

Vermont School Improvement Grant Application

Spring, 2010

Supervisory Union/ District Name: Chittenden East Supervisory Union

Contact Person: Mark Carbone

Role: Principal – Camels Hump Middle School

Email: mark.carbone@cesu.k12.vt.us

Phone: 802-434-2188

This grant application must be submitted with:

- Statement of Agreement signed by superintendent
- School Improvement plans for each Tiered school included in the grant
- Budget
- All relevant attachments Tier I and II: (B, D2, E) Tier III (B, E)

Superintendent Signature:

Date:

LEA Application

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS APPLICATION MUST INCLUDE INFORMATION AND RESPONSES FOR ALL TIERED SCHOOLS IN YOUR SU OR DISTRICT. FOR SOME DISTRICT YOU MAY HAVE MULTIPLE ENTRIES IN THE TIER III SECTIONS. FOR SUPERVISORY UNIONS/DISTRICTS WITH ONLY TIER III SCHOOLS, GO TO THE APPROPRIATE PROTION OF SECTION B INDICATED BY THE ARROW.

In Vermont, for the purposes of the School Improvement Grant, when we refer to the LEA, we are referring to the Supervisory/Union District.

A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED: An LEA must include the following information with respect to the schools it will serve with a School Improvement Grant.

An LEA must identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and II school.

	School Name	NCES ID #	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	INTERVENTIONS (TIER I AND II ONLY)			
	CAMELS HUMP MIDDLE SCHOOL	00399							
<p>Note: An LEA that has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools</p>									

Camels Hump Middle School
School Improvement Grant Application
2010

School Assets and Data Analysis

a. Overview and assessment of school and community assets as well as needs.

See narrative included in self assessment survey. School community (support staff, teachers, administration) have put in place a number of elements for long-term sustainable school improvement. Professional learning communities format and processes, a culture of coaching and learning from each other, train the trainer, integration of learning/professional development embedded into practice are examples of this sustainability. Introduction of a standards-based reporting system and the professional work associated with this endeavor is also an example of CHMS staffs willingness to look at and change practice/instruction and assessment. National Writing Project and Vermont Math Initiative, approximately 25 core content staff participating is a clear demonstration of the staffs' commitment to embedded professional development and improvement of instructional practices. Of the 8 factors outlined in Roots of Success: high expectations, continuous improvement, leadership, use of data, professional teaching culture, student supports, school climate, and family engagement CHMS has clear evidence in all areas. Self assessment information supports this contention. While all areas are in need of further/continued development areas that are currently less developed are: use of data, and leadership. Continued development of formative assessment and response time to student misconceptions, data teams ability to collate, disseminate and analyze data for teachers and teams, measurable and attainable goals that are directly tied to staff development, student achievement and instruction, a systematic and well articulated connection between Act 68 goals, school improvement endeavors, district initiatives are needs.

b. Input from staff, public/private partnerships, parent and other community members

See staff survey results for further information. Information collected from staff comes from grade level PLC meetings (Grade 5, Grade 6, Grade 7/8, EXP), VMI Math group, National Writing Project study group, Steering Committee. Through these various staff groups the following are perceived needs: continued alignment of supplemental math services with formative/summative assessment results, 80/20 math instruction, increasing use of Readers Workshop – grades 7/8, better use of professional development time, organization of PLCs, streamlining of initiatives, math lesson study format, writing across the content, on-demand writing, common rubric calibration, instructional development of voice, ideas and details.

- c. Inclusion of analysis of recent and longitudinal New England Common Assessment Program results and other relevant common local assessment system data for all students and for subgroups (demographic categories as well as any subgroup of students relevant to school needs including at minimum, students with disabilities, students eligible for free and reduced lunch, and English language learners. Directions – Summarize conclusions from your analysis of data here

		Scaled Score(Averaged) by Cohort - Over time - 09				
Area	AYP Score	5 th Grade	6 th Grade	7 th Grade	8 th Grade	
All students -Reading	Yes-479					4 yr. AYP increase 35 pts. (444-479)
Reading-Grade8		44.12	47.18	55.97	53.92	4 yr. scale score increase 9 pts.
Reading-Grade 7		46.29	49	53.09		3 yr. scale score increase 7pts
Reading-Grade 6		51.11	53.51			2 yr. scale score increase 2 pts.
All student-Math	Yes-449					4 yr. AYP increase 23 pts. (426-449)
Math-Grade8		42.99	43.69	43.43	44.22	4 yr. scale score increase 1 pt.
Math-Grade 7		46.03	45.54	46.37		3 yr. scale score increase.3 pts.
Math-Grade 6		47.24	48.54			2 yr. scale score increase 1 pt.
SES-Reading	Yes-444					4 yr. AYP increase 69 pts. (375-444)
SES-Reading-Grade 8		32.4	34	44.64	43	4 yr. scale score increase 11 pts.
SES-Reading-Grade 7		39.07	39.33	41.6		3 yr. scale score increase 2 pts
SES-Reading-Grade 6		44.29	49			2 yr. scale score increase 5 pts.
SES-Math	No-370					4 yr. AYP increase 42 pts. (338-370)
SES-Math-Grade8		35.4	34.5	34.93	34.73	4 yr. scale score decrease 1 pt.
SES-Math-Grade 7		37.73	37.4	39		3 yr. scale score increase 1 pt.
SES-Math-Grade 6		40.65	41.74			2 yr. scale score increase 1 pts.
Disability-Reading	Yes-411					4 yr. AYP increase 23 pts. (273-449)
Disability-Reading-Grade 8		26.61	29.53	36.53	37.47	4 yr. scale score increase 9 pts.
Disability-Reading-Grade 7		32.62	31.15	34.38		3 yr. scale score increase 2pts.
Disability-Reading-Grade 6		36.3	38.73			2 yr. scale score increase 2 pts.
Disability-Math	No-339					4 yr. AYP increase 66 pts. (273-339)
Disability-Math-Grade 8		25.56	28.39	27.35	29.74	4 yr. scale score increase 4 pts.
Disability-Math-Grade 7		37	36	37.15		3 yr. scale score flat
Disability-Math-Grade 6		26.4	32.9			2 yr. scale score increase 6 pts.

