Carson City School District Turnaround Plan

Carson Middle School 2011-12

District Turnaround Plan			
Date: August 18, 2011			
District: Carson City School District			
School Name: Carson Middle School			
Grades Served: 6-8			
School Location Number: 301			
School Address: 1140 West King Street			
City/State/ZIP: Carson City, NV 89703			
Phone:	none: 775-283-2800		
Fax:	775-283-2890		

Individuals Responsible for the Development of the Plan

The Local Educational Agency (LEA) is responsible for the development of the Turnaround Plan [NRS 385.3745 Sec. 18(a)(1)]. Therefore, Turnaround team membership must include at least 1 District-level representative who is responsible for plan oversight.

Name	Position
Richard Stokes	CCSD Superintendent
Susan Keema	Associate Superintendent of Educational Services
Jose Delfin	Associate Superintendent of Human Resources
Ricky Medina	District Statistician
Dr. Steven Pradere	District Grants and Special Projects Manager
Dan Sadler	School Principal
Jeremy Lewis	Department Chair, ELA
Gail Herbert	Department Chair, P.E.
Lisa Stocke	Department Chair, Career Technical Education
Kathy Dilger	Department Chair, Social Studies
Marjorie Rispin	Department Chair, Science
Sonia Zacharias	Department Chair, Special Education
Kim Whisler	Department Chair, Math
Susan Hoffman	CMS Teacher
Susan Roman	CMS Parent

For NDE Use Only

Approval Status:

NDE Comments:

Date:

Community Notifications Required for Turnaround (Attach ALL required notifications and relevant documentation as available):Notice to Parents and Teachers Informing the CommunityNA - In Needs Improvement Year 2

INA - In Needs improvement Teal 2
Staff Meeting – September 6 th , 2011. First CMS Parent
Newsletter - September 2011
First CMS Parent Newsletter – September 2011
Principal's Coffee Hour – first Tuesday of each month.
Family Engagement Night – first Tuesday of each month.
PTA will be informed at the September 2011 meeting
Achievement notification will be placed on the CMS website
NA

TURNAROUND PLAN COMPONENTS

Step I - Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Identify and Analyze a variety of data elements in the areas of **Curriculum and Instruction**, **Assessment and Accountability**, **and Leadership** that are relevant to the operation and governance of the school and have caused the school to reach the

Turnaround stage. [The School Longitudinal Data Profile and a summary report of the Nevada Comprehensive Curriculum Audit Tool for Schools (NCCAT-S) are required. Additional examples of data to consider include: AYP Reports, District Audit Reports, CRT Data, Interim Assessments, Survey Data, School Improvement Plans, Accountability Reports, SST Reports (e.g. November 1st Reports, Quarterly Reports, End of the Year Reports), School and Curriculum Audits, School Schedules, etc.]

I A. Data Element	I B. Data Analysis		
Identify data sources and attach relevant documents.	Identify the trends that significantly contributed to the school's failure to make AYP.		
School Longitudinal Data Profile - REQUIRED	 During the 2010-11 school year, Carson Middle School made AYP in mathematics. They did not make AYP in English Language Arts. Making AYP in mathematics changed the CMS AYP designation from "Year 4 Needs Improvement" to "Year 2 Needs Improvement." Identification options for ethnic groups changed which skews longitudinal data within subgroups. Categories added were: Two or More Races and Pacific Islander NDE revised ELA assessment cut scores from the previous year. State-wide reading 		

TURNAROUND PLAN COMPONENTS						
Step I - Comprehensive Needs Assessment						
Identify and Analyze a variety of data elements in the areas of Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment and Accountability,						
and Leadership that are relevant to the operation and governance of the school and have caused the school to reach the						
Turnaround stage. [The School Longitud	Turnaround stage. [The School Longitudinal Data Profile and a summary report of the Nevada Comprehensive Curriculum Audit Tool for Schools (NCCAT-S) are required. Additional					
examples of data to consider include: AYP Reports November 1st Reports, Quarterly Reports, End of	s, District Audit Reports, CRT Data, Interim Assessments, Survey Data, School Improvement Plans, Accountability Reports, SST Reports (e.g. the Year Reports), School and Curriculum Audits, School Schedules, etc.]					
	scores declined approximately 20%.					
	 In ELA, the percent of proficient students in each subpopulation were as follows: School (60.64%), American Indian/Native American (48.15%), Asian (87.50%), Hispanic/Latino 					
	(49.00%), White/Caucasian (68.45%), Two or More Races (72.73), IEP (26.88%), LEP					
	(41.67%), and FRL (46.29%).					
	 In ELA, the School (60.64%), Hispanic/Latino (49.00%), LEP (41.67) and FRL (46.29%) made AYP by appeal. 					
 In ELA, the IEP (26.88%) did not make their target of 63.80%. 						
	 In ELA historically, the PAC rate for the IEP subpopulation has been low. 					
	• In mathematics, the percent of proficient students in all subpopulations increased from the					
previous year except the American Indian/Alaskan Native group.						
	 In mathematics, the percent of proficient students in each subpopulation were as follows: School (83.30%), American Indian/Native American (62.96%), Asian (100%), Hispanic/Latino (77.31%), White/Caucasian (88.13%), IEP (59.42%), LEP (73.24%), and FRL (75.78%). 					
NCCAT-S Summary Report- Required	 The NCCAT-S process requires the analysis of various sources of data. Some data sources were already available and in use; others were already available but not in use; others had to be collected and/or organized. Based on careful analysis of the data, the following indicators were identified for potential inclusion in next year's restructuring plan based on the needs of the school and high index scores: Indicator 1.2 – All instructional staff members deliver the standards-based curriculum to every student. Indicator 1.4 – All instructional staff members routinely collaborate to review the impact of instructional staff members analyze assessment results from local and state vendors. Results are used to refocus or modify instruction at the school and classroom levels to ensure that all students meet or exceed proficiency. Indicator 2.3 – All instructional staff members use progress monitoring, grading, and/or reporting procedures that are standards-based to inform students and parents of student academic progress. Indicator 2.4 – All instructional staff members continually provide specific and timely 					

