  
 Application for a Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG)   
  Improvement Support Partnership (ISP) or School Improvement Grant

Description of Action Steps to Implement the Major Improvement Strategy	Timeline (2013-14 and 2014-2015)	Key Personnel*	Resources (Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local)	Implementation Benchmarks	Status of Action Step* (e.g., completed, in progress, not begun)
Teachers will develop understandings of how students learn language and plan intentionally for whole group and differentiated small group instruction.	2013-2014 and 2014-2015	Literacy and Math Teacher Coaches, English Language Acquisition Consultant, Principal, TOSA		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers will complete proficiency charts in reading, writing and math three times per year using the TS GOLD age range expectations, the Colorado Academic Standards for Preschool the District Emergent Reading Assessment, the District Emergent Writing Assessment and Counting Pre-K Math assessment</li> <li>• Weekly team planning meetings will result in high quality whole-group, small group and 1-1 plans for student learning.</li> <li>• All staff members (administrators, facilitators, coaches, para-professionals) will engage in high-quality instruction around language development.</li> </ul>	In progress

<p>Whole group Professional Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-K LETRs training around the development of literacy skills in young children (SPED and facilitators)</li> </ul>	<p>Dec. 2013</p>	<p>LETRs trainer</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher Coaches and Administrators will monitor and provide feedback through monthly learning walks and informal observations in whole group and small group instruction</li> </ul>	<p>Not started</p>
<p>Small Group Professional Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaborative Coaching and Learning (CCLs) groups             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identify and understand the Essential Standard that all P4 students must reach in order to be prepared for kindergarten</li> <li>○ Use the Colorado Academic Standards and TS GOLD to identify the proficiency targets for P4 students in oral language and literacy</li> <li>○ Develop a Common Formative Assessment (CFA)</li> <li>○ Plan and teach a lesson with colleagues using “Elements of Effective Lessons”</li> <li>○ Analyze P4 student data</li> <li>○ Complete an Action Plan for the content being studied for students not meeting the age range expectations or the Colorado Expectations for Preschool</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Team Planning using the APS Content Planners, Colorado Academic Standards, TS GOLD objectives and student data</li> </ul>	<p>2013-2014 and 2014-2015</p>	<p>Literacy and Math Teacher Coaches, English Language Acquisition Consultant, Principal, TOSA</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers will attend CCLs 3 times per month in oral language/reading, writing or math and study each content area for at least one cycle</li> <li>• Teacher Coaches and ELA consultant and the Principal/TOSA will facilitate CCLs</li> <li>• Teacher Coaches and/or Principal/TOSA will attend Team Planning with teams of teachers once per week</li> <li>• Teacher Coaches and Administrators will monitor and provide feedback through monthly learning walks and informal observations in whole group and small group instruction</li> <li>• Teachers will administer the district Emergent Reading Assessment and Emergent Writing Assessment 3 times per year and use the data to plan small group instruction</li> <li>• Teachers will evaluate Common Formative Assessments to plan for differentiated instruction</li> </ul>	<p>In progress</p>



<p>Individual Professional Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Job-embedded professional learning by Teacher Coaches in literacy, math and English Language Acquisition</li> </ul>	<p>2013-2014 and 2014-2015</p>	<p>Literacy and Math Teacher Coaches, English Language Acquisition Consultant</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher Coaches and Administrators will monitor and provide feedback through monthly learning walks and informal observations</li> <li>ILT will create success criteria for learning walks, build capacity by joining the learning walk and use the data gathered to determine next steps for professional learning.</li> </ul>	<p>In progress</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers will identify and recommend to the RtI team academically at risk P4 students that are not on track for meeting the standard to enter kindergarten in the fall in reading, writing and math</li> </ul>	<p>2013-2014 and 2014-2015</p>	<p>Literacy and Math Teacher Coaches, English Language Acquisition Consultant, Principal, TOSA</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers will complete proficiency charts in oral language/reading, writing and math 3 times per year using a body of evidence.</li> <li>Teachers will take P4 students through the RtI process that are not on track for being ready for kindergarten, including second language learners</li> </ul>	<p>In progress</p>
<p>Resources to Support Professional Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WIDA standards for preschool</li> <li>Model Performance Indicators (MPI)</li> <li>Use exemplars on the APS ECE website to identify proficiency</li> <li>Use the APS ECE ERA and EWA rubrics</li> <li>Use the APS ECE reading monitoring sheet</li> </ul>		<p>Literacy Teacher Coaches, English Language Acquisition Consultant, Principal, TOSA</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers will evaluate common district assessments as a group to ensure inter-rater reliability and to develop common understandings</li> <li>ILT will begin to develop understandings around English Language Acquisition</li> <li>ILT will analyze data collected for ELLs using Objectives 37 and 38 (English Language Acquisition)</li> <li>ILT will analyze data collected for TS GOLD Objectives 9D and 18C</li> </ul>	<p>In progress</p> <p>Not started</p>

\* Note: These two columns are not required to meet state or federal accountability requirements, although completion is recommended. "Status of Action Step" may be required for certain grants (e.g., Tiered Intervention Grant).

