

# LEA Planning Cycle

Hamilton Community Schools  
Hamilton, Michigan, United States  
Date Created - 10/11/2011

Prepared for the Michigan Department of Education

# LEA Planning Cycle

## Table of Contents

1. Goal: Math Proficiency	1
1.1. Objective: Increased math proficiency	2
1.1.1. Strategy: Curriculum alignment/ Curriculum Crafter training	2
1.1.1.1. Activity: Curriculum review	2
1.1.2. Strategy: Intervention planning and monitoring	2
1.1.2.1. Activity: Assessment, Curriculum Alignment and Technology training	3
1.1.3. Strategy: Math interventions	3
1.1.3.1. Activity: Math RtI	4
2. Goal: Reading	5
2.1. Objective: Increased reading proficiency	6
2.1.1. Strategy: Assessment of secondary literacy skills	6
2.1.1.1. Activity: Secondary literacy assessment strategies	6
2.1.2. Strategy: Professional Development with Cognitive Coaching	7
2.1.2.1. Activity: Formative Assessment and Data Management PD	7
2.1.3. Strategy: RtI with Reading Specialist and Literacy Coaches	8
2.1.3.1. Activity: Targeted instruction in reading	8
3. Goal: Writing Proficiency	10
3.1. Objective: Improved writing proficiency	11
3.1.1. Strategy: Improved writing instruction and use of project based learning	11
3.1.1.1. Activity: writing instructional strategies and PD	11
3.1.2. Strategy: Writing across the curriculum; CCSS framework	12
3.1.2.1. Activity: Formative Assessment training	12

# 1. Goal: Math Proficiency

**Content Area:** Math

**Student Goal Statement:** All students will be proficient in math.

**Gap Statement:** Math screener assessments (from OAISD) for grades 1-3 indicate that at least 90% of students are proficient on key math concepts of prior year's grade level, however, over 50% of students are not proficient on key math concepts (GLCEs) of current grade. Analysis of the errors indicated particular difficulty with fractions, decimals and algebraic expressions.

MEAP math tests indicate that most students (over 90-100%) in grades 3-8 are scoring in the proficient range. However, about one-third of those students are scoring in Level 2 and 25-40% of students in grades 4-8 declined in their performance level compared to 2009. Subgroup analysis shows that the group of students with disabilities scores 22-42 proficiency points below their grade level peers in grades 5-8; the disparity between these two groups was 60 points on the MME Mathematics subtest (85% compared to 25% proficient). The group size for students with disabilities was generally around 20 students; the group of students without disabilities was generally around 175 students.

Analysis of performance of economically disadvantaged students shows that this subgroup scored lower than non-economically disadvantaged; the difference varied from 4 to 16 points in grades 3-8; the difference at the 11th grade was 14 points on the MME Math subtest (68% compared to 82%).

**Cause for Gap:** Changes in the grade level content expectations over the past few years in the area of mathematics have required more difficult concepts to be taught at earlier grade levels. The process of making these curriculum and instructional adjustments is in process.

Algebra concepts have been difficult for teachers to teach effectively and for students to understand and apply.

Targeted interventions in the area of mathematics have not been utilized extensively throughout the district.

The taught curriculum is not closely aligned with the assessed curriculum, both in content and in method of assessment.

**Multiple measures/sources of data you used to identify this gap in student achievement:** OAISD Math screeners  
MEAP and MME math tests  
District grade level common assessments

**What are the criteria for success and what data or multiple measures of assessment will be used to monitor progress and success of this goal?** All students at grade levels assessed with OAISD math screeners will be proficient on key grade level concepts.

All students will be proficient on the MEAP and MME math tests.

All students will score at grade level on common district assessments in mathematics.

**Contact Name:** Barb Ferguson

### ***1.1. Objective: Increased math proficiency***

**Measurable Objective Statement to support Goal:** All elementary and middle school students will increase skills in the area of mathematics: the percent of students (including those with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students) scoring at least 80% correct on the MEAP math test will increase by 10 percentage points by the fall of 2013. All high school students will increase skills in the area of mathematics: The percent of high school juniors in reaching the ACT College Readiness benchmark on the Mathematics test will increase by 10 percentage points by the spring of 2013.