TURNAROUND PLAN COMPONENTS				
Step I - Comprehensive Needs Assessment				
<u>Identify and Analyze</u> a variety of data elements in the areas of Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment and Accountability, and Leadership that are relevant to the operation and governance of the school and have caused the school to reach the				
examples of data to consider include: AYP Reports	nal Data Profile and a summary report of the Nevada Comprehensive Curriculum Audit Tool for Schools (NCCAT-S) are required. Additional , District Audit Reports, CRT Data, Interim Assessments, Survey Data, School Improvement Plans, Accountability Reports, SST Reports (e.g. he Year Reports), School and Curriculum Audits, School Schedules, etc.]			
	feedback to students. This feedback should help improve their performance.			
	• The above indicators are all dependent on the establishment of a guaranteed and viable curriculum for all subjects and grade levels.			
	• The NCCAT-S Process helped identify the needs of all teachers to focus on the development of common formative assessments aligned to state standards. Common Unit of Instruction tied to the assessments would serve as the basis for delivery of standards based instruction. The Common Units of Instruction and assessment results derived from the Common Assessments would provide an opportunity for teachers to collaborate during PLC meetings on both instruction and the use of results to modify instruction and provide both interventions and acceleration.			
Measures of Academic Progress Growth Analysis Program Results	 In Reading, the percent of students who met their projected growth targets (measured using MAP assessment results) by grade level is as follows: 6th grade (51.6%), 7th grade (55.4%), and 8th grade (44.4%). In Math, the percent of students who met their projected growth targets (measured using MAP assessment results) by grade level is as follows: 6th grade (59.3%), 7th grade (52.3%), and 9th grade (50.4%). 			
8 th Grade Writing Results	 and 8th grade (59.1%). On the 8th grade writing assessment, 61.3%% of 8th graders were proficient. A decrease of 2.6% from the 2009-10 school year (64.9%). 			
SST Quarterly Reports	 The following accomplishments were noted in the final 2009-10 SST Quarterly Report: The PDC trainers, site administrators, district administrators, regional PDC trainers worked collaboratively as T4S data was collected, reviewed, and shared with staff. The math trainer and the principal walked through all math classrooms in one day and then referenced the standards to identify the rigor of the content being taught. The district had an organized process for unwrapping the curriculum audit document. All licensed personnel gave input and all data was presented to the SST. There was a significant increase in teacher performance with respect to the T4S document. Significant growth was made in areas of student engagement and posting of objectives. 			
	 The following concerns or barriers were noted in the final SST Quarterly Report: Staff needs to continue work on their presentation of key vocabulary and formative assessment, as per T4S data. 			

