



Monona Grove School District

Final Report on 2011-14 Strategic Plan

November 25, 2014

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	p. iii
Full Results	p. 2
Preface	p. 3
Participants	p. 4
Vision and Mission Statements	p. 6
Summary of Priorities, Objectives, and Strategies	p. 7
Priorities, Objectives, Strategies, and Results	p. 8
Glossary	p. 21

Executive Summary

Introduction

The 2013-14 school year was our third year implementing the 2011-2014 District Strategic Plan. We are carrying our current goals forward for 2014-15 while we prepare to write a new long term plan for implementation in fall 2015. This report includes our three-year results and outlines next steps for our district's strategic planning process. The Executive Summary outlines the design of the plan, summarizes our three-year results, and suggests conclusions and next steps. Detailed results follow the executive summary.

Strategic Goals

1. Increase overall achievement in literacy and math
2. Reduce race-based equity gaps in student achievement, behavior, and identification for special education.
3. Use resources more effectively by improving operational efficiency and redirecting savings to the classroom.
4. Create and implement a district climate survey to gather feedback from students, parents, and staff that we can use to improve satisfaction.
5. Align our professional development efforts with district goals and regulatory requirements.

Measures

Student Learning:

- **Literacy and Math**
 - DIBELS early literacy benchmark (Grades K-3)
 - Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) for reading, language, and math (Grades 2-7)
 - Percentage of students scoring at or above the 65th %-tile (status estimate for college and career readiness)
 - Percentage of students meeting typical growth targets
 - EXPLORE/PLAN/ACT suite for reading and math.
 - Percentage of students meeting College Readiness Benchmark

Measures (continued)

Student Learning (continued)

- **Behavior**
 - Percentage of students with one or more major discipline referrals.
- **Disproportionate Special Education Identification**
 - DPI weighted risk ratio

Budget

- Balanced Budget
- Dollars saved through efficiency

Climate

- Survey participation
- Stakeholder Satisfaction

Process Improvement

- Alignment of professional development to district goals and other requirements

Results Summary

Student Learning

Overall measures of learning improved for status measures, but growth results were inconsistent and equity gaps still persist. After an initial decline in overall measures after the first year of the plan, we saw three-year improvement in all of the overall measures of literacy and math status (DIBELS early literacy benchmark, percent of students scoring at 65th %tile for MAP, and % meeting EPAS College Readiness Benchmarks). **Our strongest improvement was in reading, where Early Literacy, MAP status, and EPAS college readiness benchmark results each improved for three consecutive years from 2012-2014.**

Improvement in average MAP percentile rank is another important indicator of steady improvement in student learning. Although percentile rank was not identified as a strategic measure at the outset of the plan, we believe this metric is an important result because we use the 65th percentile as a local benchmark for college and career readiness. **Average percentile rank for MAP Reading and Math improved each year from 2012 through 2014, and the district average now exceeds the 65th percentile in all three areas.**

MAP average percentile rank: 2012 – 2014 (all students)

	Spring 2012	Spring 2013	Spring 2014
Reading RIT %tile	62.67	65.12	67.00
Language RIT %tile	63.87	65.52	65.22
Math RIT %tile	66.92	69.17	70.80

Monona Grove’s College Readiness Status Target = 65th National Percentile on MAP.

In contrast to our success in status measures, **growth results for students in grades 2-7 (MAP reading, language, and math) were inconsistent.** We showed modest improvement from 2012-14 in MAP reading and language growth, but we declined slightly in MAP math growth.

From 2011 to 2014 we steadily reduced the MAP math status equity gap for African American students in grades 2-7. We also steadily reduced the EPAS college readiness benchmark gap in reading for Hispanic / Latino students. However, these and other **equity gaps persist in our achievement, behavior, and special education placement.** Additionally, the fact that there are relatively few students in these groups means that the changes in percentage scores from one year to the next tend to be exaggerated.

Budget

The budget is balanced and we captured **over \$233,000 in efficiency savings** that was redirected to teaching and learning.

