

New Hampshire Department of Education



Instructions and Materials for Completing the 2010-2011 District Improvement Progress Report and 2011-2012 Action Plan

As required by NH RSA 193-H and Federal Law 107-110 for Schools and Districts in Need of Improvement

For Title I Districts in Need of Improvement

April 2011

**Virginia M. Barry, Ph.D., Commissioner
New Hampshire Department of Education
101 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301
www.ed.state.nh.us**

**Instructions and Materials for the
2010-2011 District Improvement Progress Report
and
2011-2012 Action Plan**

Statutory Requirement and Purpose

New Hampshire's school and school district performance and accountability law (NH RSA 193-H) requires the development of a two-year improvement plan by any school or district officially designated as in need of improvement. The statute requires the Department, at a minimum, to annually review the progress of each identified school or district and report the findings to the State Board of Education. The following citation from RSA 193-H:4 describes how this requirement shall be carried out:

"...On or before the one-year anniversary of being designated as a school or school district in need of improvement, the commissioner shall designate a progress review team to evaluate the implementation of the improvement plans and the progress towards state performance targets. The progress review team shall deliver a report to the state board. This report shall include evidence of satisfactory implementation and progress towards state performance targets or lack thereof, and recommendations regarding future actions pursuant to subparagraph II (b)."

The primary purpose of the progress report is therefore to provide the Department and State Board with:

- 1) *evidence of satisfactory implementation of the strategies and activities as described and approved in the district's 2010-2011 improvement plan; and*
- 2) *evidence of progress for students scoring below proficiency.*

Report Format and Deadlines

This document is designed for districts identified for improvement in one or more areas, as well as districts identified for a new content area in 2011-12. The document contains the necessary instructions and forms for submitting all required information. Please use the forms provided in this document. Completed reports should be organized in the following sequence:

- Cover Page
- Memorandum of Understanding (Title I districts)
- 2010-2011 Progress Report: Evidence of Progress in Plan Implementation AND Evidence of Progress in Improving District Practices and Student Outcomes
- Proposed Action Plan for 2011-2012
- Parent Notification Letter (Title I districts)

Submission

Submit completed plans by *September 2, 2011* to:

**Kristine Braman
Title I Office
NH Department of Education
101 Pleasant Street
kbraman@ed.state.nh.us**

2010-2011 District Improvement Progress Report and 2011-2012 Action Plan

As required by NH RSA 193-H and Federal Law 107-110 for Schools/Districts in Need of Improvement

SAU#: 47		
District Name: Jaffrey-Rindge Cooperative School District		
Year 1 of Improvement for Mathematics		
Year 2 of Improvement for Reading		
Superintendent of Schools: James O'Neill		
Address: 81 Fitzgerald Drive		
City: Jaffrey	Zip: 03452	
Tel: 603-532-8100	Fax: 603-532-8164	Email: j.oneill@sau47.org

District Improvement Coordinator:

Name: Greg Naudascher		
Title: Director of Curriculum & Instruction		
Address: 81 Fitzgerald Drive		
City: Jaffrey	Zip: 03452	
Tel: 603-532-8100 x212	Fax: 603-532-8164	E-mail: g.naudascher@sau47.org

District Improvement Monitoring Team

Team Members	Title and Stakeholder(s) Team Member Represents
James O'Neill	Superintendent of Schools
David Beauchamp	Ass't. Superintendent for Pupil Services
Greg Naudascher	Director Curriculum & Instruction
Ryan Earley	Principal, Jaffrey-Rindge Middle School
Susan Shaw-Sarles	Principal, Jaffrey Grade School
Kevin Stone	Instructional Coach / Teacher Representative
Melissa Senecal	Teacher Representative
Rachel Soney	Parent Representative/Teacher (Special Education)
Lisa Wiley	Parent Representative

SAU #47

District Jaffrey=Rindge Cooperative School District

**2011-2012 District Improvement Plan
Title I Memorandum of Understanding**

To meet compliance requirements of Title I, Part A of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 a district identified as "In Need of Improvement" must complete and submit this form.

The Superintendent of Jaffrey-Rindge Cooperative School District assures the Commissioner of Education that:

- The identified district will establish annual, measurable objectives for continuous and substantial progress by each group of students enrolled.
- The district will adopt policies and practices concerning the core academic subjects that have the greatest likelihood of ensuring that all groups of students in the school or district will meet the State's proficiency levels of achievement on the State's academic assessment.
- The district has identified a District Improvement Coordinator. The coordinator will attend monthly meetings with the Department of Education to track the progress of action plans and determine the success and effectiveness of the improvement plan.
- The District Monitoring Team includes a parent whose student is currently enrolled in a school Title I program and/or a parent representative from a population of students that did not meet the adequately yearly progress standards.
- Consultation for the development of the district improvement progress report includes input from representatives of parents, school staff and others (i.e. community members, outside experts).
- Not less than 10% of the Title I funds received by the district for each fiscal year that the district is identified for improvement will be spent for professional development.
- The district will use Title I Improvement funds to supplement and not supplant any activities previously funded by district funds.
- All parents receive a notification letter explaining the District's AYP status for the 2011-2012 school year. (Provide a copy with this document).

The New Hampshire Department of Education will provide:

- A planning and implementation model to guide and support districts as they reaffirm or redesign district structures to ensure that all children reach New Hampshire's academic standards;
- Technical assistance via monthly meetings to Districts In Need of Improvement;
- NHDOE liaisons;
- DINI priority status in actions/activities offered by NHDOE during the 2011-2012 school year; and
- Additional implementation funds as available.