TURNAROUND PLAN COMPONENTS				
IDKNARCOUND FLAN COMPONENTS Step I - Comprehensive Needs Assessment Identify and Analyze a variety of data elements in the areas of Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment and Accountability, and Leadership that are relevant to the operation and governance of the school and have caused the school to reach the Turnaround stage. [The School Longitudinal Data Profile and a summary report of the Nevada Comprehensive Curriculum Audit Tool for Schools (NCCAT-S) are required. Additional examples of data to consider include: AYP Reports, District Audit Reports, CRT Data, Interim Assessments, Survey Data, School Improvement Plans, Accountability Reports, SST Reports (e.g. November 1st Reports, Quarterly Reports, End of the Year Reports), School and Curriculum Audits, School Schedules, etc.] O Setting time aside each week to conduct walkthroughs. • The final SST Quarterly Report also stated, "This school has come a long way during the past two years. They should be commended for their efforts."				
Step II - Inquiry Process <u>Identify</u> the Priority Concerns, Root Causes, and Solutions from the data sources listed above that significantly contributed to the school's identification for turnaround and led to the development of this Turnaround Plan. This should be a plan that looks at the operation and governance of the school. Attach relevant documents, i.e. charts, graphs, profiles.				
II A. District Priority Concerns Based on the analysis of the Comprehensive Needs Assessment, identify priority concerns focused on the areas of Curriculum and Instruction, assessment and Accountability, and/or Leadership that led to the failure of the school to make AYP.	II B. Root Causes Identify the root cause(s) of the concern relative to the school's Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment and Accountability, and/or Leadership that led to the failure to make AYP and resulted in the need for this Turn Around Plan.	II C. District Solutions Identify solutions selected by the LEA that focus on the school's Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment and Accountability, and/or Leadership and have substantial promise of improving academic achievement, enabling the school to make AYP this year and in the future.		
 Delivery of the standards-based curriculum to all students is inconsistent (Indicator 1.2, There is a need for a guaranteed and viable curriculum) Collaboration to review the impact of instructional strategies and to modify instruction accordingly can be improved (Indicator 1.4, Common Units of Instruction and Common Assessments would facilitate collaboration during PLC meetings. Staff's ability to analyze results from a variety of assessments and to use the results to refocus or modify instruction 	 The standards are broad in scope and not interpreted by all teachers in the same manner The standards have not been prioritized and/or sequenced Teachers are not in agreement as to what needs to be taught, to what extent, and what time frame Many classroom assessments are not standards-based and lack rigor Classroom assessments are inconsistent from classroom to classroom at the same grade level Interpretations of "proficient" and "non-proficient" are inconsistent among 	 Curriculum Standards for all areas will be "unwrapped" Power Standards will be identified Key Concepts and Skills will be identified Graphic Organizers for "Unwrapped" Concepts and Skills will be developed Big Ideas will be identified Essential Questions will be identified Assessment Common Formative Assessments will be developed		
to ensure that all students meet or exceed proficiency at the school and classroom level is lacking or not	classroomsData is not consistent among	 Common Formative Pre-assessments will be developed, reviewed, and 		

possible (Indicator 1.5, Common Formative Pre- and Post-assessments would address this issue)

- Progress monitoring, grading, and/or reporting procedures to inform students and parents of academic progress is not being utilized (Indicator 2.3, Common Formative Pre- and Post-assessments would also address this issue)
- Specific and timely feedback to students on an ongoing basis, and students use of the feedback to improve performance, needs improvement (Indicator 2.4, Common Formative Pre- and Post-assessment, Common Units of Instruction, and Effective Instructional Strategies would address this issue).

classrooms which hinders collaboration and sharing during PLC meetings

- Units of Study is inconsistent with classrooms
- Because Units of Study are inconsistent, teachers are unable to collaborate, share ideas about interventions for struggling students and acceleration for advanced students at PLC meetings
- Pre-assessments are not being utilized to maximize instructional time on curriculum that has yet to be mastered
- Because pre- and post-assessments are not being utilized consistently, teachers are not fully able to track what key skills and concepts have been mastered through instruction
- The alignment of classroom assessments with state CRT's and district's MAP results is inconsistent
- The refinement of classroom assessments is inconsistent

revised.

- Common Formative Post-assessments will be developed, reviewed, and revised.
- Collaborative Scoring Guides (Rubrics) will be developed, reviewed, and revised.

Common Formative Pre-assessments will be administered and scored

- Common Formative Pre-assessments will be administered.
- Common Formative Pre-assessments will be scored.
- S.M.A.R.T. Goals will be set.

Instruction

Differentiated Instruction will be planned and delivered

- Units of Instruction will be designed (Effective teaching strategies will be selected beginning with the end in mind)
- Plans for Interventions and Acceleration will be designed (Effective teaching strategies will be selected)
- Performance Assessments will be developed, reviewed, and revised.
- Units of Instruction will be taught (Plans for Interventions and Acceleration will be used)
- Performance Assessments will be administered
- Instruction will be monitored, reflected on, and adjusted as needed
- Students will have at least two opportunities to reach mastery and the

 classroom teacher will provide interventions and enrichment opportunities to students in order to assist all students to grow in the content area (the classroom teacher takes the primary responsibility for students meeting unit mastery on each unit of study). Instructional success will be measured by the percentage of students who have met mastery in identified strands for each unit.
 Common Formative Post-assessments will be administered and scored Common Formative Post- Assessments will be administered Common Formative Post- Assessments will be scored Common Formative Post-Assessment data will be charted Common Formative Post-Assessment data will be Collaboratively Analyzed Common Formative Post-assessment results will be compared Performance assessments will be collaboratively scored.
 Common Pre- and Post-assessments will be refined Common Formative Post-assessment results will be compared to District MAP results Common Formative Post-assessment results will be compared to State CRT results Common Formative Pre- and Post- assessments will be checked for