Climate (Stakeholder Satisfaction)

Students, Staff, and Parents have high overall levels of satisfaction with Monona Grove School district (84%, 89%, 91%, respectively). Some concerns about bullying persist and are being addressed at the school level through anti-bullying awareness efforts and restorative practices. We also learned that 92% of students agree that “my school is a good place for me to be,” 84% of staff would recommend Monona Grove to a friend as a good place to work, and 96% of parents would recommend Monona Grove to a friend as a great place to educate their child.

Process Management

Professional development activities addressed district goals and regulatory requirements. All teachers received training from Dylan Wiliam in formative assessment, a key component of differentiated instruction. All K-5 teachers received multiple trainings over three years from Kathleen Dawson on a variety of techniques for differentiated instruction, and twenty K-5 teachers also received a series of in-depth trainings that they shared in their collaborative teams. Scores of staff members attended equity-based professional development sessions including CREATE, White Privilege Conference, Beyond Diversity 1 and 2, and Restorative Justice training. All certified staff members have received multiple trainings on Educator Effectiveness and changes to the Specific Learning Disability rules for special education. Staff members are trained in nonviolent crisis intervention and CPR on an ongoing basis as required.

Conclusions and Next Steps

Conclusions

The 2011-14 Strategic Plan was a positive step forward in the District's continuous improvement journey. We successfully embedded the PDSA process into our school improvement work. We celebrated a number of successes in overall student achievement in literacy and math as we continue to work to close equity gaps. We redirected over \$230,000 into the classroom by improving operational efficiency. We focused our professional development activities on district goals and regulatory requirements but we have not yet developed adequate measures of instructional practice to determine the impact of these trainings on teaching and learning. We learned that 92% of students agree that "my school is a good place for me to be," 84% of staff would recommend Monona Grove to a friend as a good place to work, and over 96% of parents would recommend Monona Grove to a friend as a great place to educate their child.

Next Steps

As we prepare to write our next strategic plan there are several important issues to consider for strengthening our organization. We need to improve our ability to measure instructional practices so that we can better understand the relationships between specific instructional strategies and student learning outcomes. Our student assessment system has changed significantly as a result of new state testing requirements. Changes in state law give us the opportunity to restructure our school calendar. How will we use this opportunity to improve teaching and learning? How do our operational and instructional our technology systems integrate with our strategic plan?

We face a number of challenges in human resources. As of fall 2014 approximately 25% of our teaching staff are new to the district and will need strong support through our mentoring and induction program. In terms of process management, restructuring our district office staff and adding a Human Resources department gives us an opportunity to enhance interdepartmental communication and coordination. There are also major changes underway in teacher compensation that must be integrated with district mission, vision, and goals. Our student population is projected to expand dramatically in the near future which will increase pressure on our facilities. All of these issues are occurring in an uncertain budget and policy environment.

During the next few months Superintendent Olson and our administrative team will lay the groundwork for a new long-term plan with the expectation of beginning implementation in fall, 2015. We will seek broad stakeholder input as we identify new strategic priorities and set new goals. Staff will then write action plans to address those goals. Most importantly, our next strategic plan must build on what we learned over the past three years while positioning the district to address new challenges head on.

Submitted by Andrew Briddell, Director of Instruction

Full Results
2011 -2014 Strategic Plan

Preface

The formal process for developing the 2011-2014 Monona Grove School District Strategic Plan began on August 26, 2009 when the Monona Grove Board of Education adopted the goal “*Select and implement a continuous improvement process that includes development of a strategic plan.*” Following the adoption of this goal, the district selected the Malcolm Baldrige continuous improvement framework and engaged Brenda Clark and Mathew Fail as consultants to facilitate our work. Ms. Clark and Mr. Fail have extensive experience in education. As senior administrators, they led the Iredell-Statesville School District (North Carolina) through continuous improvement work that resulted in that district receiving the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award in 2008.

In February 2011, after extensive pre-planning, a group of School Community stakeholders gathered to develop new vision and mission statements for our district. Their work was then published in draft form and feedback was received through surveys and focus groups. The Board of Education formally adopted the new Vision and Mission in June 2011. Those statements are reflective of our community’s values and beliefs about education and guide the work of the district.