Across all groups significant gains have been made in reading. According to AYP scores the smallest gain was in the subgroup –Students w/ Disabilities who showed a 23 point AYP gain. Using scale score reading data across all subgroups also significant growth is demonstrated. Students have shown particular growth in informational text, word identification, initial understanding and analysis. See included graphs for support. While all-school math AYP score has increase 23 points over 4 years and CHMS met AYP in “09” the subgroups SES and Disability have not achieved AYP. While these subgroup’s AYP scores have increased – 23 and 66 points respectively – further growth is needed. Trend lines for all groups are strong. Subgroup growth in functions/algebra are significant. CHMS math teachers have focused on multiplicative and proportional reasoning and the results show for these subgroups. See math graphs for further supporting information. Students IEP, SES have almost doubled the number of correct items in Functions/Algebra and Geometry/measurement over the 4 year data period. Reading instruction based on student choice, teacher/student conference, direct analysis instruction has improved student performance.

d. Inclusion of the following data and summarization of conclusions reached after assessing the data:

Data Area	
Graduation rates	95.58 – MMU - 08-09
Drop-out rates	.84 – MMU – 08-09
Discipline referrals	CHMS
School action plan priorities	Math Instruction, Math Remediation/supplemental programming, writing Instruction, community involvement, service learning/community learning opportunities, Readers Workshop, public relations
Highly qualified teacher data	
Child count by disability category	SLD- 28 Learning Impairment – 1 Speech/Language - 15 ED- 14 Health Impairment – 11 Autism Spectrum – 3
Percent of students with disabilities in the general education classroom more than 80% of the time	97%
Number of out of district placements	0 – CHMS
Number of students in “alternative” day placements	1 – CHMS – District program - Mansfield Academy
Number of ELL students	0 - CHMS
Number of student eligible for free and reduced lunch	77 – CHMS – June 09
Most recent Youth Risk Behavior Survey	

Students are connected to the building and programming and supports are in place to meet their academic, behavioral and emotional needs. MMU has one of the highest graduation rates in the state. Currently, CHMS is experiencing a dramatic increase in students identified with an Emotional Disturbance and their programming needs will need to be addressed. CHMS support services are revising service and priorities to meet these challenges. Currently, CHMS is in conversations with Baird Center for Children to implement a social skills training program for identified students. Further programmatic changes include: proactive behavioral intervention program, school-wide training for common language and interventions based on Garcia-Winters research and training. Supplement services are provided to students both during and after the school day for all identified students. Supplemental programming is coordinated with CHMS curriculum and are researched based.

- e. Inclusion of a guided self assessment, conducted by the SU – School Support team and for each school, on major Factors for Rapid Change in School Improvement (see attachment B – Major Factors for Rapid Change Self Assessment Tool, and Attachment C – A Theory of Action,)

See Attachment B

1. If a school has an existing school improvement plan and/or a plan for restructuring under the Vermont State Accountability System and the related Commissioner’s Required Actions, the School Improvement Support Team will review this plan with the SU School Support team and school leadership team to assist them in incorporating any new strategies established by this application, into their plan.

School Improvement Plan - 09

Identified Area	Action Steps	Service/Program	Description
School-wide	Appoint outside expert to advise school on its progress toward making adequate yearly progress based on school plan	Hiring of School Improvement Coordinator	Central Office administration position. Oversight and management of supplemental services implementation and fidelity. Coordination of professional development
	Institute and fully implement new curriculum, including providing appropriate professional development for all relevant staff, that is based on scientifically –based research and offers substantial promise of improving educational achievement for low-achieving students and enabling the school to make adequate yearly progress.	Do-the-Math Renaissance Math Read Naturally Great Leaps Soar to Success	District wide supplemental services programs.
	School-wide Professional Learning community structure	Bi-weekly grade level mtgs Monthly school-wide mtgs	Instruction, learning, assessment
	Technology	7 Mimios 11 Whiteboards 1 Turning point	Interactive technology -
	Investigate and implement systematic formative assessment tools/system	Vermont Item Bank	State developed resource of assessment type questions – formative assessment markers
Mathematics	Professional Development	Vermont Math Initiative	2009-2010 – Third year – Teacher specific observations and feedback with VMI staff. Monthly +/- observation schedule.
	Development and implementation of specific formative assessments – multiplicative and proportional reasoning		Grade specific formative assessments aligned with curricular objectives
	Continuum of supplemental service provision for all identified students	Three/four tiered service option – Grades 5-8	5/6 - Foreign Language/Band Chorus Study 7 – Foreign Language/Band Chorus Study 8- Foreign Language Study 5-8 – After school – 3-4x/wk – 5-6 wks 5-8 – Alternative Exploratory Arts rotation
Reading	Professional Development	National Writing project study group	Second year – instruction, 6-traits, common language – common goals
	Implement Readers workshop across grades		Individualized reading program

- a. **The application reflects consideration of the required and permissible elements as outlined in the Transformation Model and addresses which of those strategies it is committed to pursuing with these funds. Directions – indicate the require and permissible activities considered**

Researched-based programs – District has implemented instructional programs and are aligned with district curriculum – Do-the-Math, Accelerated Math, Great Leaps, Read Naturally, Soar-to-Success – prior improvement plans supported Do-the-Math implementation, the 10-11 improvement plan would focus on increasing access and use of Accelerated Math

Promotion of continuous use student data – Prior improvement plans focused on student data an formative assessment - VMI work, NWP work, -10-11 improvement plan VMI work and Item Bank alignment with curriculum and formative assessment.

