	Schoolwide Title I	Plan for Improvement/Accountability P	lan for Targeted Schools		
Focus of Plan (cl	neck the appropriate box):	Kansas City Public Schools			
		Name of School or Charter: J. A. Rogers Elementary	Principal/Lead Person: Dr. Adriane Blankinship- Johnson		
Ξ School or Charter		Address: 6400 E 23 rd Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64129	School Website: www.kcpublicschools.com/rogers		
Plan Year(s): 202	19-2020				
Purpose: To dev	elop a plan for improving the	e top 3 needs identified in the needs assessment.			
One plan may m	eet the needs of a number of	different programs. Please check all that apply.			
Ξ	Title I.A School Improveme	ent			
	Title I.C Education of Migra	atory Children			
	Title I.D Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk				
Ξ	Title II.A Language Instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Children				
	Title IV 21 st Century Schoo	ls			
	Title V Flexibility and Acco	untability			
Ξ	Individuals with Disability B	Education Act			
	Rehabilitation Act of 1973				
	Carl D. Perkins Career and	rechnical Education Act			
	Workforce Innovation and	Opportunities Act			
	Head Start Act				
Ξ	McKinney Vento Homeless	Assistance Act			
	Adult Education and Family	Literacy Act			
Ξ	MSIP Other State and Local Requ				

What staff/stakeholders have been involved in the needs assessment and development of this plan?

Stakeholder Group*
Principal
Vice Principal
Instructional Coach
Parent
Parent Involvement Coordinator
Math Interventionist
Reading Interventionist
Special Education Teacher
Teacher
Teacher
Parent
Federal Programs Supervisor
Budget

*Indicate Stakeholder Group to which each planning team member belongs. Stakeholders in bold font are required.
Principal
Teacher(s)/Certified Staff
Parents (at least 2)
Support Staff
Title 1 Supervisor/Coordinator
Vice Principal
Assistant Superintendent(s)
Superintendent
Board Member(s)
Other District Staff

What are the key issues identified from the needs assessment?

1.) In ELA, 90% of IEP students scored Below Basic in 3rd grade, 78.6% of IEP students scored Below Basic in 4th grade, 66.7% of IEP students scored Below Basic in 5th grade, and 71.4% of IEP students scored Below Basic in 6th grade.

2.) In Mathematics, 80% of IEP students scored Below Basic in 3rd grade, 78.6% of IEP students scored Below Basic in 4th grade, and 92.9% of IEP students scored Below Basic in 6th grade. 3.) In Mathematics, 92.3% of the Black students scored Below Basic in 5th grade.

What are the prioritized needs for the LEA or building based on a root cause analysis?

1.) Special Education Teachers and General Education Teachers will participate in training in order to utilize a Co-Teaching process

2.) Special Education Teachers will align IEP goals more closely to grade level standards where applicable

3.) Secure the Reading and Math Interventionists three days per week (increase from two) to work with small groups in order to enhance students' math and reading skills

		(Goals and the Plan than 3 goals to focus on with yo	our improvement plan)	
				Area of the Continuous Impro		s under:
\langle	Leadership		e Climate and Iture	Effective Teaching and Learning	Data-Based Decision Making	Alignment of Standards and Curriculum
MAR	T (Specific, Meas	urable, Achievable, I	Relevant and Tim	ely) Goal #1		
nd ev	valuative confere	nces that will result in	n a 50% decrease	for all students; including thos	_	and academic rigor on walkthrough on Programs, in the Below Basic
nd ev atego	valuative confere pry in ELA, Math,	nces that will result ir and Science accordin	n a 50% decrease g to the 2019-202	for all students; including thos 20 MAP results.	e with Individualized Educatio	
nd ev atego	valuative confere pry in ELA, Math,	nces that will result ir and Science accordin	n a 50% decrease g to the 2019-202	for all students; including thos	e with Individualized Educatio	
nd ev atego ation	valuative confere bry in ELA, Math, nale (name of the	nces that will result ir and Science accordin	n a 50% decrease g to the 2019-202	for all students; including thos 20 MAP results.	e with Individualized Educatio	
nd ev atego ation	valuative confere pry in ELA, Math,	nces that will result ir and Science accordin	n a 50% decrease g to the 2019-202	for all students; including thos 20 MAP results.	e with Individualized Educatio	
nd ev atego ation	valuative confere bry in ELA, Math, nale (name of the	nces that will result in and Science accordin e existing conditions/	n a 50% decrease g to the 2019-202 <mark>/data points to su</mark>	for all students; including thos 20 MAP results. pport the selection of the obj	e with Individualized Educatio	on Programs, in the Below Basic