District Jaffrey-Rindge Cooperative School District

DINI Year 3 (or more) Corrective Action No

To meet compliance requirements of Title I, Part A of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002, a Memorandum of Understanding is developed between any district identified as "In Need of Improvement – Corrective Action" and the State Education Agency (SEA) to articulate the roles, responsibilities, and expected deliverables from each party within the time frame specified herein.

The Superintendent of Schools assures that:

- to the extent practicable, the necessary human and fiscal resources will be allocated to carry out the action steps described in the district's corrective action plan in a timely and expeditious manner.
- a District Monitoring Team has been established to oversee the implementation of the plan. The Team will meet quarterly (September, December, March and June) with the NHDOE to report on progress in completing the action steps approved for implementation.
- an Improvement Coordinator has been appointed to coordinate the day-to-day implementation of action steps described in the plan. The Improvement Coordinator shall report regularly to the District Monitoring Team and also attend monthly meetings with the NHDOE to participate with coordinators from other districts identified for improvement in discussions of best practices.
- the plan has been developed in consultation with representatives of parents, school staff and others (i.e. community members, outside experts).
- all parents will receive a notification letter explaining the District's AYP status for each year the district is in "in need of improvement" status. A copy of such letter will be forwarded annually to the NHDOE.
- all schools in the district will continue to meet the requirements of the Minimum Standards for Public School Approval, Part Ed 306 of the New Hampshire Code of Administrative Rules.

School District will implement at least one of the following corrective actions as part of their corrective action plan for the 2011-2012 school year: (Not Applicable)

- defer programmatic funds or reduce administrative funds;
- instituted a new curriculum, including based on State and local achievement standards that includes research-based professional development for all staff;
- replace LEA personnel who are relevant to the inability of the LEA to make adequate progress;
- remove individual schools from the jurisdiction of the LEA and arrange for their public governance and supervision;
- appoint a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the LEA in place of the superintendent and school board; and/or abolish or restructure the LEA.

District Jaffrey-Rindge Cooperative School District

- The current District In Need of Improvement Plan will be examined and revised to include the following elements required in a Corrective Action Plan as well as our Corrective Action option indicated above:
 - Annual measurable performance objectives for students performing below proficiency in the subject areas for which the district is identified for corrective action. Objectives must be written for each student performing below proficiency, using valid and reliable assessments for each student group as the baseline from which annual progress will be measured;
 - A description of how student progress will be monitored at regular intervals during the school year, especially for students performing below proficiency, including a description of the local assessments to be used and with what frequency;
 - A description of the priority issues (no more than 3-5) identified or reaffirmed through a strategic mapping process conducted in partnership with an external provider; that the district will create strategies based on these priority issues to substantially increase the likelihood of improved student achievement for students performing below proficiency in the subject areas for which the district is identified. The description of each strategy must be accompanied by action steps, with a timetable; and
 - A description of how the use of federal funding received by the district from the following programs is directed or redirected, within the boundaries allowed by the laws governing each funding source, to align with the corrective action steps designed to address the priority issues identified:
 - Title I, Part A funds reserved for professional development;
 - Title I School and District Improvement funding;
 - Title II, Part A
 - Title III funding for ELL students (if applicable)
 - Special Education funding

The Commissioner of Education assures that the New Hampshire Department of Education will provide:

- assistance in developing applications for funding to ensure that funds are directed or redirected to address the district’s priority issues and corrective action steps;
- content coaches and consultants, as available and appropriate, to assist the district in carrying out its action steps;
- priority status in activities and competitive grant funding;
- additional federal and state funds, as available, to supplement, not supplant, local improvement initiatives; and
- technical assistance during monthly meetings with the District Improvement Coordinator and quarterly (September, December, March and June) meetings with the District Monitoring Team.

Once approved, requests to amend the plan’s corrective action steps and timetable must be submitted in writing. Only requests based on substantive circumstances will be considered.

Signature of Superintendent	Date	Signature of Commissioner of Education	Date

**2010-2011 District Improvement Progress Report
Evidence of Progress: Plan Implementation**

Instructions: For each district improvement goal listed in the approved improvement plan for 2010-11, provide a status report on the strategies and activities implemented to help the district meet that goal.

AYP Area(s) of Focus

List the area(s) in which the district did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for two years and was identified for District Improvement.

Reading-Year 2 and Mathematics-Year 1



Improvement Goal #1

State the improvement goal: The school district will adopt and Implement core Reading / ELA programs and assessments that are articulated across the elementary, middle school and high school levels and aligned with the GLEs / GSEs contained in the K-12 NH Reading Curriculum Framework and Common Core Standards for Reading.

Implementation of Approved Strategies

List the strategies implemented, during 2010-2011 school year to accomplish this goal:

- The district is in the process of creating a K-12 scope and sequence of standards-based reading /communication skills;
- The district is in the process of reviewing/adopting core instructional approaches/models that include benchmark assessments supporting the standards and content encountered on NECAP Reading Assessments. Program models provide common assessments, incorporating key vocabulary and test formats for the measuring student competency. To date, common assessments are in place at the primary level (K-2) in the areas of phonetic, phonemic awareness, and fluency and writing, and at the middle school level (6-8) in the areas of reading skills and writing. This process is in progress at the intermediate level (3-5) and high school level (9-12)
- The implementation of an articulated scope and sequence and identification of common assessments are supported by the adoption of core instructional resources, linked to the New Hampshire Frameworks and the Common Core Standards. During 2010-2011 the district adopted several core programs including *Foundations*, *Expert 21*, and locally designed core units for required high school English courses.
- Instructional coaching in the area of literacy will support the implementation of key best practices linked to the standards, focusing on differentiation of instruction and delivery of a balanced literacy program.