Provision of professional development activities – Prior improvement plans - Vermont Mathematics Initiative, National Writing Project, Readers Workshop training, Differentiated Instruction training, training in implementing Do-the-Math, Great Leaps, Read Naturally, Accelerated Math, Soar to Success. 10-11 improvement plan continues with VMI and NWP work specifically

Community involvement – VYCC, Herpetology Project, Richmond Land Trust, Richmond Conservation Commission, VT Nature Conservancy, 08-09 Parent Volunteer Math Project - 10-11 plan does not specifically address this area.

Other elements that are in place or will be worked on that are not part of the current improvement grant request:

After school supplement math and reading programming are in place and will continue. Support services department will be implementing a behavioral support option for students with social awareness programming offered through the Baird Inclusion setting.

b. The initial school improvement plan is provided with the application and includes at minimum

See above for 09-10 school improvement plan. Below is a proposed 10-11 school action plan.

Proposed - School Improvement Plan - 10-11

Identified Area	Actions Steps	Description
Mathematics Instructor \$65,000	Hiring Mathematics Instructor Services/Program Support in-class math instruction Professional Development – Year 4 Time for Math Teachers Increase flexibility and access	<i>Hiring a math instructor</i> - will allow CHMS to:1) provide direct instruction w/in students regular math class, student teacher ratio would then be 1:10. Furthering integration of formative assessment and instruction response to conceptual misunderstandings. 1:10 ratio will also assist in increasing differentiated instruction in: flexible groups, readiness, and student products. 2) Provide instructional coverage at the 7 th and 8 th grade levels to allow teachers time for “lesson study” work and development. 3) Work with math teachers aligning Item Bank resources with math units/lessons for formative assessment use.
Total \$65,000		

i. Establishment of self-defined annual achievement goals tied to state accountability measures and achievement for all student s and relevant sub-groups. Information in percentages

	Reading – Below Standard 10	Math – Below Standard 10
Grade 5	14	24
Grade 6	25	29
Grade 7	13	33
Grade 8 not include – exiting CHMS		

Grade Level Content Area Comparison State - 10

Grade	Reading				Math			
	At/Above Standard		Below Standard		At/Above Standard		Below Standard	
	CHMS	State	CHMS	State	CHMS	State	CHMS	State
5	70%	72%	30%	28%	71%	67%	29%	33%
6	89%	71%	11%	29%	81%	66%	19%	34%
7	87%	73%	13%	27%	74%	63%	26%	37%
8	83%	75%	17%	25%	69%	65%	31%	35%

Proficiency Level by Grade Level & Content Area - Years 09 & 10

Grade/Area	Proficiency Level - 09							
	Level 4		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1	
	CHMS	State	CHMS	State	CHMS	State	CHMS	State
5 Reading	30	18	56	52	11	21	3	9
5 Math	29	20	48	48	12	15	11	17
5 Writing	34	27	31	28	21	26	13	19
6 Reading	23	15	52	56	17	19	7	10
6 Math	24	22	46	44	18	17	11	18
7 Reading	42	20	45	56	8	17	5	8
7 Math	26	21	42	42	14	18	19	20
8 Reading	31	17	48	52	17	21	3	10
8 Math	22	21	38	42	19	19	20	19
8 Writing	14	12	47	42	28	31	10	15

Grade/Area	Proficiency Level - 10							
	Level 4		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1	
	CHMS	State	CHMS	State	CHMS	State	CHMS	State
5 Reading	18	19	52	54	19	18	10	10
5 Math	23	21	48	46	10	15	19	18
6 Reading	36	17	53	54	11	20	0	9
6 Math	29	24	52	43	12	17	7	17
7 Reading	33	15	54	58	6	18	6	9
7 Math	28	21	46	41	14	18	12	19
8 Reading	41	26	42	46	15	18	2	6
8 Math	29	24	40	41	14	18	1	18

Intra-group Level Comparison

Grade/Area	Proficiency Level							
	Level 4		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1	
	08	05	08	05	08	05	08	05
8 Reading	31	15	48	54	17	23	3	14
8 Math	22	15	38	30	19	18	20	28
		06		06		06		06
7 Reading	42	16	45	43	8	18	5	15
7 Math	26	15	42	38	14	18	19	22
		07		07		07		07
6 Reading	23		52		17		7	
6 Math	24		46		18		11	

School Accountability - 2009

	# Students	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Total Above Proficient	Total Below Proficient
READING							
All Student	301	27	50	18	6	76	24
Not Free/Reduced	250	31	52	15	2	83	17
<i>Free/Reduced</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>37</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>57</i>
Female	147	34	47	14	5	81	19
Male	154	20	52	21	6	72	28
MATH							
All Student	301	28	37	19	17	64	36
Not Free/Reduced	250	32	40	18	10	72	28
<i>Free/Reduced</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>47</i>	<i>27</i>	<i>73</i>
Female	147	27	37	21	15	64	36
Male	154	28	37	17	18	65	35

School Accountability - 2009

	# Students	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Total Above Proficient	Total Below Proficient
READING							
All Student	268	37	49	11	3	86	14
Not Free/Reduced	219	43	47	9	1	90	10
Free/Reduced	50	10	58	20	12	68	32
Disability	44	0	48	34	18	48	52
Female	137	42	47	9	2	89	11
Male	137	32	52	13	4	84	16
MATH							
All Student	268	29	45	13	13	74	26
Not Free/Reduced	218	34	48	10	8	82	18
Free/Reduced	50	6	32	26	36	38	62
Disability	43	0	26	30	44	26	74
Female	137	24	47	12	16	71	29
Male	131	34	43	13	11	77	23

Based on the above information identified goals are: (% in NECAP)