The next step in our process occurred in May 2011, when the Administrative Team met to draft a strategic plan. We began by grounding our work in our Vision and Mission. Next we reviewed exhaustive district data as part of a comprehensive needs assessment. We identified the priority areas of Student Learning, Budget, Customer and Workforce Focus, and Process Management. Within each of these priority areas are specific goals and strategies for improvement in the areas of closing equity gaps, improving student achievement, increasing budgetary efficiency, improving stakeholders’ climate satisfaction, and aligning professional development.

The 2011-14 Strategic Plan is the basis for our School and District Department Improvement Plans, which translate the district goals into the concrete actions we undertake to meet our goals. It is these actions –what adults do on behalf of students – that makes our continuous improvement work a living, breathing process. Throughout the three-year lifespan of our Strategic Plan we will regularly examine both our implementation of our strategies and the progress we are making towards achieving our goals. In other words, “Are we doing what we set out to do?” and, “Is it working?” Throughout this monitoring process, we will continually refine our work be as effective as possible in serving our students and community in our priority areas. We will learn and improve as we move forward.

Notes: Throughout the document, the term “Objective” is synonymous with “Goal”
A glossary of key terms appears at the conclusion of this document.

*Monona Grove School District Vision and Mission workshop participants
February 2011*

School Community Stakeholders

Craig Gerlach, Superintendent
Bill Breisch, Director of Instruction
Tim Fosshage, Director of Student Services
Deb Lyons, Continuous Improvement Coordinator
Paul Brost, Principal Monona Grove High School
Connie Haessly, Principal, Taylor Prairie Elementary
Susan Fox, President, Monona Grove Board of Education
Jason McCutchin, Member, Monona Grove Board of Education
Patty Krall, Paraprofessional
Dan Marron, Custodial
Sharon Bates, Food Service
Kim Kieck, Clerical
Pat Dorn, Music Teacher, Secondary
Michelle LeMieux, Special Education, Elementary
Angie Fassel, Classroom Teacher, Elementary
Diane Jensen, Instructional Facilitator, Secondary
Abby Taylor, Junior Class President, Monona Grove High School
Amelia Speight, Sophomore Class President, Monona Grove High School
Jane Beebe, Monona Grove High School PTO Forum
Jennifer Pickel, Cottage Grove PTO President
Margaret Clark, Monona PTO Representative
Zong Her, Parent, Madison Area Technical College
Holly Elsberry, Parent, MGSD graduate, MGSD Diversity Coordinator
Simone DeVore, Community Representative; Associate Professor, UW-Whitewater
Jeff Wiswell, President, Monona City Council
Steve Anders, Cottage Grove Town Council
Elizabeth Zande, Village of Cottage Grove
Bob Miller, Monona Business Chamber
Kristin Chambers, President Cottage Grove Business Chamber
Tom Wellman, Cottage Grove Business Chamber, Wisconsin Community Bank
Andrew Briddell, Community Representative, Parent

Vision and Mission facilitator

Mathew Fail, Executive Director for Organizational Planning and Development
Cabarrus County Schools, Concord, North Carolina

*Monona Grove School District Strategic Planning workshop participants
May 2011*

Craig Gerlach, Superintendent
Jerrud Rossing, Director of Business Services
Bill Breisch, Director of Curriculum and Instruction
Tim Fosshage, Director of Student Services
Mark Scullion, Director of Buildings and Grounds
John VanDerMerwe, Director of Transportation
Bill Herman, Director of Technology
Connie Haessly, Principal, Taylor Prairie School
Barb Berg, Principal, Cottage Grove School
Deb Lyons, Principal designate, Cottage Grove School
Ann Schroeder, Principal, Winnequah School
Renee Tennant, Principal, Glacial Drumlin School
Paul Brost, Principal Monona Grove High School
Christa Macomb, District Data Assessment Coordinator
Andrew Briddell, Continuous Improvement Coordinator designate

Strategic Planning facilitator

Mathew Fail, Executive Director for Organizational Planning and Development
Cabarrus County Schools, Concord, North Carolina



The Vision:

MGSD is a student-focused culture that empowers continuous learners to embrace global opportunities and excellence.