4 th	7.4%	20.6%	51.5%	20.6%	68
5 th	7.7%	16.7%	44.9%	30.8%	78
6 th	7.8%	7.8%	42.9%	41.6%	77

Mathematics, MAP

Grade	Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic	Total Students
3 rd -6 th	5.4%	13.0%	26.0%	55.6%	277
3 rd	11.1%	20.4%	31.5%	37.0%	54
4 th	5.9%	17.6%	20.6%	55.9%	68
5 th	5.1%	9.0%	26.9%	59.0%	78
6 th	1.3%	7.8%	26.0%	64.9%	77

Communication Arts, MAP, by Subgroup (IEP)

Grade	Below Basic	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
3 rd	90%	0%	10%	0%
4 th	78.6%	14.3%	7.1%	0%
5 th	66.7%	11.1%	22.1%	0%
6 th	71.4%	14.3%	7.1%	7.1%

Mathematics, MAP, by Subgroup (IEP)

Grade	Below Basic	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
3 rd	80%	10%	10%	0%
4 th	78.6%	21.4%	0%	0%
5 th	77.8%	11.1%	0%	11.1%
6 th	92.9%	7.1%	0%	0%

Alignment to KCPS Strategic Plan - Goals and Measures of Student Success (p. 14 KCPS Strategic Plan):

Continuous Growth Toward Mastery of All Academic Subjects: Every student will progress at a pace that closes the achievement gap and will meet or exceed academic standards in academic subjects.

- a) Increased percentage of students meeting proficiency standards on local, state and national examinations.
- b) Increased percentage of identified students who move up or out of tiered academic support (e.g., English Language Learners [ELL]; Problem-Solving Team [PST]; Individualized Education Program [IEP]).
- c) Increased growth rate by a minimum of one year for students at/above grade level and 1.5 years for students below grade level.

Alignment to KCPS Strategic Plan - Professional Practices for Instructional Effectiveness (p.15 KCPS Strategic Plan):

Teaching Practices

T1: Teachers guide students to direct their own learning and to work with other students on culturally and socially relevant research projects and assignments.

T2: Teachers utilize a variety of high engagement strategies, real-life and authentic learning opportunities and motivational approaches to raise expectations for all students, regardless of current level of performance.

Leadership Practices

L1: Principal/Leadership encourages teachers and staff to challenge their own beliefs and actions about students' ability to meet high expectations and provide culturally relevant ongoing professional development.

L2: Principal communicates high expectations by prioritizing mastery of instruction for all student subgroups, and leading ongoing teacher, team and schoolwide dialogue about student work products.

Strategies for Improvement

- Administrators will apply knowledge gained from district, local, out-of-state Professional Development and research to real-world experiences and reflect on those experiences with colleagues. This learning community will act as a support network for developing leadership capacity to improve classroom teaching.
- Administrators will apply the Professional Learning Community Model to enhance teaching and develop a collaborative focus on improving student learning and achievement in English language arts and math.
- Administrators will help to set challenging learning goals and clarify what success means (Hattie, 2009).
- Administrators and Instructional Support Coach will participate in PLC meetings with teachers as measured by improved instructional strategies and student achievement.
- Administrators will conduct 5 "Classroom Walkthroughs" each week to identify instructional practices in need of improvement, especially practices related to rigor and engagement in English language arts and math.
- Teachers will include differentiated instructional strategies in lesson plans (small group instruction, RtI, math workshop model, reading workshop model, and learning stations)
- Teachers will include content-specific vocabulary words per content area in their lesson plans

Action Steps	Start	Person	Resources	Completed/Date
	Date	Responsible		
	August	Administrative	MAP data, common	
1 st quarter	2019	Team, Teachers,	assessment data, formative	
1. Attend grade level PLC meetings with classroom teachers		and Instructional	assessment data, iReady	
and analyze current student achievement data (ongoing)		Support Coach	data, QRI data, pathways	
2. Strategically develop PD agendas and ongoing			data, attendance data, Big 5	
professional learning			data	