 quality Common Formative Pre- and Post- assessments will be refined as necessary Leadership
 Learning guides: Learning guides will be developed, reviewed, and shared with students prior to the start of each unit. The learning guides will define mastery and teachers will refer to those guides through-out the unit. Specific feedback on progress toward mastery must be provided to students throughout the unit so that students can make adjustments and be able to demonstrate mastery at the end of the unit.
 Professional Learning Communities (PLC's): PLC team members share unit instructional goals connecting those results to post assessment learning targets PLC team members share progress of students throughout the unit PLC teams share post assessment results and discuss instruction and interventions as needed. Teachers provide classroom interventions to students who have not met mastery in the unit of study.
Administrators: Work directly with PLC teams monitoring focus on learner performance

	Learning and class to suppo in each o • Administ chairs to	rators triangulate data from guides, Post assessments, sroom walkthroughs in order rt improvement of instruction lassroom. rators work with department enhance student nce within the department.
--	---	--

Step III - Master Plan Design The Master Plan Design is designed to improve the academic achievement of the pupils enrolled in the school and have substantial

	promise of ensuring that the school makes AYP this year and in the future. In this section, the LEA must select a Turnaround				
	Option (III A) and develop a School Turnaround Plan that identifies the Goals, Measurable Objectives, and respective Action Steps				
	the supporting information and data.				
	III A. Turnaround Option – Per NRS 385.3745 and based on the conclusions formed from the information above, districts are required to carry				
out a	plan of Turnaround that includes selecting at least one of the following options:				
	[Nevada Option a] Replace all or most of the staff who are relevant to failure of the school making AYP;				
	[Nevada Option b] Enter into a contract with an entity, such as a management company, with a demonstrated record of				
	effectiveness to operate the public school;				
	[Nevada Option c] Request that NDE oversee the operation of the school, if agreed to by NDE; or				
	[Nevada Option d] Nevada Option d only applies to schools where the NDE is responsible for Turnaround as the LEA.				
Ŋ	INevada Option e] Take any other action to restructure the governance of the school. Actions designed to improve the academic achievement of the pupils enrolled in the school and has substantial promise of ensuring that the school makes AYP. (Under this option, NDE requires that the LEA changes the governance structure of the school in a significant manner that either diminishes school-based management and decision making or increases control, monitoring, and oversight of the school's operations and educational program by the LEA)				
	In addition to what is defined under Option e above, the following examples may constitute "any other action to turn around the governance of the school."				
	 Close the school and reopen as a focus or theme school with new staff or staff skilled in the focus area (e.g., math and science, dual language, communication arts); 				
	 Reconstitute the school into smaller autonomous learning communities (e.g., school-within-a-school model, learning academies, etc.); 				
	 Dissolve the school and assign students to other schools in the district; 				
	 Pair the school in Turnaround with a higher performing school so that K-3 grades from both schools are together and the 4-5 grades from both schools are together; or 				
	 Expand or narrow the grades served, for example, narrowing a K-8 school to a K-5 elementary school. 				

Step III B. School Turnaround Plan

Directions - Use for the following chart below.

- Develop no more than 2 <u>Turnaround Plan Goals</u>. Based upon data obtained from NCCAT-S results, each goal must address one of the following as an area of focus: <u>Curriculum and Instruction</u>, <u>Assessment and Accountability</u>, or <u>Leadership</u>.
- 2) Provide <u>Rationale for Goal</u> as supported by the Priority Concerns, Root Causes, and District Solutions identified in the Inquiry Process.
- 3) State no more than 3 Measurable Objective(s) for each Turnaround Plan Goal.
- 4) Describe the <u>Action Steps</u> that will change the operation and governance of the school in order to increase student achievement in areas currently identified as not meeting AYP.
- 5) Specify the <u>Timelines</u> for implementing each action step.
- 6) Describe the <u>Resources</u>, including district personnel as well as funding sources, available to the school to carry out the plan.
- 7) Identify the Evidence to be collected by Area/Division to document implementation of the action step.
- 8) List <u>District/Area/School Staff Responsible</u> for ensuring the action step is carried-out.

Goal 1 – Select an area of focus: Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment and Accountability, or Leadership Turnaround Plan Goal 1: In all areas, all teachers will use collaboratively designed Common Units of Instruction that are aligned with Common Formative Pre- and Post-assessments which measure the entire scope of a guaranteed and viable standards-based curriculum.