#### ***1.1.1. Strategy: Curriculum alignment/ Curriculum Crafter training***

**Strategy Statement:** An audit of the K-12 mathematics curriculum, including learning standards, instructional practices and assessment design, will be completed and revisions to the delivered curriculum implemented during the 2011/12 and 2012/13 school years. Curriculum Crafter, a web-based curriculum mapping and organizational tool, will be utilized to document aligned curriculum and for organization of resources. Training in the use of Curriculum Crafter will be provided in small group settings based on grade level or department requirements.

**Research:** What Works in Schools (Marzano)

Michigan Curriculum Framework

Common Core State Standards

##### ***1.1.1.1. Activity: Curriculum review***

**Activity Description:** Grade level and department groups will work with curriculum consultants to review current learning standards for alignment with Michigan Grade Level Content Expectations, High School Content Standards and Common Core State Standards. Revisions to instructional sequences and grade level curriculum maps will be completed using Curriculum Crafter. Actions steps and timelines for integrating and assessing Common Core standards will be developed.

**Planned staff responsible for implementing activity:** Grade level chairs

Department chairs

Curriculum Director

**Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:**

**Planned Timeline:** Begin Date - 09/07/2011, End Date - 01/18/2013

**Actual Timeline:** Begin Date - , End Date -

#### ***1.1.2. Strategy: Intervention planning and monitoring***

**Strategy Statement:** Teachers will utilize Formative Assessment strategies, including the clear statement of learning goals (e.g., "I can" statements), actionable feedback and progress monitoring to increase student understanding and achievement of

learning goals. Training in formative assessment strategies will be a continued focus of professional development for all teachers in the district during the 2011/2012 school year.

Teachers will use student growth data to review monthly student progress and to identify areas of difficulty for additional instruction.

**Research:** James Popham: Formative Assessment Strategies

OAISD: Delta Math Assessments and connection to grade level content expectations

Robert Marzano: Classroom Strategies that Work

### ***1.1.2.1. Activity: Assessment, Curriculum Alignment and Technology training***

**Activity Type:** Professional Development

**Activity Description:** Training in the areas of formative assessment and cognitive coaching will be completed during the 2011/12 school year. Professional learning teams will be organized by content area to enable greater understanding of the sequencing and scaffolding of instruction.

Teachers will learn how to use Curriculum Crafter as a tool for organizing curriculum resources, including instructional and assessment resources.

Teachers will learn how to use of technologies effectively to increase student engagement and understanding.

**Planned staff responsible for implementing activity:** Building principals, grade level and department chairpersons, curriculum director, technology staff

**Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:**

**Planned Timeline:** Begin Date - 09/07/2011, End Date - 06/06/2012

**Actual Timeline:** Begin Date - , End Date -

### ***1.1.3. Strategy: Math interventions***

**Strategy Statement:** District staff will implement effective, research based strategies to increase students performance on key mathematics concepts (e.g., targeted small group math interventions, after school and summer instruction, professional development). Effectiveness of interventions will be monitored through the collection of student performance data and analyzed by teachers.

A review of the K-12 Math curriculum will be conducted to determine areas for revision. The review will be informed by student performance data and the common core state standards.

Teachers will identify and implement strategies using technology that increase student learning.

**Research:** Assisting Struggling Students with Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle Schools  
Intervention: Houghton Mifflin Mathematics

Classroom Assessment and Grading that Works ? Marzano

"Inside the Black Box: Raising Standards through Classroom Assessment" (Black and Wiliam) ? Phi Delta Kappan (1998)  
Transformative Assessment ? W. James Popham

***1.1.3.1. Activity: Math RtI***

**Activity Description:** Classroom teachers and trained paraprofessionals will implement a program of targeted math interventions in small group settings at least twice a week. Progress will be monitored at least monthly and instructional and organizational adjustments will be made based on analysis of the assessment data.