 3. Administrators will meet weekly with Instructional Support Coach to evaluate progress and plan ongoing professional development (ongoing) 4. Conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs 5. Present a monthly report focused on assessment, discipline, and attendance data (quarterly) 6. Review KCPS Stakeholder survey of teachers' perceptions of culture and climate of the school, and respond to needs (1st quarter) 				
2 nd quarter 1. Teachers will complete Individual Support Plans 2. Teachers will complete Student Growth Objectives 3.	October 2019	Administrative Team, Teachers, and Instructional Support Coach	MAP data, common assessment data, formative assessment data, iReady data, QRI data, pathways data, attendance data, Big 5 data	
3 rd quarter 1. 2. 3.				
Long Range 1. 2. 3.				

Leaders		borative Climate and Culture		tive Teaching and Learning	Data-Based Decis Making	ion Alignment of Star Curriculu	
MART (Specifi	c, Measurable, Achieva	Die, neievant and	Timely) Goa	l #2			
-	C process, 80% of the stund of the PLC process ove			-	the iReady grade/class re	eports as a result of effective	
ommunication Arts,	MAP				ojective/goal) and Alignr		-
Grade 3 rd -6 th	Advanced 8.3%	Proficien 15.9%	t	Basic 42.6%	Below Basic 33.2%	Total Students 277	
3 rd	11.1%	20.4%		27.8%	40.7%	54	_
		20.4%		27.070	40.770	54	
		20.6%		51 5%	20.6%		
4 th	7.4%	20.6%		51.5%	20.6%	68	
4 th 5 th	7.4% 7.7%	16.7%		44.9%	30.8%	68 78	-
4 th 5 th 6 th	7.4%					68	-
4 th 5 th 6 th Aathematics, MAP	7.4% 7.7% 7.8%	16.7% 7.8%	+	44.9% 42.9%	30.8% 41.6%	68 78 77]
4 th 5 th 6 th Aathematics, MAP Grade	7.4% 7.7% 7.8% Advanced	16.7% 7.8% Proficien	t	44.9% 42.9% Basic	30.8% 41.6% Below Basic	68 78 77 Total Students	
4 th 5 th 6 th Athematics, MAP Grade 3 rd -6 th	7.4% 7.7% 7.8% Advanced 5.4%	16.7% 7.8% Proficien 13.0%	t	44.9% 42.9% Basic 26.0%	30.8% 41.6% Below Basic 55.6%	68 78 77 Total Students 277	
4 th 5 th 6 th Athematics, MAP Grade 3 rd -6 th 3 rd	7.4% 7.7% 7.8% Advanced	16.7% 7.8% Proficien	t	44.9% 42.9% Basic	30.8% 41.6% Below Basic	68 78 77 Total Students	
4 th 5 th 6 th Athematics, MAP Grade 3 rd -6 th 3 rd 4 th	7.4% 7.7% 7.8% 4dvanced 5.4% 11.1% 5.9%	16.7% 7.8% Proficien 13.0% 20.4%	t	44.9% 42.9% Basic 26.0% 31.5%	30.8% 41.6% Below Basic 55.6% 37.0%	68 78 77 Total Students 277 54 68	
4 th 5 th 6 th Athematics, MAP Grade 3 rd -6 th 3 rd 4 th 5 th	7.4% 7.7% 7.8% Advanced 5.4% 11.1%	16.7% 7.8% Proficien 13.0% 20.4% 17.6%	t	44.9% 42.9% Basic 26.0% 31.5% 20.6%	30.8% 41.6% Below Basic 55.6% 37.0% 55.9%	68 78 77 Total Students 277 54	
4 th 5 th 6 th Iathematics, MAP Grade 3 rd -6 th 3 rd 4 th 5 th 6 th	7.4% 7.7% 7.8% 4dvanced 5.4% 11.1% 5.9% 5.1% 1.3%	16.7% 7.8% Proficien 13.0% 20.4% 17.6% 9.0%	t	44.9% 42.9% Basic 26.0% 31.5% 20.6% 26.9%	30.8% 41.6% Below Basic 55.6% 37.0% 55.9% 59.0%	68 78 77 Total Students 277 54 68 78	