Rationale for Goal (as supported by Inquiry Process): In order to fully deliver standards-based instruction, teachers must have access to a guaranteed and viable standards based curriculum. Therefore, standards in all areas must be "unwrapped" to determine what key concepts and skills need to be taught, to what extent they need to be taught, and when they need to be taught. This will allow teachers to develop assessments that measure the entire scope of the guaranteed and viable curriculum. Common Units of Instruction will be collaboratively built around these assessments during PLC meetings. This will ensure full coverage of the guaranteed and viable curriculum. Once the Common Units of Instruction are put into practice in the classroom, teachers will be able to collaborate and use assessment data to make data informed decisions that will lead to better differentiation and more focused instruction.

Measurable Objective 1: 2011-12 Pre-Post Assessment data will be refined and analyzed in order to provide enrichment or academic interventions to students.

Action Step	Timeline	Resource Allocation &	Evidence	Person(s) Responsible
Describe the turnaround action that will increase student achievement in areas currently identified as not meeting AYP.	Identify the timelines for implementing the action step.	Reallocation Include all types of resources (e.g., district personnel, funding sources, etc.) available to the school and necessary for implementing the action step.	Evidence the District/Area will use to document implementation and measure the results of the action step.	Identify District and School staff responsible for the action step and timeline.

Common Pre- and Post-assessments will be refined • Common Formative Post- assessment results will be compared to District MAP	 Comparisons of Common Formative Post-assessments and District MAP results (both Fall and Spring) will be completed by June 30th, 2012. Comparisons of 	 Common Core Standards Rubicon Atlas CCSD District K-2 Vocabulary Assessment District Adopted Math/ELA Materials 	Common Formative Post-assessment and MAP Comparison Report Common Formative Post-assessment and State CRT Comparison Report Common Formative	 School Leadership Team Site Department Chairs Director of Grants & Special Projects, Dr. Steven Pradere District Statistician
 Common Formative Post- assessment results will be compared to State CRT results Common Formative Pre- and Post- assessments will be checked for quality Common Formative Pre- and Post- assessments will be refined as necessary 	 Post-assessments and State CRT results will be completed by June 30th, 2012. Checks for quality will be take place during the summer of 2012 and will be completed prior to the start of school the following year. Refinements will be made after checks for quality are completed and before the start of school the following year. 	 Professional Development Days Professional Learning Communities (PLC) Common Assessment Workshop time/Professional Development Center/June Criterion Reference Test (CRT) Item Specifications Traits Writing Scoring Rubric NWEA Measure of Academic Progress (MAP) Data 	assessments Quality Report Copies of Refined Common Formative Pre- and Post- assessments	Assessment Dr. Rick Medina • Associate Superintendent of Educational Services Susan Keema Note: School Leadership Team means: • Principal, Dan Sadler • Assistant Principal, Gavin Ward • Dean of Students, Mike Walker

instruction using effect Action Step Describe the turnaround action that will increase student achievement in areas currently identified as not meeting AYP.	Timeline Identify the timelines for implementing the action step.	Resource Allocation & Reallocation Include all types of resources (e.g., district personnel, funding sources, etc.) available to the school and necessary for implementing the action step.	Evidence Evidence the District/Area will use to document implementation and measure the results of the action step.	Person(s) Responsible Identify District and School staff responsible for the action step and timeline.
 Differentiated Instruction will be planned and delivered Units of Instruction will be designed (Effective teaching strategies will be selected) Plans for Interventions and Acceleration will be designed (Effective teaching strategies will be selected) Performance Assessments will be developed Units of Instruction will be taught (Plans for Interventions and Acceleration will be used) Performance Assessments will be used) Performance Assessments will be used) Performance Assessments will be used) Instruction will be administered Instruction will be 	The focus of the school year will be on the development of Units of Study, the collaborative scoring/ analysis of assessment results. and the ongoing development, review, and revision of assessments during PLCs. • After each Common Formative Pre- Assessment information is shared amongst teachers in the common PLC. Prior to administering Post Assessment teachers will share student progress toward goals on post assessment. Intermediate PLC meetings will be devoted to developing Units of Instruction, Plans for Interventions	 Common Core Standards Rubicon Atlas CCSD District K-2 Vocabulary Assessment District Adopted Math/ELA Materials Supplementary Reading/math materials Carson City Community Agencies (Guest Speakers) District Designated Early Release & Development Days Professional Learning Communities (PDC) Faculty Meetings 	 Unit of Instruction Plans Interventions and Acceleration Plans Copies of Performance Assessments Classroom Observation Reports Coaching Logs 	 School Leadership Team Site Department Chairs Director of Grants & Special Projects, Dr. Steven Pradere Associate Superintendent of Educational Services Susan Keema Note: School Leadership Team means: Principal, Dan Sadler Assistant Principal, Gavin Ward Dean of Students, Mike Walker