Next, select one descriptor that best describes the status of the strategies at the end of 2010-2011:

Completed as planned, with no changes to the strategies and activities described in the approved school improvement plan

Completed as planned, with changes/refinements to certain strategies and activities

Progressing as planned, with no changes to strategies and activities

X **Progressing, with changes/refinements to certain strategies and activities**

Beginning stages of implementation

No strategies or activities implemented

Improvement Goal #2 – Reading

Develop and implement building-based plans, addressing instruction in the regular classroom and supplemental skills instruction designed to prepare all students to demonstrate proficiency the NECAP Reading Assessment.

Implementation of Approved Strategies

List the strategies implemented, during 2010-2011 school year to accomplish this goal:

- At the elementary and middle school levels, building-based plans to address skills instruction have been initiated. Each elementary school is refining the way in which supplemental skills instruction is delivered. Supplemental instruction is provided through a combination of grade level skill groups, as well as Title I / Tier II services. The various skills groups are based on the performance data from NECAP, MAPs, and local assessment data.
- At the middle school level, supplemental skills instruction for all students is planned by each core academic team. Each grade level team offers additional time for reading instruction during a regularly scheduled skills block that is differentiated to address the range of student achievement. Each team determines the focus for each of the various skills groupings, based on the performance data from NECAP, MAPs, and local assessment data.

Next, select one descriptor that best describes the status of the strategies at the end of 2010-2011:

Completed as planned, no changes to strategies and activities described in the approved school improvement plan

Completed as planned, with changes/refinements to certain strategies and activities

Progressing as planned, with no changes to strategies and activities

X ***Progressing, with changes/refinements to certain strategies and activities***

Beginning stages of implementation

No strategies or activities implemented

Improvement Goal #3 – Reading

Identify and implement best practices proven to positively impact student performance in reading.

Implementation of Approved Strategies

List the strategies implemented, during 2010-2011 school year to accomplish this goal:

During the 2010-11 school year the district has been provided assistance in the identification /and implementation of best instructional practices through literacy coaches provided by the Department of Education. Literacy Coaches were provided at the elementary and secondary levels.

At the elementary level, Michelle Romein, DOE Elementary Literacy Coach provided services to both Jaffrey Grade School and Rindge Memorial School, based on the differing needs at each school. A significant amount of the consulting time was devoted to supporting the development of a building Literacy Committee. This committee served as professional learning community focusing on evaluating the effectiveness of current practice and identification of target areas for professional development. The DOE Coach also provided a workshop to introduce the Common Core Standards for all elementary teachers of Reading. In addition to the support provided by the DOE-sponsored Literacy Coach, Jaffrey Grade School used a portion of its Title I funds for a building-based Literacy Coach to support classroom teachers in the implementation of best practices.

At the secondary level, Christina Felix, DOE Secondary Literacy Coach, provided coaching support at Jaffrey-Rindge Middle School and Conant High School. Coaching support at the middle school focused primarily establishing a Proficiency Enhancement Program designed to provide supplemental reading instruction to a group of at-risk students in grades 6, 7, and 8. At the high school level, coaching support focused on assisting the English Department with assessing performance data and the development a set of core instructional units for grades 9, 10, 11 and 12.

Next, select one descriptor that best describes the status of the strategies at the end of 2010-2011:

Completed as planned, no changes to strategies and activities described in approved school improvement plan

Completed as planned, with changes/refinements to certain strategies and activities

Progressing as planned, with no changes to strategies and activities

X **Progressing, with changes/refinements to certain strategies and activities**

Beginning stages of implementation

No strategies or activities implemented

Improvement Goal - Reading #4

Develop and implement build-based plans and strategies designed to foster collaboration and responsibility among all stakeholders for improving student achievement in reading.

Implementation of Approved Strategies

List the strategies implemented, during 2010-2011 school year to accomplish this goal:

- Each school has explored ways in which instructional blocks can be organized in order to offer teachers the opportunity to plan together to determine how instructional responsibility can be shared. This collaboration has included regular classroom and Title I or Tier II teachers.
- A K-5 District Reading Committee has been formed at the Elementary level to guide the selection of a new core reading program and professional development. This committee is composed of members representing all grade levels and Tier II and Title I programs. The committee has worked to bring greater consistency to the design and implementation of reading programs in the two schools, developing a common vision and set of beliefs statements regarding the teaching of reading, common criteria for evaluating core materials being considered for district-wide adoption, process and time line for the review and selection of core reading program materials, and the planning of professional development opportunities.
- Elementary professional development, beginning with the primary grade levels, has been provided to support the implementation of a core program involving instruction in the areas of phonics, phonemic awareness and fluency. *Fundations* training sessions have involved regular classroom teachers, Title I and Tier II teachers, and Special Education teachers, to establish how the instruction occurring these various programs should be designed in order to coordinate core and supplemental programs.