The Mission:

The mission of the MGSD is to increase learning for all students while cultivating social responsibility and a desire for learning.

We will achieve this by...

- Building positive relationships among students, staff, parents, and community.
- Working together to inspire and engage students in meaningful learning opportunities by using research-based practices to address individual learning needs.
- Providing a safe and healthy environment that fosters respect and culturally responsive practices.
- Using resources efficiently and effectively.

Unanimously adopted by the Monona Grove Board of Education on June 8, 2011

Summary of Priorities, Objectives and Strategies

Priority 1: Student Learning

Objective 1.1 *Close equity gaps in the areas of reading, math, behavior, and special education placement by...*

- Implementing Culturally Responsive Practices
- Implementing Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS)

Objectives 1.2 - 1.7 *Increase student achievement in literacy and mathematics by...*

- Differentiating instruction using standards-based assessment data.
- Implementing a professional learning community framework that supports collaborative work on meeting strategic goals.

Priority 2: Budget

Objective 2.1 *Increase effectiveness of our financial resources by...*

- Capturing efficiencies in our cost-generating processes

Priority 3: Customer and Workforce Focus

Objective 3.1 *Improve stakeholder satisfaction in school climate by...*

- Developing a district-wide climate survey and using the results to make data-driven decisions about improving stakeholder satisfaction.

Priority 4: Process Management

Objective 4.1 *Align professional development with district goals, strategies, and/or with regulatory requirements by...*

- Implementing a professional development alignment process.

Please note: "Objective" is synonymous with "Goal"

Priorities, Objectives, and Strategies

Priority 1: Student Learning

Objective 1.1: Equity

By 2014, we will reduce the gaps in outcomes for our minority students by 50% in the areas of Reading, Math, Behavior, and Special Education Placement, as measured by DIBELS, Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) Status and Growth, Explore/Plan/ACT, Office Discipline Referrals (SWIS), and Special Education Placement Data.

***Comparison group** for gap determination is White (majority) students. The gap is determined by taking the difference between the percentages of White students meeting the identified target and African American or Hispanic/Latino students meeting that same target or goal. Data are reported for subgroups that include at least 50 students (district-wide) and for whom a negative gap has been identified during the baseline period and/or if trends over time have indicated a negative gap.*

***Gap indicators** indicate the difference between the percentages of White students meeting the identified target and the percentage of the identified subgroup meeting the target. For example, in Reading Indicator 1: DIBELS Grades 1-3, 77% of White students met the benchmark target and only 45% of African American students met these same targets. Thus, a **32% gap** exists for African American students on the DIBELS indicator.*

Strategies for closing Equity Gaps:

- Implement Culturally Responsive Practices
- Implement Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS)

READING Gaps

Early Literacy GAP: Grades 1-3				
Percent of students meeting DIBELS Benchmark				
	Spring 2011 (baseline gap)	June, 2012 Goal/Result	June 2013 Goal/Result	June 2014 Goal/Result
African American (2014 N=25)	32%	26% / 16%	21% / 48%	16% / 26%
Hispanic / Latino (2014 N= 45)	14%	11% / 15%	9% / 26%	7% / 19%

READING Gaps, continued

READING Growth GAP, Grades 2-7: Percent of students meeting growth targets for MAP Reading				
	Spring 2011 (baseline gap)	June, 2012 Goal/Result	June 2013 Goal/Result	June 2014 Goal/Result
African American (2014 N=27)	0.5%	0% / 4.3%	0% / 20.4%	0% / 21.7%
Hispanic/Latino (2014 N=50)	5%	4% / 3.2%	3% / 2.8%	2% / 15%

READING Status GAP: Grades 2-7: Percent of students scoring at or above 65th %tile on MAP Reading				
	Spring 2011 (baseline gap)	June, 2012 Goal/Result	June 2013 Goal/Result	June 2014 Goal/Result
African American (2014 N=35)	36%	30% / 44%	24% / 36%	18% / 39%
Hispanic/Latino (2014 N=67)	23%	19% / 7%	15% / 20%	11% / 22%