monitored, reflected on, and adjusted as needed	 and Acceleration, and Performance Assessments. At the conclusion Post Assessment results will be reviewed and interventions planned for students who have not met mastery. All Units of Instruction, Plans for Interventions and Acceleration, and Performance Assessments will be used in the classroom beginning the 2011- 2012 school year. Classroom and PLC observations will be conducted regularly. Observation results will be shared with District Office personnel once every two weeks beginning the second week of school. 	 Teach for Success Protocol(T4S) PLC Protocol Instructional Consultation Team(IC) Thinking Maps Instructional Consultation Team (IC) Extended Day Remediation School Schedule - ACE 21st Century After School Programming. 		
Common Formative assessments will be administered and scored • Common Formative assessments will be administered • Common Formative assessments will	 The assessment window for each Common Formative assessment will be set after each assessment is completed. Each Common Formative assessment will be scored (this applies to 	 Common Core Standards CCSD District K-12 Vocabulary Assessment District Designated Early Release & Development Days Professional Learning Communities (PDC) 	 Common Formative Pre-assessment Calendar Common Formative Pre-assessments Charts Observation reports from PLC meetings where results are Collaboratively Analyzed 	 School Leadership Team Site Department Chairs Director of Grants & Special Projects, Dr. Steven Pradere Associate Superintendent of Educational Services Susan Keema

	1			
 be scored Common Formative assessment data will be Collaboratively Analyzed S.M.A.R.T. Goals will be set 	 selected response questions) and the data will be shared at the next PLC meeting. S.M.A.R.T. Goals will be set at the conclusion of each PLC meeting. 	 Faculty Meetings District/Site Calendars 	 Lists of S.M.A.R.T. Goals Coaching Logs 	Note: School Leadership Team means: • Principal, Dan Sadler • Assistant Principal, Gavin Ward • Dean of Students, Mike Walker
School Governance All CMS certified staff will be evaluated on Domain III Instruction and Assessment	 School Governance: Review of Domain III will occur during pre-observation conference planning. April 1, 2012 All probationary staff will be evaluated May 1, 2012 All non- probationary staff will be evaluated 	 School Governance Evaluation Program: <i>Framework for</i> <i>Effective Teaching,</i> Charlotte Danielson Director Professional Development, Laurel Terry OCEA Officer, Gaylea Manning 	School Governance: • Human Resources check off list of evaluated CMS staff	 School Governance: Principal, Dan Sadler Assistant Principal, Gavin Ward Dean of Students, Mike Walker Associate Superintendent, Jose Delfin

Dept. Chairs will conduct classroom walkthroughs focusing on T4S elements and implementation of instruction related to the unit model. Observations to take place at least one time per quarter.	 School Leadership Team Site Dept. Chairs WNRPDP (Kirsten Odegard) District Statistician (Ricky Medina) Identified District T4S Walkthrough Element Dr. Steven Pradere T4S Walkthrough Observation data and notes gathered to be shared at PLC's 	 Principal, Dan Sadler Assistant Principal, Gavin Ward Dean of Students, Mike Walker Director of Grants & Special Projects, Dr. Steven Pradere Associate Superintendent of Educational Services Susan Keema
---	--	--

Step IV – Monitoring and Evaluating Implementation of School Turnaround Plan

The Monitoring and Evaluation Plan provides a mechanism for the appropriate district personnel to systematically monitor and evaluate the implementation of the Turnaround plan. During Step IV, it is the responsibility of the district to keep the Turnaround plan focused – ensuring that the action steps are implemented and monitored and that consistent evaluation relative to improvement and student achievement takes place.

	improvement and student achievement takes place.						
Action Steps Describe the turnaround action that will change the governance of the school in order to increase student achievement in areas currently identified as not meeting AYP. (Same as steps in Turnaround Plan).	Timeline & Benchmarks Identify Timeline for Implementing action steps/activities and benchmarks to be met toward accomplishing these action steps.	Responsible District Staff Identify District staff responsible for monitoring/evaluating the action steps/activities and timeline for administering Technical Assistance/Consequences for school if turnaround timelines/benchmarks are not met.	Documentation of Implementation Identify Evidence to be collected by District/Area to document implementation of activity.				
 Common Pre- and Post- assessments will be refined Common Formative Pre- and Post-assessment results will be compared to District MAP results Common Formative Pre- and Post-assessment results will be compared to State CRT results Common Formative Pre- and Post-assessments will be checked for quality Common Formative Pre- and Post-assessments will be refined as necessary 	 Comparisons of Common Formative Pre- and Post- assessments and District MAP results (both Fall and Spring) will be completed by June 30th, 2012. Comparisons of Common Formative Pre- and Post- assessments and State CRT results will be completed by August 30th, 2012. Ricky Please check this. Checks for quality will be take place during the summer of 2012 and will be completed prior to the start of school the following year. Refinements will be made after checks for quality are completed and before the start of school the following year. 	The comparison of Common Pre- and Post-assessment results with District MAP and State CRT results will be led by the District Statistician . Based on statistical analysis of results by the District Statistician and content analysis of questions and responses by District Coaches , checks of assessment quality will be made. This work includes correlational research in tested areas and approved assessment methodologies in non-tested areas. Director of Grants and Special Projects will assist in this process. Assistance/Consequences Any assessment questions that are found to be defective will be corrected by selected teachers	 Common Formative Pre- and Post-assessment and MAP Comparison Report Common Formative Pre- and Post-assessment and State CRT Comparison Report Common Formative Pre- and Post-assessments Quality Report Copies of Refined Common Formative Pre- and Post-assessments 				