Next, select one descriptor that best describes the status of the strategies at the end of 2010-2011:

Completed as planned, with no changes to the strategies and activities described in the approved school improvement plan

Completed as planned, with changes/refinements to certain strategies and activities

Progressing as planned, with no changes to strategies and activities

X **Progressing, with changes/refinements to certain strategies and activities**

Beginning stages of implementation

No strategies or activities implemented

**2010-2011 District Improvement Progress Report
Evidence of Progress: Plan Implementation**

Narrative Response

Instructions: Describe, in narrative form, the progress made in implementing the strategies listed on the previous page, including any key factors or circumstances that resulted in a modification of the activities as they were described in the approved improvement plan.

The improvement strategies include both school-based and district-wide activities.

Progress regarding **Goal #1** includes the formation of a K-5 District Reading Committee. Representation on the committee includes all K-5 grade level teams, Tier II or Title I programs from each school. Because the committee involves stakeholders from both elementary schools, collaborative efforts have been successful in focusing on bringing greater consistency within and among the schools, through establishing performance expectations at each level, the adoption of common assessments, designing uniform criteria for the review and selection of core program resources, and collaborative planning to determine priorities for professional development. The scope of the tasks associated with Goal #1 has resulted in the timeline for the review and selection of core reading program resources and assessments to be extended through 2011-2012.

Goal #2 has resulted in the elementary and middle schools implementing skills blocks, designed to provide supplemental instruction and increased the amount of time available for students to engage in reading and other literacy activities. A significant amount of this supplemental instruction provides students with the opportunity to engage in tasks involving reading and responding to text, that are similar to those encountered on the NECAP assessments. The implementation of the skills block instruction, at both the elementary and middle school levels offers student the opportunity to engage in individualized instruction designed using programs proven to be effective in improving performance in Reading (i.e., Study Island)

Efforts regarding **Goal #3**, to implement best practices in reading varied in each of the schools. Professional development resources at the elementary level have focused primarily on providing training for teachers of kindergarten through grade two, in strategies designed to develop students' phonetic, phonemic awareness, and fluency skills. This training in the implementation of the *Foundations Program* involved all primary teachers of reading, including regular classroom, special education and reading specialists in an initial two-day training conducted by a training consultant from Wilson Reading. *Foundations* training will be continued during 2011-2012.

At the middle school a pilot group of ELA teachers received training in the use of the *Expert 21 Program*, a core program aligned to the Common Core Standards. Following a year long pilot, *Expert 21 Program* has been adopted as the school-wide core program for Reading / Language Arts, with implementation to begin in 2011-2012. Professional development is planned for all teachers using the program. The initial two-day training for new adopters will occur in September 2011. *Expert 21* provides a balanced approach to literacy instruction, which incorporates the use of leveled fiction and informational texts encompassing all genre, to teach strategic reading and writing skills. The program incorporates the Six Traits Writing model in having students respond to text, and integrates a variety of technology-based tools including diagnostic, formative and summative assessments.

The implementation of **Goal #4** has involved a variety of build-based initiatives. At the elementary level, most significant initiative has been the formation of a district-wide K-5 Literacy Committee. This team serves as a Professional Learning Community to review current district-wide practices and offer feedback to guide decisions that drive Reading instruction, selection of resources, etc. Each of the elementary schools has also formed a building Literacy Committee that can support the implementation suggestions offered at the district-wide level. At the secondary level, English teachers have met on a regular basis to develop core unit and select supporting instructional resources.

2010-2011 District Improvement Progress Report Evidence of Progress

- In what ways has the district continued the practice of a data team, such as the DINI Root Cause Analysis Data Team, to collectively organize and analyze student data?

The overall AYP index has increased in reading at the elementary/middle level and secondary level. However, gaps remain between the overall population and the performance of special education students. Over the last five years the performance gap has not been closing significantly. In some grades the proportion of students performing in the proficient range has declined while the state average has increased. In response to this trend, the district has supported the efforts of building data teams to analyze performance data with the services of a data analysis provided through an external review team provided by S.E.R.E.S.C. The S.E.R.E.S.C. team reviewed performance data and conducted a series of surveys / interviews with all instructional and administrative staff using a process similar in design to the DINI Root Cause Analysis process. Following a four-month, data-gathering process, the team generated a report focusing on the performance gap Educationally Disabled students. The report identified factors that contribute to performance gaps offering recommendations to address these deficits.

- ◆ What district-wide efforts are in place or planned, providing teachers with access to and better understanding of students' test data and achievement gaps?

District's professional development workshops will continue to engage teachers in opportunities to review and planning for the use of student performance data, individually and in collaborative grade level / school-wide review and analysis of students' test data. This professional development will also include training in the use of tools provided by Performance Plus, NWEA, etc. In addition, S.E.R.S.C. will continue providing consultative assistance to the district / schools to assist with the implementation of the recommendations provided in the report, including the use of performance data to drive the RTI process in regular and Title I/Tier II instruction.

- ◆ What district-wide strategies are in place to identify and respond to students scoring below proficient levels? Are the responses consistent among the schools in the district?

The district continues the process of refining and expanding its systemic process for universal assessment. Response to Intervention (RTI) has foundational pieces in place. All elementary students are screened for grade level ability, using several assessments (primarily DIBELs and MAPs. Intervention time/resources are available for all students not currently on level. Regular class sizes are favorable, with sufficient Tier II and Tier II staff available to deliver interventions and keep groups small.