Reading

Decrease from 14% below standard to 11%

Increase SES Proficiency from 43% to 50%

Decrease Level 1 SES from 24% to 15% - Correlating increase in Level 2 and 3

Increase in Level 4 SES by 5%

Math

Increase

Increase SES Math proficiency by 20%

Decrease Level 1 SES from 47% to 25% - Correlating increase in Level 2 and 3

Increase in Level 4 SES – to 5%

Intra-group comparison data above shows a significant gains across all sub-groups and with proficiency levels. Free/Reduced and Students with Disabilities – very low percentage of students performing in the Distinguished categories. Overall CHMS showed a 10% decrease in students below the standard in Reading (09-10 comparison) and a 9% decrease in students below the standard in Mathematics (09-10 comparison). While these decreases demonstrate growth in student performance several markers need to be noted. CHMS current 5th grade students scored 29% below the standard in both reading and mathematics. Their entry scores into CHMS are significantly below the previous years' scores (14% below reading and 23% below mathematics). Monitoring their progress will be important to valid current supports/services. See prior discussion for further sub-group information

ii. Those strategies defined as required actions through the state accountability system

See information below and above.

iii. One of the required elements of the SIG Transformation Model (Attachment F – SIG Transformation Model Required and Permissible Strategies) as it related to the data analysis and school improvement plan. Directions – Indicate which required element of the Transformation Model is included in the Improvement Plan

Both the continuation of the Math Initiative and the National Writing Project work meet the required and permissible strategies in the following areas:

- Comprehensive instructional reform
- Response to intervention model
- Professional development

iv. Other strategies designed to assist in achieving school improvement targets.

Increase in the availability/use of accelerated math will provide for CHMS to address Numbers and Operations more consistently with better data and alignment of learning objectives (remediation). Introduction of Math Mate program to address math teachers concerns about repetition of learned skills. See self-assessment chart for further information.

Requirement 1 - cont.

The LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools. Directions – Review your budget and school improvement plan to assure adequate resources have been allocated to effectively implement each plan

In each of the last three years CHMS has implemented improvement plans and used the resources allocated. The 10-11 plan identifies the hiring of one teacher and is appropriate to hire a staff member @ full benefits (\$22,000 family insurance) and a salary of \$43,000. Current district contract would indicate a Master Level teacher w/ 2-3 years experience. The indicated VMI costs have been discussed with VMI staff and that is \$12,000 cost is indicative of this conversation. The money indicated for substitutes has been derived by estimating costs/day. The NWP costs and teacher professional development time are estimates based on prior agreements and professional development activities. The technology costs are derived from an early purchase of Accelerated Math materials and equipment.

The school will conduct a guided self-assessment of each school using the rubric provided (See attachment E) to determine capacity and readiness for implementing the school improvement plan. Directions – Attachment E – to be completed by school staff – A compilation of the data on Attachment E with the Superintendent’s signature should be attached and a summary of the findings included here.

Factors for Assessing School Capacity to Improve/Actions to Take	Not Evident	Emerging	Strong
The Principal has communicated urgency, vision and a plan	10/-	17/-	73/100
The Principal is recognized as the instructional leader	10/-	17/-	73/100
All staff know how a continuous improvement system works.	-/-	45/50	55/50
The curriculum is aligned and focused across and within grades	-/-	21/25	79/75
The curriculum is aligned with state standards	-/-	21/25	79/75
The curriculum reflects rigor	-/-	21/25	79/75
All students are expected to master the curriculum	-/-	21/25	79/75
The school has a data team that meets to review student outcomes and a computerized student data tracking system	14/25	45/75	55/-
All teachers review their student data regularly	10/-	52/50	38/50
Common formative assessments have been developed for each grade across all grades in the school and are tracked by the student data system	3/-	52/50	45/50
The schedule permits common planning time and is focused on academic improvement and social support	10/-	31/50	59/50
There is a warm and welcoming climate with firm expectations for acceptable behavior	3/-	7/-	90/100
Paraprofessionals have passed proficiency requirements	59/25	41/75	-/
Professional development is provided in classrooms and is focused on school areas of need identified by the accountability system	10/25	66/50	24/25
The Principal is frequently in classrooms and the teacher evaluation system is effective in improving teaching and learning	24/25	55/50	21/25
Teachers reflect the climate of open communication by visiting one another’s classes and sharing lessons and other materials	-/	31/25	69/75
The special education and support systems are provide in regular classrooms, are based on the response to intervention system, and connected to the formative assessment system	-/-	17/25	83/75
Resources are equitably distributed across classes and support systems	-/-	21/25	79/75
Social and emotional support systems are adequate for the student needs	-/-	7/25	93/75
There are preschool, after school programs for all students	-/-	10/-	90/100
There is evidence of business and community support	-/-	57/50	43/50
Career and college readiness programs begin in the middle school and offer pathways to college, internships, and supports in high school	31/25	69/75	-/

Information is in percentage of respondents – Teachers Total 29 – Support Staff – 8

The CESU district teachers have worked on a standards-base curriculum that is aligned to the state standards and developed a monitoring system. CHMS teachers clearly believe that the curriculum is rigorous, and aligned to these standards. The emerging comments in the curriculum area were predominately concerning the Socials Studies curriculum. Teachers have indicated lack of “quality” local assessments that identify and assess the most relevant/important concepts. Common assessment, professional development and data review while receiving emerging/strong scores indicate that there is a disconnect between math and LA teachers and other teachers within the building. While math and writing professional develop have focused on formative assessment, student

work and data review imbedded into daily practice this is not true for science, social studies or other non-core staff. Increasing the connectedness between our PLC model and individual teacher/subject matter may address this. In looking at the comments related to these areas it was clear that content area specificity influenced responses. Science, Social Studies, Art, Technology Education, and other non-core teachers rating significantly lower on professional development, common assessment and data review than their math and LA counterparts. Paraeducator professional develop is an area of concern and rated that way. Teachers report that supports and services appear to be in place to meet all students’ needs.