**Major Improvement Strategy #2:** If teachers use the Teaching Learning Cycle in math, then teachers will plan intentionally for whole group or differentiated small group math instruction to develop mathematical understandings in our students.

**Root Cause(s) Addressed:**

- We do not use the Teaching Learning Cycle to plan intentionally for whole group or differentiated small group math instruction to develop mathematical understandings in our students.
- We do not understand how young students develop understandings in math or what the learning trajectory in math looks or sounds like.
- We do not understand how oral language develops or how to teach students whose first language is not English.

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

- School Plan under State Accountability   
  Title I Schoolwide or Targeted Assistance Plan requirements   
  Title I Focus School Plan requirements  
 Application for a Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG)   
  Improvement Support Partnership (ISP) or School Improvement Grant

Description of Action Steps to Implement the Major Improvement Strategy	Timeline (2013-14 and 2014-2015)	Key Personnel*	Resources (Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local)	Implementation Benchmarks	Status of Action Step* (e.g., completed, in progress, not begun)
Teachers will use the Teaching Learning Cycle to plan intentionally for whole group and differentiated small group math instruction.	2013-2014 and 2014-2015	Math Teacher Coaches, Principal, TOSA		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers will complete proficiency charts in math three times per year using the TS GOLD age range expectations, the Colorado Academic Standards for Preschool and the Counting Pre-K Math assessment</li> <li>• Weekly team planning meetings will result in high quality, differentiated whole-group, small group and 1-1 plans for student learning.</li> </ul>	In progress
Small Group Professional Learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaborative Coaching and Learning (CCLs) groups                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identify and understand the Essential Standard that all P4 students must</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2013-2014 and 2014-2015	Math Teacher Coaches, Principal, TOSA		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers will attend CCLs 3 times per month in oral language/reading, writing or math and study each content area for at least one cycle</li> <li>• The Math Teacher Coach and the</li> </ul>	In progress

<p>reach in order to be prepared for kindergarten</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Use the Colorado Academic Standards and TS GOLD to identify the proficiency targets for P4 students in math</li> <li>○ Develop a Common Formative Assessment (CFA)</li> <li>○ Plan and teach a lesson with colleagues using “Elements of Effective Lessons”</li> <li>○ Analyze P4 student data</li> <li>○ Complete an Action Plan for the content being studied for students not meeting the age range expectations or the Colorado Expectations for Preschool</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Team Planning using the APS Content Planners, Colorado Academic Standards, TS GOLD objectives and student data</li> </ul>				<p>Principal/TOSA will facilitate CCLs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Teacher Coaches and Administrators will monitor and provide feedback through monthly learning walks and informal observations in whole group and small group instruction</li> <li>● Teachers will administer the district Emergent Reading Assessment and Emergent Writing Assessment 3 times per year and use the data to plan small group instruction</li> <li>● Teachers will evaluate Common Formative Assessments to plan for differentiated instruction</li> <li>● Teacher Coaches and/or Principal/TOSA will attend Team Planning with teams of teachers once per week</li> </ul>	
<p>Individual Professional Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Job-embedded professional learning by Math Teacher Coach</li> </ul>	<p>2013-2014 and 2014-2015</p>	<p>Math Teacher Coach</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Teacher Coaches and Administrators will monitor and provide feedback through monthly learning walks and informal observations</li> </ul>	<p>In progress</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Teachers will identify and recommend to the RtI team academically at risk P4 students that are not on track for meeting the standard to enter kindergarten in the fall in reading, writing and math</li> </ul>	<p>2013-2014 and 2014-2015</p>	<p>Literacy and Math Teacher Coaches, English Language Acquisition Consultant, Principal, TOSA</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Teachers will complete proficiency charts in reading, writing and math 3 times per year using a body of evidence.</li> <li>● Teachers will take P4 students through the RtI process that are not on track for being ready for kindergarten</li> </ul>	<p>In progress</p>

<p>Resources to Support Professional Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use <i>Developing Math Concepts in Pre-Kindergarten</i> by Kathy Richardson in CCLs to develop teacher understandings in math.</li> </ul>		<p>Math Teacher Coach Principal, TOSA</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers will evaluate common district assessments as a group to ensure inter-rater reliability and to develop common understandings</li> <li>ILT will create success criteria for learning walks, build capacity by joining the learning walk and use the data gathered to determine next steps for professional learning.</li> <li>ILT will analyze data collected for TS GOLD Objective 20A</li> </ul>	<p>In progress</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--------------------

**Major Improvement Strategy #3:** If teachers use the Teaching Learning Cycle to differentiate instruction and plan intentionally in literacy, then all students will receive instruction at their point of need.