The elementary and middle schools are currently working to strengthen the connection between the instruction in the regular classroom and intervention strategies provided through pull-out services. These efforts have involved the selection of several core reading instructional resources that provide teachers with intervention materials and strategies that are designed to differentiate instruction in the regular classroom, as well as offer additional resources supporting more students requiring more intensive interventions.

The district has made a commitment to update instructional resources to better align with state and national standards. Several core programs have already been adopted. These core programs provide now provide a consistent scope and sequence of skill and concepts articulated across grade levels, as well as common assessment tools and benchmarks for identification of struggling learners (i.e., Foundations, Expert 21, English unit assessments)

- ◆ What accomplishments can be documented during 2010-11 that resulted in improved outcomes for students scoring below proficient levels in Reading and Mathematics?
 1. The increase in the use of NECAP Released Items as an instructional resources in both regular classroom, Tier II, and special education classrooms.
 2. The initiation of individual learning plans for students at the elementary and middle school levels has begun to improve the connection between core instruction in the regular classroom and supplemental support proved in skills group situation and Tier II classrooms.

- ◆ Where there is greatest evidence of improvement in district-wide practices, which factors were most influential in generating change?

The results of the external review of student performance and the objective identification of causal factors offered a powerful catalyst for reevaluating instructional practices for all students and in particular for Tier II and Special Education programs. While these changes have not yet been measured by NECAP, noted improvements are reflected in the percentage of students that have meet their individual Expected RIT Growth, particularly the percentage of Educationally Disabled student meeting their expected growth.

- ◆ Where improvement is less evident, what factors have impeded change?

Gaps remain between the overall population and the performance of special education students. Over the last five years the Performance gap has not been closing significantly. In some grades the proportion of students performing in the proficient range has declined while the state average has increased.

The composition of the Special Education population within the district consists of a significant percentage of students with severe learning challenges, as well as multiple handicaps. Clearly, the NECAP is not an appropriate assessment for he number of “low incidence”, who are severely challenged significantly. The percentage of students that would more appropriately be assessed using the Alternative Assessment significantly exceeds the 1% who are eligible to take the Alternate Assessment.

Frequently, the focus of instruction for many students with IEPs has tended to emphasize skills and concepts that are below grade level expectations. While instructional goals contained in student’s IEPs for may be appropriate in terms their current level of achievement, it has limited their exposure to grade level expectations assessed on the NECAP compounding the widening achievement gap. Generally, most special education instruction is provided to students through pull-out services. While providing instruction outside of the regular classroom may offer the opportunity for small group interactions, it also limits the student’s accessibility to instruction that introduces grade level skills and content.

At the primary grade levels, the core instructional programs used in the regular classroom, Tier II classrooms, and Special Education classrooms have been different, creating inconsistency for students as they moved between these various settings. The need to improve the alignment of the core resources used in these various program has been another factor impeding the improvement of struggling learners.

- ◆ Based on these outcomes, summarize the proposed refinements, if any, to the DINI plan for 2011-2012. **Note:** *If the district's AYP status has changed and now includes a new subject area, please describe the changes/refinements made to the DINI plan to include and address the new area.*

Mathematics has been identified as “In Need of Improvement – Year 1”, with the following proposed strategies added to the 2011-2012 DINI Plan

MATHEMATICS: Proposed Strategies and Activities for 2011-2012

Goal	Curriculum and Instruction - Mathematics					
Strategy #1	The district will align Mathematics assessment to the New Hampshire GLEs/GSEs and the Common Standards for Mathematics					
Objectives (to be written as responses to the italicized questions)	<i>What changes in the district practices are expected as a result of this strategy?</i> Alignment of Mathematics assessment will help ensure that instruction is based upon skills and concepts that are standards-based and articulated across grade levels.					
	<i>What changes in student learning are expected as a result of this strategy? How will it help to improve achievement for students who are not yet proficient?</i> Students will be exposed to a consistent set of performance expectations based on the GLEs/GSEs and Common Core Standards designed to improve students' performance on the NECAP and foster expected academic growth.					
Proposed Activities for 2011-12 <i>Describe the activities to be implemented to achieve stated objectives. Provide sufficient detail regarding the purpose of each activity.</i>	Resources <i>What existing and/or new resources will be used to accomplish the activity?</i>	Timeline <i>When will this activity begin and end?</i>	Oversight <i>Who will take primary responsibility/ leadership? Who else needs to be involved?</i>	Monitoring (Implementation) <i>What evidence will be collected documenting implementation? How often? By whom?</i>	Monitoring (Effectiveness) <i>What evidence will be collected to assess effectiveness? How often? By whom?</i>	
<p>Develop a systematic assessment plan spanning all levels. The plan will provide guidelines for the types of standardized assessment data (i.e., NECAP & MAPs) and curriculum-based assessment data to be obtained and standard format for compilation of the information.</p> <p>At the elementary and middle school levels, curriculum- assessment information will include pre- and post-test results from unit tests.</p> <p>At the high school level, assessment data will include results from mid-term and final exams for required core mathematics courses (Algebra II and II, Geometry) 60% of the content for mid-terms and final exams will be generated from a bank of common exam questions, based on the content of the NECAP.</p>	School and district personnel NECAP Reports and Released items, MAPs Reports and Resources Materials, DIBELS Reports and Resources. and curriculum-based assessments	Sept. 2011- June 2012	District Assessment Plan submitted by the Superintendent and District DINI Team Coordinator by January 2012	The completed District Assessment Plan will be submitted to the DINI Monitoring Team – Jan. 2012 SINI Teams will report progress in implementing the District Assessment Plan - Jan. 2011	Review of the feedback from users of the Assessment Plan information, including elementary and middle school grade level teams, and high school English and Math departments	