Requirement 2

CESU has no Tiered I schools

Requirement 3

The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to

Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;

Recruit, screen and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality

Align other resources with the interventions

Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and

Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends

Guided self assessment is included.

Camels Hump Middle School and the Chittenden East School District agree to work with the state School Improvement Support team in the development and execution of a school improvement implementations plan that assesses and incorporates effective school improvement strategies already underway and includes strategies to do so. The Supervisory Union will designate a local leadership team responsible for directing and reporting on the progress of implementing defined elements. This team will include the superintendent, principal of CHMS, curriculum coordinator and the special education coordinator. CHMS commits to providing the following required data elements annually:

	09-10	10-11
Number of minutes in school day	420	
Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup	100%	
Dropout rate	.84 – MMU – 08-09	
Student attendance rate	96%	
HQT status -	2%	
Number and percentage of students completing advanced course work, early college high schools, or dual enrollment classes	**	
Discipline incidents	156	
Truants	2	
Distribution of teachers by performance level on a LEA’s teacher evaluation system – Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, Distinguished	2%	10%* 55% 31%
Teacher attendance rate	90%	

**** Advanced course work offered – Algebra, Foreign Language, Pre-Algebra,
Algebra – 25% of 8th graders enrolled
Foreign Language – 60% of 8th graders enrolled – French/Spanish offered
Pre-Algebra – 25% of 7th graders enrolled**

2. LEA agrees to collaborate and cooperate with state organized trainings fro Supervisory Union Administrators, principals, teachers and paraprofessionals, informational meetings, and trainings provided through the state. This item is addressed in the “statement of Agreement”

3. The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to align other resources with the interventions.

See prior sections for discussion.

The LEA plan must be comprehensive and systemic in its approach. Reviewers will look to the budget and school improvement plan to assess the alignment and allocation of resources (personnel, percent of time committed, recognition of and /or effort to assess and realign existing initiatives and funds from other sources to support school improvement goals, refocusing existing professional development and in-service days to support training needs related to improvement) Directions – Please review budget and school improvement plan to assure items below are addressed and check appropriate boxes

- a. Human resources**
- b. Fiscal resources**
- c. Time and schedule**
- d. Existing Initiatives**
- e. Related Activities**
- f. Partnerships**
- g. Alignment of PD activities**

CHMS improvement plan consists of two major components. One the hiring of a math teacher to provide direct instruction within classrooms and to support other math teachers in participating in a “lesson study” professional development program. Earlier school improvement monies have been used to put CHMS in a position to fully utilize this approach. We have systematically trained math teachers in: math content, instructional strategies, and formative assessment. By utilizing a “lesson study” approach CHMS can bring all these elements together at the teacher/instructional level while also building capacity for future professional development within the school. District Math Coordinator will support CHMS “lesson study”. Teachers have had training in PLC strategies and this “lesson study” approach brings these trainings together. Finally, our work with VMI this year has shown us that we need to increase our instructional skills in: describing the daily learning outcomes – what are we going to learn (specifically), having students engage in smaller more precise learning activities and then closing the instructional period with a data gathering device that is specific to the lesson. CHMS teachers have identified this process as valuable to them. We have conducted one “lesson study” this year as a pilot this year and time and schedule issues can be address with the identified substitutes and math hire. We have an existing relationship with VMI and the District Math Coordinator as they have been at CHMS all year observing teachers and meeting with them regarding practice and instruction. The “lesson study” format only adds more clarity/structure to these meeting/observations.

Our continuation of our work with NWP is also part of existing initiatives and a continuation of a successful partnership. Teachers have used NWP to advance a common rubric and expand their understanding of what good writing is and the elements of good writing instruction. Teacher are willing to meet outside of their contracted day to complete this work and have done so over the past two years. Providing an opportunity for teachers to meet more formally in

conjunction with an NWP support person would further the “lesson study” across another content area. NWP study groups’ members have identified as an Act 68 goal increasing the knowledge and skill of all teachers across the building in writing instruction as a goal. This work will be supported by improvement funds.

Requirement 6

For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.

For the 10-11 Academic year CHMS will:

- Introduce pilot Math Mate across all grade levels – Math Mate is a skills maintenance program – will be attached to supplemental services for identified students

- Participate in a “lesson-study” program for all math teachers – grades 5-8

- Align Item Bank with current units of study

- Continued development of formative assessment and instructional practice – 80/20 math instructional practices..... 20% teacher directed – 80% student work/explorations/activity – research from our VMI work indicates positive results in student outcomes when students “do” more

- Work with NWP group

Requirement 7

The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds. – Directions – Describe indicators the LEA will use to assess progress towards implementation of the improvement plan for Tier III schools

Review of student performance data and other assessment information. Focus on growth of individual sub-groups within proficiency levels. Trimester reports from school principal on student performance and teacher data. CHMS has identified the following markers for improvement:

Reading

- Decrease from 14% below standard to 11%

- Increase SES Proficiency from 43% to 50%

- Decrease Level 1 SES from 24% to 15% - Correlating increase in Level 2 and 3

- Increase in Level 4 SES by 5%

Math

- Increase

- Increase SES Math proficiency by 20%

- Decrease Level 1 SES from 47% to 25% - Correlating increase in Level 2 and 3

- Increase in Level 4 SES – to 5%

Finally, fidelity of the implementation of the improvement plan outlined in prior sections will be reviewed. Item Bank use and accuracy/alignment, participation and number of “lesson studies” conducted. Notes from these meetings collected for documentation. NWP group participation and work samples.

Requirement 8 – don’t have to do Tier I and II

B. BUDGET: An LEA must include a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school it commits to serve.

The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to:

- Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA’s Tier I and Tier II schools; and
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA’s application.