4 th 5 th 6 th Iathematics, MAP Grade 3 rd -6 th 3 rd 4 th 5 th 6 th	7.4% 7.7% 7.8% 4dvanced 5.4% 11.1% 5.9% 5.1% 1.3% MAP, by Subgroup (IEP)	16.7% 7.8% Proficien 13.0% 20.4% 17.6% 9.0% 7.8%		44.9% 42.9% 26.0% 31.5% 20.6% 26.9% 26.0%	30.8% 41.6% Below Basic 55.6% 37.0% 55.9% 59.0% 64.9%	68 78 77 Total Students 277 54 68 78 77	
4 th 5 th 6 th Iathematics, MAP Grade 3 rd -6 th 3 rd 4 th 5 th 6 th 6 th Grade	7.4% 7.7% 7.8% 4dvanced 5.4% 11.1% 5.9% 5.1% 1.3% MAP, by Subgroup (IEP) Below Basic	16.7% 7.8% Proficien 13.0% 20.4% 17.6% 9.0% 7.8%	Basic	44.9% 42.9% 26.0% 31.5% 20.6% 26.9% 26.0%	30.8% 41.6% Below Basic 55.6% 37.0% 55.9% 59.0% 64.9% oficient	68 78 77 77 Total Students 277 54 68 78 78 77 77	
4 th 5 th 6 th lathematics, MAP Grade 3 rd -6 th 3 rd 4 th 5 th 6 th Communication Arts, Grade 3 rd	7.4% 7.7% 7.8% 4dvanced 5.4% 11.1% 5.9% 5.1% 1.3% MAP, by Subgroup (IEP) Below Basic 90%	16.7% 7.8% Proficien 13.0% 20.4% 17.6% 9.0% 7.8%	Basic 0%	44.9% 42.9% 26.0% 31.5% 20.6% 26.9% 26.0% Pr 10	30.8% 41.6% Below Basic 55.6% 37.0% 55.9% 59.0% 64.9% oficient	68 78 77 77 Total Students 277 54 68 68 78 78 77 77	
4 th 5 th 6 th Athematics, MAP Grade 3 rd -6 th 3 rd 4 th 5 th 6 th 6 th Grade 3 rd 4 th	7.4% 7.7% 7.8% 4dvanced 5.4% 11.1% 5.9% 5.1% 1.3% MAP, by Subgroup (IEP) Below Basic 90% 78.6%	16.7% 7.8% Proficien 13.0% 20.4% 17.6% 9.0% 7.8%	Basic 0% 14.3%	44.9% 42.9% 26.0% 31.5% 20.6% 26.9% 26.0% Pr 10 7.	30.8% 41.6% Below Basic 55.6% 37.0% 55.9% 59.0% 64.9% oficient 1%	68 78 77 77 54 68 78 277 54 68 78 78 77 77 77	
4 th 5 th 6 th Aathematics, MAP Grade 3 rd -6 th 3 rd 4 th 5 th 6 th Communication Arts, Grade 3 rd 4 th 5 th 6 th	7.4% 7.7% 7.8% 4dvanced 5.4% 11.1% 5.9% 5.1% 1.3% MAP, by Subgroup (IEP) Below Basic 90% 78.6% 66.7%	16.7% 7.8% Proficien 13.0% 20.4% 17.6% 9.0% 7.8%	Basic 0% 14.3% 11.1%	44.9% 42.9% 26.0% 31.5% 20.6% 26.9% 26.0%	30.8% 41.6% Below Basic 55.6% 37.0% 55.9% 59.0% 64.9% oficient % 1%	68 78 77 Total Students 277 54 68 78 77 54 68 78 77 70 4 68 78 77 54 68 78 77 0% 0% 0%	
4 th 5 th 6 th Mathematics, MAP Grade 3 rd -6 th 3 rd 4 th 5 th 6 th Communication Arts, Grade 3 rd 4 th 5 th 6 th Communication Arts, Grade 3 rd 6 th	7.4% 7.7% 7.8% 4dvanced 5.4% 11.1% 5.9% 5.1% 1.3% MAP, by Subgroup (IEP) Below Basic 90% 78.6% 66.7% 71.4%	16.7% 7.8% Proficien 13.0% 20.4% 17.6% 9.0% 7.8%	Basic 0% 14.3%	44.9% 42.9% 26.0% 31.5% 20.6% 26.9% 26.0%	30.8% 41.6% Below Basic 55.6% 37.0% 55.9% 59.0% 64.9% oficient 1%	68 78 77 77 54 68 78 277 54 68 78 78 77 77 77	
4 th 5 th 6 th Mathematics, MAP Grade 3 rd -6 th 3 rd 4 th 5 th 6 th Communication Arts, Grade 3 rd	7.4% 7.7% 7.8% 4dvanced 5.4% 11.1% 5.9% 5.1% 1.3% MAP, by Subgroup (IEP) Below Basic 90% 78.6% 66.7% 71.4%	16.7% 7.8% Proficien 13.0% 20.4% 17.6% 9.0% 7.8%	Basic 0% 14.3% 11.1%	44.9% 42.9% 26.0% 31.5% 20.6% 26.9% 26.0% Pr 10 7. 22 7.	30.8% 41.6% Below Basic 55.6% 37.0% 55.9% 59.0% 64.9% oficient % 1%	68 78 77 Total Students 277 54 68 78 77 54 68 78 77 70 4 68 78 77 54 68 78 77 0% 0% 0%	