MATHEMATICS: Proposed Strategies and Activities for 2011-2012

Goal	Delivery of Instruction - Mathematics				
Strategy #2	The district will align Mathematics assessment to the New Hampshire GLEs/GSEs and the Common Standards for Mathematics				
Objectives (to be written as responses to the italicized questions)	<i>What changes in the district practices are expected as a result of this strategy?</i> The amount of instructional time for mathematics will be increased for struggling learners by providing supplemental instruction o.				
	<i>What changes in student learning are expected as a result of this strategy? How will it help to improve achievement for students who are not yet proficient?</i> Students will be exposed to a consistent set of performance expectations based on the GLEs/GSEs and Common Core Standards designed to improve students' performance on the NECAP and foster expected academic growth.				
Proposed Activities for 2011-12 <i>Describe the activities to be implemented to achieve stated objectives. Provide sufficient detail regarding the purpose of each activity.</i>	Resources <i>What existing and/or new resources will be used to accomplish the activity?</i>	Timeline <i>When will this activity begin and end?</i>	Oversight <i>Who will take primary responsibility/ leadership? Who else needs to be involved?</i>	Monitoring (Implementation) <i>What evidence will be collected documenting implementation? How often? By whom?</i>	Monitoring (Effectiveness) <i>What evidence will be collected to assess effectiveness? How often? By whom?</i>
At the elementary and middle school levels, supplemental instruction aligned to the needs of struggling learners will include grade level skill groupings, Title I/Tier II, and/or special education instruction support.	School and district personnel Standardized and curriculum-based assessments and core and supplemental instructional program materials	Sept. 2011- June 2012	Building plans for skills grouping submitted to the Superintendent and District DINI Team Coordinator by January 2012	Building plans will be submitted to the Superintendent and DINI Monitoring Team – November 2011 SINI Teams will report progress in implementing the skills grouping plan - Jan. 2012	Review of students performance data and feedback from grade level teams, regarding the implementation of plans for elementary and middle school skill groupings

MATHEMATICS: Proposed Strategies and Activities for 2011-2012

Goal	Delivery of Instruction – Mathematics				
Strategy #3	The district will align Mathematics assessment to the New Hampshire GLEs/GSEs and the Common Standards for Mathematics				
Objectives (to be written as responses to the italicized questions)	<i>What changes in the district practices are expected as a result of this strategy?</i> The current method of scheduling core instruction for Algebra I will be modified, to extend or increase the amount of instructional time.				
	<i>What changes in student learning are expected as a result of this strategy? How will it help to improve achievement for students who are not yet proficient?</i> Students will be exposed to a consistent set of performance expectations based on the GLEs/GSEs and Common Core Standards designed to improve students' performance on the NECAP and foster expected academic growth.				
Proposed Activities for 2011-12 <i>Describe the activities to be implemented to achieve stated objectives. Provide sufficient detail regarding the purpose of each activity.</i>	Resources <i>What existing and/or new resources will be used to accomplish the activity?</i>	Timeline <i>When will this activity begin and end?</i>	Oversight <i>Who will take primary responsibility/ leadership? Who else needs to be involved?</i>	Monitoring (Implementation) <i>What evidence will be collected documenting implementation? How often? By whom?</i>	Monitoring (Effectiveness) <i>What evidence will be collected to assess effectiveness? How often? By whom?</i>
At the high school level, the semester-long instructional block for all Algebra I students will be extended to include year-long instruction, closely aligned to state and national standards.	Course competencies for Mathematics core courses	Sept. 2011- June 2012	High School Principal	Exam questions submitted High School Principal – Jan. 2012 SINI Team will report progress in completing the design of common assessments for core Math courses - Jan. 2011	Bank of course competencies / exam questions for Algebra I and II and Geometry

READING: Proposed Strategies and Activities for 2011-2012

Instructions: Use the format below to describe the action plan for 2011-2012. Provide sufficient detail regarding how the proposed activities are designed to achieve the anticipated changes/outcomes in professional practice and student learning, especially to improve outcomes for students who are working below proficiency in the area(s) for which the district is identified.