READING College Readiness GAP: Grades 7-10 Percent of students meeting College Readiness Benchmarks on EXPLORE / PLAN				
	Spring 2011 (baseline gap)	June, 2012 Goal/Result	June 2013 Goal/Result	June 2014 Goal/Result
African American (2014 N=38)	34%	28% / 40%	22% / 48%	17% / 45%
Hispanic/Latino (2014 N=43)	14%	11% / 25%	9% / 24%	7% / 17%
2 or More Races (2014 N=23)	13%	10% / (-6%)	8% / 13%	6% / 31%

MATH Gaps

MATH: Growth GAP Grades 2-7				
Percent of students meeting growth targets for MAP Math				
	Spring 2011 (baseline gap)	June, 2012 Goal/Result	June 2013 Goal/Result	June 2014 Goal/Result
African American (2014 N=26)	15%	12% / 0.58%	9% / 17%	7% / 18.7%
Hispanic/Latino (2014 N=50)	(3%)	0% / 6.6%	0% / 3.1%	0% / 21.2%
Asian (2014 N=39)	7%	5% / 4.4%	4% / No Gap	3% / 8.8%

MATH Status: Grades 2-7				
Percent of students scoring at or above 65th %tile on MAP Math				
	Spring 2011 (baseline gap)	June, 2012 Goal/Result	June 2013 Goal/Result	June 2014 Goal/Result
African American (2014 N=35)	57%	47% / 54%	37% / 46%	28% / 40%
Hispanic/Latino (2014 N=67)	33%	27% / 12%	21% / 15%	16% / 32%

Math College Readiness: Grades 7-10				
Percent of students meeting College Readiness Benchmarks on EXPLORE / PLAN				
	Spring 2011 (baseline gap)	June, 2012 Goal/Result	June 2013 Goal/Result	June 2014 Goal/Result
African American (2014 N=38)	54%	45% / 42%	36% / 52%	27% / 43%
Hispanic/Latino (2014 N=43)	15%	12% / 15%	9% / 21%	7% / 17%
2 or More Races (2014 N=23)	17%	14% / 15%	11% / 20%	8% / 17%

BEHAVIOR

Behavior: Percentage of Students with an Office Discipline Referral (SWIS Data: At least 1 Major Referral)				
	Spring 2011 (baseline gap)	June, 2012 Goal/Result	June 2013 Goal/Result	June 2014 Goal/Result
African American (2014 N=87)	28%	23% / 37%	18% / 44%	14% / 28%

SPECIAL EDUCATION PLACEMENT

SPECIAL EDUCATION PLACEMENT: DPI Weighted Risk Ratios				
	Spring 2011 (baseline gap)	June, 2012 Goal/Result	June 2013 Goal/Result	June 2014 Goal/Result
African American (2014 N=92)	1.98	1.7 / 3.20	1.4 / 3.54	1.0 / 3.77*
Hispanic/Latino (2014 N=154)	0.79	0.6 / 0.88	0.5 / N/A	0.4 / 1.09*
Asian (2014 N=97)	0.32	0.26 / 0.83	0.21 / N/A	0.16 / 0.57*

* Internal estimate. DPI no longer provides weighted risk ratio data.

Priority 1: Student Learning
Objective 1.2: MAP Status & Growth - Reading

By June of 2014 the percentage of students meeting **Reading** MAP Growth and Status Targets in grades 2-7 will increase by 5% (Spring to Spring Growth).

Strategies for improving student learning:

- Differentiate instruction based upon standards-based assessment data (i.e., MAP/DesCartes, College Readiness, grade-level & course common assessments).
- Implement a professional learning community framework that supports collaborative work on meeting strategic goals.

Reading	Spring 2011 (baseline)	June, 2012 Goal/Result	June 2013 Goal/Result	June 2014 Goal/Result
% Meeting Status Target	58%	60% / 53%	62% / 57%	63% / 58%
% Meeting Growth Target	57%	59% / 50%	61% / 57%	63% / 53%

College Readiness Status Target = 65th National Percentile on MAP.