4 th	78.6%	21.4%	0%	0%
5 th	77.8%	11.1%	0%	11.1%
6 th	92.9%	7.1%	0%	0%

Alignment to KCPS Strategic Plan - Goals and Measures of Student Success (p. 14 KCPS Strategic Plan):

Continuous Growth Toward Mastery of All Academic Subjects: Every student will progress at a pace that closes the achievement gap and will meet or exceed academic standards in academic subjects.

- a) Increased percentage of students meeting proficiency standards on local, state and national examinations.
- b) Increased percentage of identified students who move up or out of tiered academic support (e.g., English Language Learners [ELL]; Problem-Solving Team [PST]; Individualized Education Program [IEP]).
- c) Increased growth rate by a minimum of one year for students at/above grade level and 1.5 years for students below grade level.

Alignment to KCPS Strategic Plan - Professional Practices for Instructional Effectiveness (p.15 KCPS Strategic Plan):

Teaching Practices

T1: Teachers guide students to direct their own learning and to work with other students on culturally and socially relevant research projects and assignments.

T2: Teachers utilize a variety of high engagement strategies, real-life and authentic learning opportunities and motivational approaches to raise expectations for all students, regardless of current level of performance.

Leadership Practices

L1: Principal/Leadership encourages teachers and staff to challenge their own beliefs and actions about students' ability to meet high expectations and provide culturally relevant ongoing professional development.

L2: Principal communicates high expectations by prioritizing mastery of instruction for all student subgroups, and leading ongoing teacher, team and schoolwide dialogue about student work products.

Strategies for Improvement

- Collect and chart data to identify how students are performing/processing standards
- Analyze student work specific to data
- Effectively utilize the PLC Cycle 1) Data analysis and instruction modification 2) Interventions and Extensions 3) Curriculum Design and Pacing 4) Student exploring and learning 5) Formative assessments

Action Steps	Start Date	Person Responsible	Resources	Completed/Date
 1st quarter 1. Implement effective teaching strategies via the outcomes of the PLC meetings 2. Implement effective teaching strategies via the outcomes of weekly onsite Professional Development 3. Facilitate professional development on differentiated instruction in science, math, and reading 	August 2019	Instructional Support Coach, teachers, Administrators, District Content Coordinators	 PLC Logs, PLC Timeline, My Learning Plan professional development catalog MAP data, common assessment data, formative assessment data, iReady data, QRI data, pathways data, attendance data, Big 5 data 	
 2nd quarter 1. Facilitate professional development on small group instruction in science, math, and reading 2. Facilitate professional development on learning stations in science, math, and reading 3. Facilitate professional development on the Reader's Workshop in reading 	August 2019	Instructional Support Coach, Teachers, Administrators, District Content Coordinators	PLC Logs, PLC Timeline, My Learning Plan professional development catalog MAP data, common assessment data, formative assessment data, iReady data, QRI data, pathways data, attendance data, Big 5 data	
 3rd quarter 1. Facilitate professional development on the Math Workshop in math 2. Ongoing use of the S.T.E.M. lab 3. Invite curriculum coordinators for onsite modeling and PD 	August 2019	Instructional Support Coach, District Content Coordinators, Teachers	 PLC Logs, PLC Timeline, My Learning Plan professional development catalog MAP data, common assessment data, formative assessment data, iReady data, QRI data, pathways data, attendance data, Big 5 data 	
Long Range 1. Supplemental teachers will provide instruction for Tier II students 2.	August 2019	Reading Interventionist, Math Interventionist	PLC Logs, PLC Timeline, My Learning Plan professional development catalog	□