Goal	Curriculum and Instruction – Reading				
Strategy #1	The district will align the Reading Curriculum to New Hampshire GLEs/GSEs and the Common Standards for Reading				
Objectives (to be written as responses to the italicized questions)	<i>What changes in the district practices are expected as a result of this strategy?</i> Curriculum alignment will help ensure that instruction and assessment is based upon a curriculum that is standards-based and articulated across grade levels.				
	<i>What changes in student learning are expected as a result of this strategy? How will it help to improve achievement for students who are not yet proficient?</i> Students will be exposed to a consistent set of performance expectations based on a curriculum aligned to the GLEs/GSEs and Common Core Standards designed to improve students' performance on the NECAP and foster expected academic growth.				
Proposed Activities for 2011-12 <i>Describe the activities to be implemented to achieve stated objectives. Provide sufficient detail regarding the purpose of each activity.</i>	Resources <i>What existing and/or new resources will be used to accomplish the activity?</i>	Timeline <i>When will this activity begin and end?</i>	Oversight <i>Who will take primary responsibility/ leadership? Who else needs to be involved?</i>	Monitoring (Implementation) <i>What evidence will be collected documenting implementation? How often? By whom?</i>	Monitoring (Effectiveness) <i>What evidence will be collected to assess effectiveness? How often? By whom?</i>
Formation of district Elementary Reading Review Committee (K-5) to review and revise district curriculum and assessments to align with state and national standards for literacy.	District funds budgeted for curriculum development	August 2011- June 2012	Director of Curr. & Instr., and Elementary Principals	K-5 Reading curriculum and program scope and sequence	Elementary Reading Review Committee and DINI Monitoring Committee
Use established evaluation criteria and process for review and selection of K-5 core reading materials. Process will engage all elementary teachers of reading in decision-making process for selection of core reading resources.	District funds budgeted for curriculum development	August 2011- June 2012	Director of Curr. & Instr., Elementary Principals, and Elementary Reading Committee	Responses of K-5 Reading teachers evaluations of core reading resources selected for review	Elementary Reading Review Committee teacher evaluation forms rating core reading materials submitted June 2012
Implementation of the core reading program in grades 6-7, including professional development, providing a scope and sequence, instructional resources, and benchmark assessment, which are used consistently across grade levels	District funds budgeted for curriculum development	August 2011- June 2012	Director of Curr. & Instr., Middle School Principal	Results of benchmark assessments from each of the program unit for Expert 21	Data from program benchmark assessments and MAPs results, indicating percentage of students meeting expected RIT growth
High School English Department will complete three core instructional units for each mandated course (grades 9-12), which include content and assessments aligned to the state GLEs/GSEs and Common Core Standards.	District funds budgeted for curriculum development	August 2011- June 2012	Director of Curr. & Instr., High School Principal, High School English Dept.	Results of local assessments for each of the three core units of study for required English course (9-12)	Completion of three core units of study for each core English course, required (grades 9, 10, 11, and 12)

READING: Proposed Strategies and Activities for 2011-2012

Instructions: Use the format below to describe the action plan for 2011-2012. Provide sufficient detail regarding how the proposed activities are designed to achieve the anticipated changes or outcomes in professional practice and student learning, especially to improve outcomes for students who are working below proficiency in the area(s) for which the district is identified.

Goal	Design and Delivery of Instruction				
Strategy #2	Development of school-based plans addressing skills instruction designed to prepare students for meeting proficiency expectations on the Reading assessments.				
Objectives (to be written as responses to the italicized questions)	<p><i>What changes in the district practices are expected as a result of this strategy?</i> Elementary and Middle schools will design and implement supplemental instruction designed to address skill deficits and prepare students to be successful in meeting proficiency expectations on the NECAP Reading assessments and the requirements of AYP</p> <p><i>What changes in student learning are expected as a result of this strategy? How will it help to improve achievement for students who are not yet proficient?</i> Schools will refine organizational structures to support the design and implementation supplemental instruction to support students in attaining proficiency on the NECAP Reading Assessment and offer alternative ways to assist students in meeting district graduation requirements for proficiency.</p>				
Proposed Activities for 2011-12 <i>Describe the activities to be implemented to achieve stated objectives. Provide sufficient detail regarding the purpose of each activity.</i>	Resources <i>What existing and/or new resources will be used to accomplish the activity?</i>	Timeline <i>When will this activity begin and end?</i>	Oversight <i>Who will take primary responsibility/ leadership? Who else needs to be involved?</i>	Monitoring (Implementation) <i>What evidence will be collected to document implementation? How often? By whom?</i>	Monitoring (Effectiveness) <i>What evidence will be collected to assess effectiveness? How often? By whom?</i>
SINI Leadership Teams will define the process used for student goal-setting to support improved student performance in reading. Results of the MAPs assessments will be used in the goal-setting process and the measure used to determine increases in student achievement.	SINI Team and school personnel, including Title I and Tier II teachers	August 2011- June 2012	Principals and SINI Planning Teams	Principal and SINI Team will provide an outline of the process / resources to be used in goal-setting and monitoring progress, based on NECAP and MAPs results	DINI Monitoring Team will establish criteria for evaluating the success of SINI goal-setting activities – Jan. 2012
Elementary and middle schools implement supplemental instruction (Tier II, Skills Block), to support students performing below level, in demonstrating proficiency on the NECAP and meeting expected annual RIT growth on MAPs	SINI Team and school personnel	August 2011- June 2012	Principals and SINI Planning Teams	Principal will provide an outline of the building plan / sample schedules for supplemental skills instruction	SINI Teams will review student growth data for 2010-2011 – June 2011
The High School will review current academic requirements for graduation and explore the revision of these requirements to include alternate ways to demonstrate academic proficiency.	SINI Team and NEASC Teams	August 2011- June 2012	High School Principal and SINI Planning Team	Principal will provide an overview current academic requirements for graduation and explore the revision of these requirements	Superintendent and Principal, monitor student success in meeting graduation requirements

READING: Proposed Strategies and Activities for 2011-2012

Instructions: Use the format below to describe the action plan for 2011-2012. Provide sufficient detail regarding how the proposed activities are designed to achieve the anticipated changes/outcomes in professional practice and student learning, especially to improve outcomes for students who are working below proficiency in the area(s) for which the district is identified.