Differentiated Instruction will be planned and delivered • Units of Instruction will be designed (Effective teaching strategies will be selected) • Plans for Interventions and Acceleration will be designed (Effective teaching strategies will be selected)	 Comparisons will be completed once District and State assessment results become available in the Spring. For the District MAP assessment, the data will become available prior to June 1st. For the State CRT assessment, data will become available August 15th. Data comparison business rules and software programs have already been developed. Checks for quality will be performed for each assessment, one after the other, and approved by the Director of Professional Development and District Coaches. The focus school year will be on the development of Units of Study and the collaborative scoring/ analysis of assessment results during PLCs. After each Common Formative Pre- and Post- assessment is shared with the teachers, intermediate PLC meetings will be devoted 	with the support of District Coaches . Units of Instruction, Plans for Interventions and Acceleration, and Performance Assessments will be developed collaboratively during PLC meetings. Time has already been allocated during the school day for PLC meetings. Assistance/Consequence PLCs will be attended by	 Unit of Instruction Plans Interventions and Acceleration Plans Copies of Performance Assessments Classroom Observation Reports Coaching Logs
 teaching strategies will be selected) Plans for Interventions and Acceleration will be designed (Effective teaching strategies will 	 assessment results during PLCs. After each Common Formative Pre- and Postassessment is shared with the teachers, intermediate 	collaboratively during PLC meetings. Time has already been allocated during the school day for PLC meetings. Assistance/Consequence	AssessmentsClassroom Observation Reports

Performance	Acceleration, and	Effective Classroom Teaching	
Assessments will be	Performance Assessments	Strategies. Professional	
administered	will be designed within three	Development needs will be	
Instruction will be	to four weeks (time	determined by the School	
monitored, reflected on,	dependent on length of unit)	Leadership Team.	
and adjusted as needed	All Units of Instruction, Plans	•	
	for Interventions and	The School Leadership Team	
	Acceleration, and Performance	will ensure that classroom and	
	Assessments will be used in	PLC observation data is shared	
	the classroom beginning the	with the staff on a regular basis.	
	2011-12 school year.	(This includes sharing weekly at	
	Classroom and PLC	PLC's and monthly at faculty	
	observations will be	meetings.) The Director of	
	conducted regularly.	Grants and Special Projects	
	Observation results will be	will ensure that personnel	
	shared with District Office	conducting observations have	
		been trained on how to provide	
	personnel once every two	•	
	weeks beginning the second	effective coaching. Coaching logs will be shared with the	
	week of school.	5	
		School Leadership Team.	
	Benchmarks		
	 Units of instruction based on 		
	common assessments		
	 Observations connected to 		
	units of study, post		
	assessments, learning		
	guides, and plans for		
	interventions. All results to be		
	shared regularly at PLC's.		
Common Formative	The assessment window for	All Common Formative Pre-	Common Formative Pre-
assessments will be	each Common Formative	and Post-assessment results	assessment Calendar
administered and scored	assessment will be set after	and S.M.A.R.T. Goals will be	Common Formative Pre-
Common Formative	each assessment is	shared with the School	assessments Charts
assessments will be	completed (every three to four	Leadership Team.	 Observation reports from
administered	weeks).	•	PLC meetings where
Common Formative	 Each Common Formative 	Assistance	results are Collaboratively
assessments will be	Pre-assessment will be	If necessary, In/Out-of-District	Analyzed
scored	scored (this applies to	resources will be utilized for	-
300104			Lists of S.M.A.R.T. Goals

 Common Formative assessment data will be charted Common Formative assessment data will be Collaboratively Analyzed S.M.A.R.T. Goals will be set 	 selected response questions) and the data charted before the next PLC meeting after administration of the assessment. Each Common Formative assessment will be scored (this applies to constructed response and essay questions) at or before the next PLC meeting after the administration of the assessment. S.M.A.R.T. Goals will be set at the next PLC meeting after the administration of each Common Formative assessment. All assessment results and S.M.A.R.T. Goals will be shared with the School Management Team prior to the start of the next Unit of Instruction. 	professional development as pertains to using data to drive instruction, setting S.M.A.R.T. Goals, etc. Professional Development needs will be determined by the School Leadership Team.	Coaching Logs
School Governance All CMS certified staff will be evaluated on Domain III Instruction and Assessment	 School Governance: Staff training will occur prior to the evaluation process on Domain III. April 1, 2012 All probationary staff will be evaluated May 1, 2012 All non-probationary staff will be evaluated 	 School Governance: Principal, Dan Sadler Assistant Principal, Gavin Ward Dean of Students, Mike Walker Associate Superintendent of Human Resources, Jose Delfin 	 School Governance: Human Resources check off list of evaluated CMS staff