3.	MAP data, common
	assessment data, formative
	assessment data, iReady
	data, QRI data, pathways
	data, attendance data, Big 5
	data

Goal #3 - Circle the appropriate Area of the Continuous Improvement System this goal falls under:							
Leadership	Collaborative Climat Culture	e and	Effective Teaching and Learning	\mathbf{i}	Data-Based Decision Making	Alignment of Stan Curriculu	
SMART (Specific, Measurab	le, Achievable, Relevant	t and Timely)	Goal #2				
By May 2020, 100% of students will increase their average scale scores from the Fall 2019 assessment to the Spring 2020 Assessment in both ELA and Math as reflected in the iReady performance reports.							
Rationale (name of the existing conditions/data points to support the selection of the objective/goal) and Alignment							
Communication Arts, MAP							1
Grade Adv	vanced Pro	oficient	Basic		Below Basic	Total Students	

Γ	3 rd -6 th	8.3%	15.9%	42.6%	33.2%	277
	3 rd	11.1%	20.4%	27.8%	40.7%	54
	4 th	7.4%	20.6%	51.5%	20.6%	68
	5 th	7.7%	16.7%	44.9%	30.8%	78
	6 th	7.8%	7.8%	42.9%	41.6%	77

Mathematics, MAP

Grade	Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic	Total Students
3 rd -6 th	5.4%	13.0%	26.0%	55.6%	277
3 rd	11.1%	20.4%	31.5%	37.0%	54
4 th	5.9%	17.6%	20.6%	55.9%	68
5 th	5.1%	9.0%	26.9%	59.0%	78
6 th	1.3%	7.8%	26.0%	64.9%	77

Communication Arts, MAP, by Subgroup (IEP)

Grade	Below Basic	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
3 rd	90%	0%	10%	0%
4 th	78.6%	14.3%	7.1%	0%
5 th	66.7%	11.1%	22.1%	0%
6 th	71.4%	14.3%	7.1%	7.1%

Mathematics, MAP, by Subgroup (IEP)

Grade	Below Basic	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
3 rd	80%	10%	10%	0%
4 th	78.6%	21.4%	0%	0%
5 th	77.8%	11.1%	0%	11.1%
6 th	92.9%	7.1%	0%	0%

Alignment to KCPS Strategic Plan - Goals and Measures of Student Success (p. 14 KCPS Strategic Plan):

Continuous Growth Toward Mastery of All Academic Subjects: Every student will progress at a pace that closes the achievement gap and will meet or exceed academic standards in academic subjects.

- a) Increased percentage of students meeting proficiency standards on local, state and national examinations.
- b) Increased percentage of identified students who move up or out of tiered academic support (e.g., English Language Learners [ELL]; Problem-Solving Team [PST]; Individualized Education Program [IEP]).
- c) Increased growth rate by a minimum of one year for students at/above grade level and 1.5 years for students below grade level.

Alignment to KCPS Strategic Plan - Professional Practices for Instructional Effectiveness (p.15 KCPS Strategic Plan):

Teaching Practices

T1: Teachers guide students to direct their own learning and to work with other students on culturally and socially relevant research projects and assignments.

T2: Teachers utilize a variety of high engagement strategies, real-life and authentic learning opportunities and motivational approaches to raise expectations for all students, regardless of current level of performance.