**Root Cause(s) Addressed:**

- We do not use the Teaching Learning Cycle to plan intentionally for second language learners.
- We do not understand how oral language develops for second language learners or how to teach students whose first language is not English.
- Teachers are not providing opportunities for students to write more than once per week with an intentional teaching objective.
- Some of students' IEP goals are not aligned with the building UIP goals

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

- School Plan under State Accountability   
  Title I Schoolwide or Targeted Assistance plan requirements   
  Title I Focus School Plan requirements  
 Application for a Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG)   
  Improvement Support Partnership (ISP) or School Improvement Grant

Description of Action Steps to Implement the Major Improvement Strategy	Timeline (2013-14 and 2014-2015)	Key Personnel*	Resources (Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local)	Implementation Benchmarks	Status of Action Step* (e.g., completed, in progress, not begun)
Teachers will use the Teaching Learning Cycle to plan intentionally for differentiated small group and 1 on 1 instruction in literacy.	2013-2014 and 2014-2015	Literacy Teacher Coach, English Language Acquisition Consultant, Principal, TOSA		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers will complete proficiency charts in reading, writing and math three times per year using the TS GOLD age range expectations, the Colorado Academic Standards for Preschool the District Emergent Reading Assessment, the District Emergent Writing Assessment and Counting Pre-K Math assessment</li> <li>• Weekly team planning meetings will result in high quality whole-group, small group and 1-1 plans for student learning.</li> <li>• All staff members (administrators, facilitators, coaches, para-professionals) will engage in high-quality instruction in literacy.</li> </ul>	In progress

<p>Whole group Professional Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-K LETRs training around the development of literacy skills in young children</li> </ul>	<p>Dec. 2013</p>	<p>LETRs trainer</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher Coaches and Administrators will monitor and provide feedback through monthly learning walks and informal observations in whole group and small group instruction</li> </ul>	<p>Not started</p>
<p>Small Group Professional Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaborative Coaching and Learning (CCLs) groups             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identify and understand the Essential Standard that all P4 students must reach in order to be prepared for kindergarten</li> <li>○ Use the Colorado Academic Standards and TS GOLD to identify the proficiency targets for P4 students in oral language and literacy</li> <li>○ Develop a Common Formative Assessment (CFA)</li> <li>○ Plan and teach a lesson with colleagues using “Elements of Effective Lessons”</li> <li>○ Analyze P4 student data</li> <li>○ Complete an Action Plan for the content being studied for students not meeting the age range expectations or the Colorado Expectations for Preschool</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Team Planning using the APS Content Planners, Colorado Academic Standards, TS GOLD objectives and student data</li> </ul>	<p>2013-2014 and 2014-2015</p>	<p>Literacy and Math Teacher Coaches, English Language Acquisition Consultant, Principal, TOSA</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers will attend CCLs 3 times per month in oral language/reading, writing or math and study each content area for at least one cycle</li> <li>• Teacher Coaches and ELA consultant and the Principal/TOSA will facilitate CCLs</li> <li>• Teacher Coaches and/or Principal/TOSA will attend Team Planning with teams of teachers once per week</li> <li>• Teacher Coaches and Administrators will monitor and provide feedback through monthly learning walks and informal observations in whole group and small group instruction</li> <li>• Teachers will administer the district Emergent Reading Assessment and Emergent Writing Assessment 3 times per year and use the data to plan small group instruction</li> <li>• Teachers will evaluate Common Formative Assessments to plan for differentiated instruction</li> </ul>	<p>In progress</p>

<p>Individual Professional Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Job-embedded professional learning by Teacher Coaches in literacy and English Language Acquisition</li> </ul>	<p>2013-2014 and 2014-2015</p>	<p>Literacy Teacher Coach, English Language Acquisition Consultant</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher Coaches and Administrators will monitor and provide feedback through monthly learning walks and informal observations</li> <li>ILT will create success criteria for learning walks, build capacity by joining the learning walk and use the data gathered to determine next steps for professional learning.</li> </ul>	<p>In progress</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers will identify and recommend to the RtI team academically at risk P4 students that are not on track for meeting the standard to enter kindergarten in the fall in reading, writing and math</li> </ul>	<p>2013-2014 and 2014-2015</p>	<p>Literacy and Math Teacher Coaches, English Language Acquisition Consultant, Principal, TOSA</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers will complete proficiency charts in oral language/reading, writing and math 3 times per year using a body of evidence.</li> <li>Teachers will take P4 students through the RtI process that are not on track for being ready for kindergarten, including second language learners</li> </ul>	<p>In progress</p>
<p>Resources to Support Professional Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WIDA standards for preschool</li> <li>Model Performance Indicators (MPI)</li> <li>Use exemplars on the APS ECE website to identify proficiency</li> <li>Use the APS ECE ERA and EWA rubrics</li> </ul>		<p>Literacy Teacher Coaches, English Language Acquisition Consultant, Principal, TOSA</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers will evaluate common district assessments as a group to ensure inter-rater reliability and to develop common understandings</li> <li>ILT will analyze data collected for TS GOLD Objectives 9D, 14A and 17A</li> </ul>	<p>In progress</p>

**Section V: Appendices**

Some districts/consortia will need to provide additional forms to document accountability or grant requirements:

- Title I Schoolwide Program (Required)
- Title I Targeted Assistance Program (Required)
- Additional Requirements for Turnaround Status Under State Accountability (Required)