Priority 1: Student Learning
Objective 1.3: MAP Status & Growth - Language

By June of 2014 the percentage of students meeting **Language** MAP Growth and Status Targets in grades 2-7 will increase by 5% (Spring to Spring Growth).

Strategies:

- Differentiate instruction based upon standards-based assessment data (i.e., MAP/DesCartes, College Readiness, grade-level & course common assessments).
- Implement a professional learning community framework that supports collaborative work on meeting strategic goals.

Language	Spring 2011 (baseline)	June, 2012 Goal/Result	June 2013 Goal/Result	June 2014 Goal/Result
% Meeting Status Target	57%	59% / 55%	61% / 60%	62% / 58%
% Meeting Growth	63%	65% / 53%	67% / 59%	68% / 54%

College Readiness Status Target = 65th National Percentile on MAP.

Priority 1: Student Learning
Objective 1.4: College Readiness - Reading

By June of 2014, the percent of students meeting the College Readiness Benchmarks in Reading for Grades 7-11 will increase by 8% at each grade level as measured by Explore, Plan, & ACT (Spring scores).

Strategies:

- Differentiate instruction based upon standards-based assessment data (i.e., MAP/DesCartes, College Readiness, grade-level & course common assessments).
- Implement a professional learning community framework that supports collaborative work on meeting strategic goals.

	Fall, 2011 (baseline)	June, 2012 Goal/Result	June 2013 Goal/Result	June 2014 Goal/Result
% Meeting EPAS College Readiness benchmarks in Reading	59%	62% / 54%	65% / 56%	67% / 58%

Priority 1: Student Learning
Objective 1.5: Early Literacy

By June of 2014, the percent of students in grades K-2 meeting the DIBELS spring benchmarks will increase by 7% or meet 100% at benchmark. (Overall Instructional Recommendation = Benchmark).

Strategies:

- Differentiate instruction based upon standards-based assessment data (i.e., MAP/DesCartes, College Readiness, grade-level & course common assessments).
- Implement a professional learning community framework that supports collaborative work on meeting strategic goals.

	Spring 2011 (baseline)	June, 2012 Goal/Result	June 2013 Goal/Result	June 2014 Goal/Result
% Meeting DIBELS Benchmark	82%	85% / 81%	87% / 85%	89% / 87%

Priority 1: Student Learning
Objective 1.6: MAP Status & Growth - Math

By June of 2014, the percentage of students meeting **Math** MAP growth and status targets in grades 2-7 will increase by 5% (Spring targets).

Strategies:

- Differentiate instruction based upon standards-based assessment data (i.e., MAP/DesCartes, College Readiness, grade-level & course common assessments).
- Implement a professional learning community framework that supports collaborative work on meeting strategic goals.

Math	Fall, 2011 (baseline)	June, 2012 Goal/Result	June 2013 Goal/Result	June 2014 Goal/Result
% Meeting Status	60%	62% / 59%	64% / 64%	65% / 62%
% Meeting Growth	55%	57% / 58%	59% / 54%	60% / 55%

College Readiness Status Target = 65th National Percentile on MAP.

Priority 1: Student Learning

Objective 1.7: College Readiness - Math

By June 2014 the percent of students meeting College Readiness Benchmarks in Math for Grades 7-11 will increase by 8% at each grade level as measured by Explore, Plan, & ACT (Spring scores).

Strategies:

- Differentiate instruction based upon standards-based assessment data (i.e., MAP/DesCartes, College Readiness, grade-level & course common assessments).
- Implement a professional learning community framework that supports collaborative work on meeting strategic goals.

	Fall, 2011 (baseline)	June, 2012 Goal/Result	June 2013 Goal/Result	June 2014 Goal/Result
% Meeting EPAS College Readiness benchmarks in Math	59%	62% / 53%	65% / 53%	67% / 59%

Priority 2: Budget**Objective 2.1: Efficient & Effective Use of Resources**

By June 2014, the district will demonstrate cost savings equal to or exceeding \$100,000 as measured by dollars saved.