Building principals will monitor implementation of the program.

Professional development, supported by OAISD math consultants, will be provided for teachers and paraprofessionals to enable selection of appropriate and effective instructional practices and resources.

Intervention resources will be identified and secured.

**Planned staff responsible for implementing activity:** Classroom teachers and paraprofessionals  
Building principals  
Curriculum personnel

**Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:**

**Planned Timeline:** Begin Date - 09/06/2011, End Date - 06/06/2012

**Actual Timeline:** Begin Date - , End Date -

## 2. Goal: Reading

**Content Area:** English Language Arts

**Student Goal Statement:** All students will be proficient in reading.

**Gap Statement:** On the Scholastic Reading Inventory (end of 2010/11 year) 50% of students with disabilities scored below grade level (basic and below basic levels), compared with 17% of all elementary students. Other subgroups (gender, economically disadvantaged) scored in ranges similar to the aggregate groups.

On the DIBELS measures, 17% of kindergartners, 23% of first graders, 24% of second graders and 21% of third graders were below benchmark targets at the end of the 2010/11 school year.

MEAP and MME data analysis indicates a gap between the proficiency levels of students with disabilities and those without disabilities. On the reading test, the difference between these two groups varies by grade level, but ranges from a difference of 20 to 38%. For example, 95-98% of non disabled students scored in the proficient ranges, while 57 to 78% of students with disabilities scored in the proficient range. Differences between those in the economically disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students were not significant.

**Cause for Gap:** A review of students' disabilities indicates that reading comprehension, word study and other English language arts areas are challenging for these students. In addition, the delivered curriculum for these students is not yet closely aligned to the general education curriculum.

Targeted reading interventions for third grade students have begun within the past year and are now in place for all students in kindergarten through third grade.

At the secondary level (middle and high school), students are required to read more difficult informational text in all subject areas. The vocabulary, difficulty level and amount of reading make this a challenge for those who are not proficient and efficient readers.

**Multiple measures/sources of data you used to identify this gap in student achievement:** MEAP and MME

DIBELS measures

Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI)

Classroom assessments, including running records and informal reading inventories

ACT PLAN and EXPLORE

**What are the criteria for success and what data or multiple measures of assessment will be used to monitor progress and success of this goal?** All students will be proficient on reading MEAP and MME. Additionally, success will be evaluated by determining the percent of students scoring 80% or more correct.

All students will be at grade level or above on classroom reading assessments (including running records, IRI)

Students SRI scores will be at grade level or above.

Students DIBELS scores will be at benchmark levels for all measures.

**Contact Name:** Barb Ferguson

## ***2.1. Objective: Increased reading proficiency***

**Measurable Objective Statement to support Goal:** All elementary and middle school students will increase skills in the area of reading (informational and narrative): the percent of non-disabled, disabled and economically disadvantaged students scoring 80% correct or higher on the MEAP reading test will increase by 10 percentage points on the Fall, 2013 MEAP test. The percentage of non-disabled, disabled and economically disadvantaged students scoring at grade level (above Basic) on the Scholastic Reading Inventory will increase by 10 percentage points by the end of the 2012/2013 school year. The percentage of non-disabled, disabled and economically disadvantaged students scoring meeting the ACT College Readiness benchmark will increase by 10 percentage points on the Spring, 2013 ACT/MME test.

### ***2.1.1. Strategy: Assessment of secondary literacy skills***

**Strategy Statement:** A process for assessing the literacy skills of secondary students and a plan for providing additional support, interventions, and instruction will be developed.