Directions: An LEA must include a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year in each Tier I, Tier II and Tier III school it commits to serve. Attach budget

Mathematics	Math Instructor	\$65,000	Total \$65,000
-------------	-----------------	----------	-------------------

This is a one year request

Note: An LEA’s budget must cover the period of availability, including any extension granted through a waiver, and be of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected school intervention model in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve.

An LEA’s budget for each year may not exceed the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve multiplied by \$2,000,000

C. ASSURANCES: An LEA must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

The LEA must assure that it will –

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State’s assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.
- (3) If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements ; and
- (4) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

These assurances and others are addressed in the Statement of Agreement. A copy of the Statement of Agreement signed by the Superintendent must be submitted with this application.

E. WAIVERS: If the SEA has requested any waivers of requirements applicable to the LEA's School Improvement Grant, an LEA must indicate which of those waivers it intends to implement.

Directions: The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

- Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds**

- "Starting Over" in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model**

- Implementing a school wide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.**

Statement of Agreement

For Tier I/II schools:

Agreement to participate in a comprehensive assessment conducted by an external evaluator of the VTDOE's choosing to inform school improvement implementation plan development and VTDOE school improvement support team service plan development.

For Tier III schools:

For schools that have been in Corrective Action under the state accountability system for 4 years or more, this includes an agreement to participate in an assessment conducted by an external evaluator of the VTDOE's choosing

For Tier I/II/III schools:

- The application includes a commitment to work with the state School Improvement Support team in the development and execution of a school improvement implementation plan that assesses and incorporates effective school improvement strategies already under way and includes required (for Tier I and II) and permissible strategies
- The application includes a commitment to designate local leadership team (SU School Support team) responsible for directing and reporting on the progress of implementing defined elements. This team must include the superintendent, the principal of the school(s), the curriculum coordinator and the special education coordinator.
- The application includes a commitment to provide the following required data elements annually:
 - 1.) Number of minutes within the school year
 - 2.) Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup
 - 3.) Dropout rate
 - 4.) Student attendance rate
 - 5.) Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (i.e. AP/IB), early college high schools, or dual enrollment classes
 - 6.) Discipline incidents
 - 7.) Truants
 - 8.) Distribution of teachers by performance level on an LEA's teacher evaluation system (once that system is up and running)
 - 9.) Teacher attendance rate

- The LEA agrees to collaborate and cooperate with state organized trainings for Supervisory Union administrators, principals, teachers and paraprofessionals, informational meetings, and trainings provided through the state.
- The LEA agrees to use an external evaluation and internal review process to identify any current practices or policies that are barriers to a full and effective implementation of the selected intervention and commit to eliminating barriers through the implementation process.
- The LEA agrees to use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- The LEA agrees to establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
- If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, the LEA agrees to include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and
- The LEA agrees to report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

Superintendent's Signature

Initial Self Assessment – Attachment B

Major Factors	
<p>1. The Principal has communicated a sense of urgency with a prioritized plan for improvement and is present and recognized in the school as the instructional leader. The Principal can identify priorities for action and “ quick wins”.</p>	<p>Teachers and administration have worked together to identify mathematics (multiplicative and proportional reasoning), reading (analysis and informational text), writing (constructed response, writing on demand) as areas for instructional/student outcome improvement. Coordinated professional development activities have been established and maintained to address these areas. District curriculum in reading, math and writing is in place and is aligned with supplemental programs. Staff members have worked together at grade level and content level teams at the school level. District curriculum committees (Mathematics, Communications) have met regularly with District Reading and Mathematics Coordinator. Teachers have met with administration to set yearly formative goals. Writing instruction aligned to NWP work, formative assessment, Differentiated Instruction have all been focus areas in goal setting. Teachers are required to track and report out on identified student progress.</p>
<p>2. All teachers and administrators know what a continuous improvement system is, how it works, and that the basis of that system is accountability through regular examination of student outcomes.</p>	<p>School-wide professional learning communities have been in place since the 06-07 academic school year. Professional learning community’s topics have included – Ruby Payne – Framework for Understanding Poverty, formative assessment strategies, standards-based reporting, common assessment of student work and instructional practices. CHMS staff have worked with the PLC questions from DuFour’s work – What are teaching, How do we know if they are learning it, What do we do if they haven’t learned it. CESU has collected data on all students using a variety of assessments for over 5 years. Teachers have access to assessment data (NECAP, Gate-McGinitie, Math Level Indicator, Diagnostic Reading Inventory, EOYM, District common assessments in reading, math, science, writing and spelling). This data is used to regularly by teams/teachers to guide instructional practice. School-wide NECAP data clearly demonstrates that all students are progressing. School-wide 86% of students are meeting the standard in reading, SES students met AYP in reading, IEP students met AYP in math. School-wide 75% of students are meeting the standard in mathematics which is an increase of 7% from prior NECAP results. AYP data in mathematics indicates that both SES and IEP subgroups are making “statistical significant” progress.</p>
<p>3. The curriculum has been aligned to state standards and focused from K-12 and all teachers understand the main focal points that must be taught over the year. The curriculum is based on high expectations and rigorous requirements for all students.</p>	<p>District curriculum has been aligned with State GE’s and a common K-12 curriculum has been for approximately 8 years. GE alignment has been assured by a District Curriculum coordinator and two District Curriculum support Teachers. (One – Communications – One- Math/Science)</p> <p>District curriculum meetings have been held at both grade level (K-4, 5-8 and 9-12) as well as K-12 to ensure vertical alignment. District coordinators are responsible for curricular adaptations/changes and implementation of changes. Teachers from each building meet regularly on District curriculum committees. In each curricular area local assessments have been identified and all teachers are required to enter these assessments into the Districts assessment data-base (VCAT) for review and fidelity. District assessments have been aligned to the focal points in the curriculum.</p>