Goal	Professional Development				
Strategy #3	Provide opportunities for school-based and district-wide professional development focused on improving student performance in reading				
	<i>What changes in student learning are expected as a result of this strategy? How will it help to improve achievement for students who are not yet proficient?</i>				
	Improved performance on the NECAP Reading Assessment, increasing the percentage of students achieving at the proficient range or higher				
Proposed Activities for 2011-12 <i>Describe the activities to be implemented to achieve stated objectives. Provide sufficient detail regarding the purpose of each activity.</i>	Resources <i>What existing and/or new resources will be used to accomplish the activity?</i>	Timeline <i>When will this activity begin and end?</i>	Oversight <i>Who will take primary responsibility/ leadership? Who else needs to be involved?</i>	Monitoring (Implementation) <i>What evidence will be collected to document implementation? How often? By whom?</i>	Monitoring (Effectiveness) <i>What evidence will be collected to assess effectiveness? How often? By whom?</i>
Provide teachers professional development designed to improve the design and delivery of Reading / Lang. Arts instruction and improve students' performance in reading	Professional literature / resources, and/or training provided through building or district funds for professional development	Sept. 2010- June 2012	Principals Director of Curr. & Instr.	SINI and/or DINI Planning Teams review of building or district plans for professional development opportunities – January 2011	DINI Monitoring Team review of proposed building and district professional development plans – January 2012 Superintendent and DINI Monitoring Team review of feedback from professional development opportunities re: August 2011 – June 2012
Develop a plan for collegial collaboration to engage teachers in self-evaluation re: the effectiveness of instructional practices in improving students' performance in Reading Refine procedures and data collection tools used during informal classroom walk-through visits	School personnel	August 2011- June 2012	Principals Director of Curriculum and Instruction Professional	Documentation of the plan for conducting informal peer observations and process for sharing collegial feedback.	Information obtained from both supervisory observations and collegial observations will be used by administrators and the DINI Monitoring Team, to determine changes in instructional practices

READING: Proposed Strategies and Activities for 2011-2012

Instructions: Use the format below to describe the action plan for 2011-2012. Provide sufficient detail regarding how the proposed activities are designed to achieve the anticipated changes/outcomes in professional practice and student learning, especially to improve outcomes for students who are working below proficiency in the area(s) for which the district is identified.

Goal	Collaboration and responsibility of stakeholders for improving student performance in reading.				
Strategy #4	Establish school-based and district-wide professional learning communities focused on improving student performance in reading				
Objectives (to be written as responses to the italicized questions)	<i>What changes in the district practices are expected as a result of this strategy?</i> Increased collaboration and shared responsibility on the part of stakeholders through building-level and district-wide opportunities for professional interaction, exchange of instructional resources, and fostering collegial discussions, supporting the implementation of best practices to improve student performance in reading.				
	<i>What changes in student learning are expected as a result of this strategy? How will it help to improve achievement for students who are not yet proficient?</i> Improved performance on the NECAP Reading Assessment, increasing the percentage of students achieving at the proficient range or higher				
Proposed Activities for 2011-12 <i>Describe the activities to be implemented to achieve stated objectives. Provide sufficient detail regarding the purpose of each activity.</i>	Resources <i>What existing and/or new resources will be used to accomplish the activity?</i>	Timeline <i>When will this activity begin and end?</i>	Oversight <i>Who will take primary responsibility/ leadership? Who else needs to be involved?</i>	Monitoring (Implementation) <i>What evidence will be collected to document implementation? How often? By whom?</i>	Monitoring (Effectiveness) <i>What evidence will be collected to assess effectiveness? How often? By whom?</i>
Each school will explore opportunities to provide time for collegial interaction and planning, using grade level common planning times, team planning, and department meeting times, to engage in professional planning.	Use of current budget resources, personnel and time for professional development	Sept. 2011- June 2012	Principals	Each SINI team will design a building plan for structuring opportunities for planning and professional development, to support improvement in reading performance. Plans submitted to DINI monitoring team for review - June 2011	DINI Monitoring Team review of proposed building PLC plan December 2010 DINI Monitoring Team review of staff surveys re: 2010-11 PLC activities – June 2011
Explore ways to increase the opportunities for professional interactions within grade level teams, across grades levels and between schools.	Use of current budget resources, personnel and time for professional development	Sept. 2011- June 2012	Superintendent, Ass't. Sup't., Principals, Director of Curr. & Instr.	SINI teams refine building plans for facilitating collegial interactions among grade level peers and between grade levels teams. Administrative Leadership Team will structure opportunities for collegial interaction between schools – June 2012	DINI Monitoring Team review of building / district plans for PLC opportunities – January 2012 DINI Monitoring Team will review staff surveys re: the effectiveness of opportunities for professional interaction / planning during 2011– 2012

TITLE I PARENT NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

Instructions: Provide the following information in narrative form:

- (a) Describe the process the district will use to provide parents of each student enrolled in the district with timely written notice regarding the district's identification as a district in need of improvement. The description must demonstrate the use of dissemination strategies that make such information accessible to all parents, and to the extent practicable, is provided in a language that parents can understand.
- (b) Attach a copy of the parent notification letter to this page. Be sure the letter includes:
- Why the district has been identified for improvement (including year and content);
 - Explanation of what it means to be a District In Need of Improvement-noting AYP status;
 - A chart delineating the district AYP summary;
 - What the district is doing to address the achievement issues (initiatives involved) or a description of the improvement planning process;
 - The process that will be used to develop an improvement plan in consultation with district staff and parents/guardians (including the method of sharing updates);
 - How parents/guardians can express an interest in getting involved (must be inviting); and
 - What the State Department of Education is doing to support the district.