**Research:** What Really Matters for Struggling Readers ? Richard Allington  
 The Struggling Reader ? Interventions that Work ? Cooper, Chard, Kiger  
 Integrating Differentiated Instruction and Understanding by Design ? Tomlinson and McTighe  
 Research reports from the US Department of Education Institute of Education Sciences: What Works Clearinghouse:  
 Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades  
 Intervention: Houghton Mifflin Mathematics  
 Research reports and studies from the DIBELS center at the University of Oregon and The Florida Center for Reading Research  
 Classroom Assessment and Grading that Works ? Marzano  
 "Inside the Black Box: Raising Standards through Classroom Assessment" (Black and Wiliam) ? Phi Delta Kappan (1998)  
 Transformative Assessment ? W. James Popham

#### ***2.1.1.1. Activity: Secondary literacy assessment strategies***

**Activity Description:** During the second and third trimesters, students who are having difficulty reading and comprehending core curriculum materials will be identified. Initial assessment using the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) will be used to provide a lexile level. Plans for addressing the needs of the struggling readers will be developed through the Student Assistance Process.

**Planned staff responsible for implementing activity:** Becky Myers, Mat Rehkopf, Doug Braschler

**Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:**

**Planned Timeline:** Begin Date - 11/08/2010, End Date - 03/23/2012



**Actual Timeline:** Begin Date - , End Date -

### ***2.1.2. Strategy: Professional Development with Cognitive Coaching***

**Strategy Statement:** District staff will participate in ongoing, embedded and collegial professional development to support the goal of increased student reading proficiency (e.g.comprehensive and common understanding of effective assessment strategies, data collection and analysis, technology skills needed to utilize data management, integration of technology to meet needs of individual students, effective instructional practices in the area of informational reading and reading strategies in core content areas). Ongoing professional development will be facilitated through professional learning teams. Each of the learning teams will be led by a teacher leader who has been trained in the use of Cognitive Coaching. This approach will support the goal of ongoing, embedded learning within a supportive, professional community.

**Research:** What Really Matters for Struggling Readers ? Richard Allington  
 The Struggling Reader ? Interventions that Work ? Cooper, Chard, Kiger  
 Integrating Differentiated Instruction and Understanding by Design ? Tomlinson and McTighe  
 Research reports from the US Department of Education Institute of Education Sciences: What Works Clearinghouse:  
 Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades  
 Research reports and studies from the DIBELS center at the University of Oregon and The Florida Center for Reading Research  
 Classroom Assessment and Grading that Works ? Marzano  
 "Inside the Black Box: Raising Standards through Classroom Assessment" (Black and Wiliam) ? Phi Delta Kappan (1998)  
 Transformative Assessment ? W. James Popham

#### ***2.1.2.1. Activity: Formative Assesement and Data Management PD***

**Activity Description:** District-wide professional development days, grade level and department sessions will be utilized to provide training in IRIS and PowerSchool data management systems for all professional staff.

Cross grade and level teacher groups will study and implement effective instructional practices to increase informational reading skills in core areas.

District wide professional days and building staff sessions will provide training and collegial instruction about effective assessment practices to build a common understanding of balanced assessment (formative and summative).

Professional Learning Team coaches will complete Cognitive Coaching Training.

Teachers will be trained in the use of Curriculum Crafter for curriculum development and organization, as well as resource development.

**Planned staff responsible for implementing activity:** District School Improvement team leaders: Sarah Geukes, Chad Miller, Brianne Schuitemann, Doug Braschler, Scott Smith, Barb Ferguson  
 Grade level and deparment chairpersons  
 District Professional staff

**Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:**

**Planned Timeline:** Begin Date - 08/24/2011, End Date - 06/06/2012

**Actual Timeline:** Begin Date - , End Date -

### ***2.1.3. Strategy: RtI with Reading Specialist and Literacy Coaches***

**Strategy Statement:** District staff will implement effective, research based strategies to increase student performance in informational reading in their small group RtI reading intervention programs, summer school programs, after school programs and parent involvement activities. District staff will monitor student progress through the implementation of effective assessment and data analysis processes. Instructional standards in the Common Core State Standards in the area of informational reading will be aligned with the curriculum. The district Reading Specialist will oversee the RtI reading interventions, monitor the assessment and data collection and determine the need for additional resources and training. The building literacy coaches will implement the RtI strategies as developed by the Reading Specialist.