<p>4. The schedule permits common planning time, grade level meetings, data team meetings, and after-school focus on curriculum and instruction. The schedule is focused on student academic and social success and does not get bogged down in several different and weakly defined initiatives.</p>	<p>Individual teams meet weekly with guidance and special educators to address academic, behavioral, and social needs for identified students. Curricular modifications or adaptations are identified and learning outcomes established.</p> <p>Grade level teams meet bi-weekly (Grade Level PLCs) to look at student work, instructional practice, assessment and student data. Twice monthly school-wide meetings. Identified goal work or professional development activities aligned with identified school goals.</p> <p>CHMS staff has used a major percentage of their grade level meetings to implement a standards-based reporting system. In implementing the standards-based reporting system teachers aligned instructional units, common assessments, curricular objectives.</p> <p>11 writing teachers have meet monthly to implement a new writing rubric based on the 6 traits from the National Writing Project and have used this rubric to look at student work and instructional practice.</p> <p>13 math teachers have met consistently with VMI instructors over the past three years to look at math contextual understanding, formative assessment, instructional practice. OGAP common formative assessments. 7th and 8th grade math teachers meet every other week to align instruction and assessment information.</p>
<p>5. Each grade level has common formative assessments that are given on a regular basis, tracked for each student and reviewed at data team meetings.</p> <p><i>*Italics indicates required district assessment – Other assessments listed are required</i></p>	<p>Math teachers have worked with VMI over the past 3 years and have integrated OGAP assessments into various instructional units. Math teachers meet regularly to review assessments. Students identified as needing supplemental interventions are placed in an appropriate Do-the-Math unit and/or placed at an instructional objective level in Accelerated Math. School uses AIMSWEB to track and monitor reading fluency and comprehension for identified students along with in-class district assessment data. District assessments are as follows:</p> <p>Math – Grade 5 – MLI, <i>PrimeTime, Bit/Pieces I</i>, Math – Grade 6 – MLI, <i>Bits/Pieces II, Covering Surrounding</i> Math – Grade 7 – MLI, <i>Comparing/Scaling, Filling/Wrapping</i> Math – Grade 8 – MLI, <i>Moving Straight Ahead, Thinking w/ Math Models</i></p> <p>Reading – Grade 5 – Gates, DRA, Reading – Grade 6 – Gates, DRA Reading – Grade 7 – Gates, DRA Reading – Grade 8 – Gates, DRA</p> <p>Science – Grade 5 – <i>Motion, Ecosystems, Cells</i> Science – Grade 6 – <i>Composition of Matter, Electricity and Magnetism, Human Body, Geology</i> Science – Grade 7 – <i>Cells, Ecology, Human Body</i> Science – Grade 8 – <i>NECAP, Force/Motion, Chemistry, Matter, Light, Solar System</i></p> <p>Writing – Grade 5 – DSA, <i>Response Literature, Procedure, On-demand-prompt</i> Writing – Grade 6 – DSA, <i>Writing to Inform, Persuasive, Personal Essay</i> Writing – Grade 7 - <i>Response Literature, Narrative, Personal Essay, On-demand prompt</i> Writing – Grade 8 – DSA, <i>Writing to Inform, Persuasive, Personal Essay,</i></p> <p>All data is collected and stored in VCAT. CHMS has sent 2 math teachers and 2 Language Arts teachers plus</p>

	<p>one administrator (principal) to the Vermont Item Bank trainings and have used the item bank to develop one common assessment at the 8th grade level. Further development and use of the Item Bank is an area that CHMS administration and teachers have identified.</p>
<p>6. A school data team reviews student progress on formative and other assessments and reports these results regularly to the faculty. There is a computerized school data system in place for tracking all student outcomes.</p>	<p>School action plan 10-13 establishes a data team to organize and disseminate data information to teams/teachers. Currently, grade level, content teams are responsible for gathering and analyzing data. District has invested heavily in developing and implementing our VCAT monitoring system. All data is inputted into the VCAT system. All teachers have access to their individual students' data through VCAT in real time. Teachers are provided a list of "identified" or "tracked" students at the beginning of the academic year. These students are "tracked" throughout the year through weekly team meetings, bi-weekly PLC meetings, monthly PLC meetings, data assessment meetings, and progress and report card review periods. The above identified meetings are not specifically or 100% used to review these individual student's progress but the structure in place allows for discuss/review if needed. Data team will need to better utilize these teams and the structure.</p>
<p>7. Professional development is delivered in schools and classrooms by experts among the staff or outside consultants, and is focused on areas identified as needing improvement by the school accountability system. Teachers share what they have learned and visit each other's classrooms.</p>	<p>VMI – 09-10 school year – Bob Laird(VMI) and Karen Reinhardt(District Math Coordinator) observed in math classes approximately 2X/mo. and met with grade level math teachers after each observation cycle to discuss instructional practice, student learning and assessment practices. 4 Math teachers along with National Writing Project – 11 teachers have been working with NWP for past three years. Teachers have observed in each other's classrooms, shared student work with each other, aligned instructional vocabulary and implemented a 6 traits writing assessment rubric. (5-8 grade levels)</p> <p>Three years ago teachers decided to move towards Readers Workshop model of reading instruction. Professional development activities were generated by staff members familiar with the model and an implementation plan developed. Currently all students throughout the building participate in a Readers Workshop model during the school year. At the 5th and 6th grade levels reading instruction is primarily done through this model. Special Educators and other support staff personnel are assigned to 5th and 6th grade reading classes to reduce student/teacher ratios for more efficient use of Readers Workshop model. Training has been provided.</p> <p>Heather Baron – Colchester Teacher – provided two days of Differentiated Instruction training August 2010. Focus on assessment, student work, unit design.</p> <p>Pam Foust – District Communications Coordinator has worked with classroom teachers with implementing Readers Workshop model and with writing instruction.</p> <p>In-service 08 – VCAT training for all teachers – Data Analysis and use of system</p> <p>In-service 08-09 – Teachers at 5th/6th and 7th/8th – Common expectations and accountability.</p> <p>In-service 08-09 – Standards –base reporting work.... What are we teaching, How are we measuring it, Is it important, How do we know if kids got it, What is meeting the standard, exceeding.</p> <p>In-service 08 – Responsive classroom – mutual respect and language</p>
<p>8. The teacher evaluation system is capable of identifying teachers who are not providing adequate instruction in the</p>	<p>District uses the Danielson Model of teacher evaluation. Identified teachers are placed on an improvement plan.</p>