		Assistance Administration would follow the negotiated agreement for Plans of Assistance. Associate Superintendent of Human Resources, Jose Delfin would provide assistance to the principal for any evaluation needs.	
Dept. Chairs will conduct classroom walkthroughs focusing on the CMS Turnaround Plan goals – observations conducted once per quarter	 Data to be shared at ILT meetings. Focus will be on triangulating data – connecting information to the units of study. 	 Principal, Dan Sadler Assistant Principal, Gavin Ward Dean of Students, Mike Walker Director of Grants & Special Projects, Dr. Steven Pradere Associate Superintendent of Educational Services Susan Keema 	T4S Walkthrough Observation data
		Assistance/Consequences Additional coaching support will be provided by Director of Grants and Special Projects.	

Goals	Total amount needed to accomplish goal. (Amounts for each action step should be listed under "Resources.")	Funds available in current school funding that has been specifically set aside for the implementation of the goal.	Funds still needed to implement goal.
Goal 1	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	
	\$ 90,000.00 <u>\$ 90,000.00</u>	<u>\$ 90,000.00</u>	<u>\$ 90,000.00</u>
	\$ 190,000.00	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 90,000.00
Goal 1 Explanation	\$ 10,000.00 to pay for teachers to collaboratively plan both in-house and with Carson Middle School	\$ 10,000.00 in Title II	
	\$ 90,000.00 to pay for after school program for interventions to supplement learning experiences for students both enrichment and intervention.	\$ 90,000.00 in 21 st Century	
	\$ 90,000.00 funds will be used to pay the salary of a full time instructional coach.		\$ 90,000 to be sought in school funds or other school district grants yet to be determined. The funds will be used to pay the salary of a full time instructional coach.

Step VI – Required Elements for All Schools

Complete items 1-6.

- 1. What are the policies and practices in place that ensure proficiency of each subgroup in the core academic subjects? Data is looked at weekly via professional learning communities or faculty meetings. School Leadership Team overseas School Support Team directives during weekly planning meetings
- 2. List and briefly describe, as appropriate, how the school has incorporated activities of remedial instruction or tutoring before school, after school, during the summer, and/or during any extension of the school year. Remedial instruction and tutoring will take place during the school day with Reading 180, Special Ed and ESL co-teach, Directed Studies, Foundations, push in and pull out programs. Additional math and English Language Arts instruction will also be provided to students during classes. The 21st Century grant will be utilized for after school remediation. The focus will be Credit recovery utilizing A+ Backbone Communication's online learning program as well as enrichment in ELA and math for targeted students.
- 3. Describe the resources available to the school to carry out the plan. See Step V, in addition District PD, ESL, Associate Superintendent of Educational Services, Director of Grants and special Projects, and District of Assessment and Accountability.
- 4. Summarize the effectiveness of any appropriations for the school made by the Legislature to improve student academic achievement. CMS increased student achievement in all sub population groups in Math for 2010-11. Pathways Technology Grant and 21st Century after school programming monies have allowed teachers to reach students in more creative and targeted ways.
- 5. Discuss how the school will utilize Educational Involvement Accord for Parents including the Honor Code and meet all the requirements of the law. This information will be sent home to the parents asking that they be returned to the school with a parent signature as verification the school is seeking parent partnerships in educating our youth. The district is also informing parents of the consequences that students will receive if they choose to cheat.
- 6. If applicable, describe how the school will make its Title III Annual Measurable Achievement Objective (AMAO) targets in English language proficiency (reading, writing, listening, and speaking comprehension). Achievement levels will be looked at individually by ESL and Content teachers. Targeted assistance will be made available through ESL services and content specific classrooms. The goal is to have all core content teachers trained in High Quality Instruction (HQSI) by July of 2012. Did CMS make their AMAO's for ESL in 2010-11? Ricky this one is for you.

7. Leadership PLC's with site level administrators to take place once a month. Leadership teams work in PLC format with a goal of implementing the restructuring plans and monitoring student performance at both sites.

VII. Approval and Assurances

This Turnaround plan is legally sufficient and meets all the requirements established by State, and District entities. The Carson City School District will implement this Turnaround Plan at Carson Middle School as described above at the beginning of the 2011-12 school year.

	Print Name	Signature	Date
Superintendent	Richard Stokes		9/2/11
Associate Superintendent of Educational Services	Susan Keema		9/2/11