**Research:** What Really Matters for Struggling Readers ? Richard Allington

The Struggling Reader ? Interventions that Work ? Cooper, Chard, Kiger

Integrating Differentiated Instruction and Understanding by Design ? Tomlinson and McTighe

Research reports from the US Department of Education Institute of Education Sciences: What Works Clearinghouse:

Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades

Intervention: Houghton Mifflin Mathematics

Research reports and studies from the DIBELS center at the University of Oregon and The Florida Center for Reading Research

Classroom Assessment and Grading that Works ? Marzano

"Inside the Black Box: Raising Standards through Classroom Assessment" (Black and Wiliam) ? Phi Delta Kappan (1998)

Transformative Assessment ? W. James Popham

#### ***2.1.3.1. Activity: Targeted instruction in reading***

**Activity Description:** Targeted instruction in whole and small group settings will be provided by classroom teachers at elementary and middle school level. Core reading program resources (eg. Pearson Reading Street, Macomb genre units, Comprehension Tool Kit) and core content resources will be utilized.

Daily reading intervention instruction (RtI model) using a variety of materials to meet specific needs (e.g.,phonemic awareness, fluency, decoding)will be provided at the elementary level by literacy coaches, classroom teachers and trained paraprofessionals. Program will be overseen by district level RtI coordinator.

Targeted small group reading instruction will be provided at the middle school level by building level RtI coordinator and English Language Arts teachers.

Consulting and coaching to support reading intervention planning and assessment provided by intervention specialist and ISD consultants.

Coordination of reading and writing instruction and practice will be implemented at each grade level through quarterly team meetings of instructional staff.

**Planned staff responsible for implementing activity:** RtI coordinators

Building literacy coaches: to be determined

Classroom teachers and paraprofessionals: assigned by building.

Curriculum personnel

**Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:** Kathy Newhouse and Katie Mulder

Craig Hoekstra and Barb Ferguson

Literacy coaches and paraprofessionals TBD

**Planned Timeline:** Begin Date - 09/06/2011, End Date - 06/06/2012

**Actual Timeline:** Begin Date - , End Date -

### 3. Goal: Writing Proficiency

**Content Area:** English Language Arts

**Student Goal Statement:** All students will demonstrate proficiency in writing.

**Gap Statement:** Performance of students on the writing tests on past MEAP and MME tests has consistently been lower than other MEAP and MME subtests. In 2010, 91% of fourth grade students were proficient in reading, while writing proficiency rates for the same students was 64%; 7th and 11th grade students followed a similar pattern (92% proficient in reading and 77% in writing for 7th graders; 82% and 66%, respectively for 11th graders). The performance of students with disabilities is lower on the writing test compared to those without disabilities. In 2008, the comparisons between the two groups demonstrate the difference: 56%/78% (4th grade), 56%/78% (5th grade), 59%/91% (6th grade), 54%/86% (7th grade), 58%/91% (8th grade). In 2010/11, 29% of 4th graders with disabilities were proficient on the MEAP writing test, while 69% of non-disabled students were proficient. Comparative scores for 7th graders were 44% and 79%; for 11th graders the disparity was greater: 15% and 72%.

The proficiency level of economically disadvantaged students on the MEAP and MME writing tests were lower than the non-economically disadvantaged students, although the difference varied considerably. In 4th grade 55% of disadvantaged students were proficient in writing compared to 69% of non-disadvantaged students. Seventh grade comparisons: 71% and 79%; Eleventh grade comparisons: 52% and 70%.

**Cause for Gap:** Written expression is a complex task that is difficult for students with disabilities in the area of English Language Arts. Although these students are better able to express their ideas verbally, the task of organizing and writing their thoughts is a challenging one.

Writing instruction at the elementary level has more often focused on narrative rather than informational writing.

The amount of instructional time devoted to writing instruction and the practice of writing has been inconsistent.

Vocabulary and language development of economically disadvantaged students has been found to be lower in studies of early language learning.

**Multiple measures/sources of data you used to identify this gap in student achievement:** District writing samples with scoring rubrics

MEAP and MME writing tests

Common classroom assessments

**What are the criteria for success and what data or multiple measures of assessment will be used to monitor progress and success of this goal?** All students will be proficient on MEAP and MME writing tests.