<p>classroom, and remediation efforts are time limited.</p>	
<p>9. Paraprofessionals must have an Associate’s Degree, must have passed a mathematics or reading test, and must have taken a district training program.</p>	<p>Special Education paraprofessionals 9 - College/graduates 6 – High school graduates Regular Education paraprofessionals 1- College graduate 1- High school graduate All paraprofessionals have participated in district trainings. Math training has been conducted by CHMS math teachers and special education teachers. UVM based para-educator training was implement 3-4years ago – approximately 50% of current staff participate in that training. M. Carbone –Principal was instructor. Special educators have run mini-workshops on – behavior management, data collection, reading instruction, providing feedback, over the past 3 years. All paras have received CPR and First Aid training.</p>
<p>10. The special education and student support system emphasizes regular classroom instruction, a response to intervention system, and an accountability system that is aligned with the formative assessment system and curricular expectations of the regular classroom.</p>	<p>2 CHMS students receive more than 10% of their instructional outside of the regular education classroom. All other students identified w/ a disability receive over 90% of their instruction within the regular education classroom. CHMS special educators are assigned to co-teach math, writing and reading classes within the regular education setting. Students receive supplement reading (Great Leaps, Read Naturally) or math (Do-the-Math, Accelerated Math) outside of the regular program.(Foreign Language, Chorus/Band, etc) 8th grade students who are not enrolled in Foreign Language and/or not meeting the standard in either math or reading are assigned to a “Learning Lab” course consisting of 250minutes/wk. Supplement math instruction is aligned to either current math instruction or remediation of multiplicative and proportional reasoning development/skills. Math instruction at the 7th and 8th grade levels is tiered so that students who have not mastered multiplicative or proportional reasoning skills receive this instruction as part of their regular math instruction. This tiered instruction is based on VMI teacher work and research.</p>
<p>11. Resources are equitably distributed across all classes and support systems.</p>	<p>Teachers have input into budget development. Resources are provided on an as needed basis.</p>
<p>12. Social and emotional support systems reflect the needs of the student and their resources.</p>	<p>Responsive Design/Classroom protocols/processes are in place throughout the building. Varying degrees of fidelity are evident. Over all philosophy is present in building. Teams conduct “team” meetings with students – to identify and address social dynamic concerns at the student level. Daily/wkly mtgs. SAM – Student-Adult-Mentor program – every other week teachers meet with their SAM kids(8-9) to develop personal relations with kids. SAM groups are a 4 year group with the same teacher. SAM activities are “game” based and contain a greeting, activity and processing time for the activity. SLAAM – 8th grade Leadership training group – 8th graders are trained and then “volunteer” to help facilitate 5th grade SAM groups. Guidance Program – all students are enrolled in a “guidance” program. Social and emotional develop curriculum. On-going/continuous education on adolescent develop. School social worker has and identified caseload that is consistent over time. Social worker has regular meetings with student teams and is seen as a member of these teams. Weekly/Bi-weekly guidance meetings with teams – teachers and</p>

	guidance counselors meet to discuss student/teacher concerns issues.
13. Schools develop career and college readiness programs in middle school and continue those programs throughout high school with defined pathways to college, internships, and supports.	
14. There are preschool, after school, and summer programs available for all students needing more support.	<p>Pre-school – District programs</p> <p>Homework Club – after school program – Monday-Thursday – school year – both team based and support services based</p> <p>Saturday School – identified students – 8:00am-12:00pm – every Saturday as needed – certified teacher on site for instruction – work completion and remediation</p> <p>Summer Youth Program – District program – 16hrs/wk – 4 weeks – identified students – Math, Reading, Writing instruction –tied to school year supplemental programs</p> <p>Camp No-name – District program – 16hrs/wk – 4 weeks - Intensive needs program for identified students – middle school</p> <p>Camp Companeros - District program – 16hrs/wk – 4 weeks - Intensive needs program for identified students – elementary school</p> <p>Math Camp – Supplemental math camp for identified students, teacher recommendation - used school improvement funds for 08 and 09 summers. Proportional and multiplicative reasoning curriculum</p> <p>OCCC – Summer program for elementary students arts and crafts based – provides two meals/day for all camps. OCCC is primarily a feeding program.</p>
15. There is evidence of community and business support or partnerships.	<p>Currently CHMS has partnerships with:</p> <p>VYCC – Monitor Barn Property – Science /Herpetology research - 2 full years</p> <p>Jim Andrews – Middlebury College/Vermont Herpetology research – 2 full years</p> <p>Students are monitoring and collecting data on Vermont reptiles and amphibians and using data within the science curriculum to study ecology – Long term association with Chinese schools/students who are doing the same research is in the planning and development stages</p> <p>Richmond Land Trust – removal of invasive species along Winooski River and Park District -</p> <p>Richmond Conservation – Native garden project – planting eco-friendly gardens and removing non-native species</p> <p>School Resource Officer</p> <p>08-09 Academic year – Parent Math Volunteer Program - approximately 15 parents volunteered weekly to support identified students in basic fact acquisition and fluency. Parent worked with identified students during their math classes. Internal CHMS data shown no identifiable gain for students who received the service and teachers identified the disruption to the math class as a significant problem. Parent volunteers enjoyed working with the students and saw an increase in student knowledge/skill. However, this is not supported by teacher data. Students enjoyed the parent contact.</p>