Leadership Practices

L1: Principal/Leadership encourages teachers and staff to challenge their own beliefs and actions about students' ability to meet high expectations and provide culturally relevant ongoing professional development.

L2: Principal communicates high expectations by prioritizing mastery of instruction for all student subgroups, and leading ongoing teacher, team and schoolwide dialogue about student work products.

Strategies for Improvement

- Administer iReady assessments, QRI, and AlphaKids; analyze data, and plan/implement interventions to improve reading achievement.
- Implement differentiated learning for RTI dedicated time (30 minutes per day) using Imagine Learning and teacher small group.
- Implement strategies for summarizing, compare and contrast, non-linguistic representations (Marzano) to address deficiencies observed in ELA and math unit assessments.
- Implement RTI using iReady, Imagine Learning, Reflex Math, and Accelerated Reader to improve student achievement in ELA and math.
- Instructional Support Coach will plan, model, and reflect with teachers for effective implementation of workshop models, RtI, and small group structures and strategies that support student engagement and rigor in the classroom.
- Instructional Support Coach will plan, model, and reflect with teachers for effective implementation including summarizing, compare and contrast, non-linguistic representations, setting objectives, and providing feedback.
- ELL teachers will provide small group instruction to reinforce grade level curriculum to develop student understanding and use of English language arts.
- ELL students will utilize the Imagine Learning program during the school day for additional practice with ELA concepts.
- Students will utilize Imagine Learning during the school day for dedicated RTI time.
- Common and formative assessments will allow teachers to monitor progress monthly.
- Reading Interventionist will work with the classroom teacher and district personnel to coordinate reading instruction designed to meet the individual needs of students.
- Math Interventionist will work with the classroom teacher and district personnel to coordinate math instruction designed to meet the individual needs of students.
- Teachers will use an Anticipatory set, modeling, guided practice, individual practice and check for understanding as described in their weekly lesson plans
- Teachers will attend weekly professional development and, participate in effective PLC meetings
- Building and District administrators will observe and provide feedback to teachers

Action Steps	Start Date	Person Responsible	Resources	Completed/Date
	August	Teachers,	1:1 student devices, reading	
1st quarter	2019	Interventionists,	inventories	

1. Administer iReady for reading and math, use results to		Instructional		
determine needed skills		Support Coach,	PLC Logs, PLC Timeline, My	
2. Administer reading inventories		Administrators	Learning Plan professional	
3. Analyze PLC logs to determine effectiveness of			development catalog	
interventions				
			MAP data, common	
			assessment data, formative	
			assessment data, iReady	
			data, QRI data, pathways	
			data, attendance data, Big 5	
			data	
	August	Teachers,	PLC Logs, PLC Timeline, My	
2 nd quarter	2019	Interventionists,	Learning Plan professional	
1. Analyze iReady data to assess growth and areas in need		Instructional	development catalog	
of intervention		Support Coach,		
2. Analyze MAP 2019 reports to identify areas in need of		Administrators	MAP data, common	
improvement			assessment data, formative	
3. Determine groups for supplemental instruction tutors to			assessment data, iReady	
work with students needing academic interventions			data, QRI data, pathways	
			data, attendance data, Big 5	
			data	
	August	Students,	1:1 student devices	
3rd quarter	2019	Teachers		
1. 45 minutes of iReady in math per week			PLC Logs, PLC Timeline, My	
2. 45 minutes of iReady in reading per week			Learning Plan professional	
3.			development catalog	
			MAP data, common	
			assessment data, formative	
			assessment data, iReady	
			data, QRI data, pathways	
			data, attendance data, Big 5	
			data	
Long Range				
1.				
2.				
3.				

	Budget Allocation Summary				
Goal # (1- 3)	Expenditure or Action to be Funded	Date	Estimated Cost	Funding Source(s)	
#3	Reading Interventionist	8/2019	45,192	Title I	
#3	Math Interventionist	8/2019	45,192	Title I	
#2	Instructional Support Coach	8/2019	70,190	Title I	
#3	Home School Coordinator	8/2019	57,830	Title I	
#3	Parent Involvement Assistant	8/2019	48,084	Title I	

Superintendent	Date
State Supervisor, School Improvement	Date
Federal Programs Supervisor/School Improvement Staff	 Date