All students will score within grade level benchmarks on district writing samples, based on a common rubric.

**Contact Name:** Barb Ferguson

### ***3.1. Objective: Improved writing proficiency***

**Measurable Objective Statement to support Goal:** All elementary and middle school students (including those with disabilities) will increase their proficiency level on the writing test of the MEAP by 15 percentage points by the fall of 2012 in grade levels tested.

All high school students (including those who are economically disadvantaged) will increase their proficiency level on the writing test of the MME by 15 percentage points by the spring of 2013.

#### ***3.1.1. Strategy: Improved writing instruction and use of project based learning***

**Strategy Statement:** District staff will implement writing instruction that includes research-based instructional practices for writing in core subject areas (eg., 6+1 Writing Traits, writing workshop, informational writing in all core areas, development of common rubrics for core areas, professional development, use of multimedia for development and presentation). A project based learning format will be utilized to support cross curricular integration, critical thinking skills, and increased student interest in writing.

**Research:** 6+1 Writing traits - Ruth Culham

Formative Assessment - James Popham

Writing Essentials -

21st Century Skills Collaborative

##### ***3.1.1.1. Activity: writing instructional strategies and PD***

**Activity Description:** Review curriculum maps to assure alignment to content expectations and adequate allocation of instructional time for writing.

Provide a variety of instructional interventions, including co-teaching and flexible grouping.

Integrate writing activities across all subject areas.

Increase engagement in writing by including greater choice and variety of writing topics during instruction.

Provide professional development for all teachers on effective writing instruction, including review of 6+1 writing traits, informational writing in core areas, and use of technology (including multimedia).

Increase teacher knowledge and use of formative assessments to measure progress more frequently and to target instruction and interventions.

Review and revise common assessments and grade level writing rubrics to measure growth at all grade levels.

Investigate the use of technology to increase the effectiveness of instruction and engagement, and to collect and analyze

data on student growth.

**Planned staff responsible for implementing activity:** Classroom teachers

Building principals

Literacy coaches

ELA department chairs

District School Improvement team

**Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:**

**Planned Timeline:** Begin Date - 09/06/2011, End Date - 06/06/2012

**Actual Timeline:** Begin Date - , End Date -

### ***3.1.2. Strategy: Writing across the curriculum; CCSS framework***

**Strategy Statement:** Teachers in all areas of the curriculum will incorporate vocabulary development and writing activities into their instruction. Teachers will use graphic organizers to support the thinking, planning and organization of writing for all students, including those with disabilities. Formative assessment strategies will be used to determine if students are making progress toward learning goals and to provide feedback to students. Feedback will be actionable and directly related to the learning goal. Use of Common Core State Standards for writing in all subject areas will be used to provide a framework for instruction and assessment.

**Research:** James Popham: Formative Assessment

David Hyerle: Thinking Maps

Robert Marzano: Classroom Strategies that Work

#### ***3.1.2.1. Activity: Formative Assessment training***

**Activity Description:** Teachers will continue training in the use of Formative Assessment strategies to measure student progress on learning goals, to provide actionable feedback to students, and to increase student achievement. Emphasis will be on learning to provide effective feedback within the Formative Assessment process. The yearlong training will be structured within professional learning communities. The Cognitive Coaching model will be used to facilitate the work of these learning communities. Training in the Cognitive Coaching model will be provided by the Center for Cognitive Coaching. Study of the Common Core State Standards will be completed at each level (elementary, middle, high school) to provide a framework for the development of writing skills and rubrics for common assessments.

**Planned staff responsible for implementing activity:** District School Improvement team (Core leadership team includes: Chad Miller, Sarah Geukes, Brianne Schuitemann, Doug Braschler, Scott Smith, Barb Ferguson)

**Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:**

**Planned Timeline:** Begin Date - 09/06/2011, End Date - 06/06/2012

**Actual Timeline:** Begin Date - , End Date -