Strategy:

Capture efficiencies in our processes while preserving quality of service.

	Fall, 2011 (baseline)	June, 2012 Goal/Result	June 2013 Result	June 2014 Result
Dollars Saved	\$0	N/A	\$150,000	\$233,000*

*Cumulative savings since 2011

Priority 3: Customer and Workforce Focus**Objective 3.1: Climate**

Climate survey items are on a Likert scale ranging from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree” with an option for Don’t Know or N/A. Total Satisfaction is calculated as percent of “strongly agree” and “agree” responses within those responses expressing an opinion.

We chose not set a specific goal for overall climate results until we collected at least three years of data.

Climate Survey Results

Students (Gr. 3-12)	Spring, 2012	Spring 2013	Spring 2014
Participation	N=1737	N=1777	N= 2046
Responses w/opinion	91%	89%	88%
Total Satisfaction	82%	83%	84%

Staff	Spring, 2012	Spring 2013	Spring 2014
Participation	N=226	N=257	N=259
Responses w/opinion	89%	90%	91%
Total Satisfaction	89%	90%	89%

Parents	Spring, 2012	Spring 2013	Spring 2014
Participation	N=611	N=707	N= 253
Responses w/opinion	78%	78%	77%
Total Satisfaction	89%	89%	91%

Priority 4: Process Management**Objective 4.1: Align Professional Development**

By June 2014, all professional development opportunities will be aligned with the district goals, strategies, and/or regulatory requirements.

Strategy:

Develop a systematic process for alignment of Professional Development with district goals and/or strategies.

Process

- Professional Development approval process in place to ensure alignment

Professional Development for Differentiated Instruction

- All K-12 teachers trained in Embedded Formative Assessment with follow-up book study (2012-13)
- All K-5 teachers trained in MAP-specific differentiated instruction strategies (DDI) for reading and math (2012-13)
- Twenty (20) K-5 teachers trained as DDI coaches to build on all-staff training (2013-14)

Equity-related Professional Development (2011-2014)

- 73 staff members attended CREATE
- 81 staff members attended Beyond Diversity I
- 24 staff members attended Beyond Diversity II
- 63 staff members attended White Privilege Conference
- 19 staff members attended the Racial Justice Summit

Professional Development in regulatory or other requirements

- All staff trained in Specific Learning Disability Rule (2013-14)
- All staff trained in Educator Effectiveness (2013-14; 2014-15)
- Staff trained in Nonviolent Crisis Intervention, CPR as required (ongoing)

Glossary

Budget Efficiency: Providing the same quality of service at a lower cost.

Climate Measures A district-wide climate survey is in development. The survey will measure a variety of issues within the broad concept of “climate” from the perspectives of students, staff, and parents.

Culturally responsive practices are defined by *The National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems* ([NCCREST](#)) as facilitating and supporting the achievement of all students. In culturally responsive classrooms and schools, effective teaching and learning occur in a culturally-supported, learner-centered context, where the strengths students bring to school are identified, nurtured, and utilized to promote student achievement

DesCartes: Also known as “learning continuum,” [DesCartes](#) is published by [Northwest Evaluation Association \(NWEA\)](#) as a companion to the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessment. *DesCartes* orders specific skills in reading, language usage, and math by achievement level. This resource enables teachers to gauge gaps between what students are ready to learn and what the curriculum is presenting.

DIBELS: Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) is a criterion referenced, predictive early literacy screening assessment for elementary students. [DIBELS](#) was developed by the University of Oregon and measures the National Reading Panel’s Five Big Ideas of early reading instruction: Phonological Awareness, Alphabetic Principle, Fluency with Connected Text, Vocabulary, and Comprehension.

EXPLORE / PLAN / ACT: also known as [Educational Planning and Assessment \(EPAS\)](#), these assessments are part of ACT’s College and Career Readiness System, which is an integrated system of programs that connect teaching, learning, and assessment for middle school and high school students.

MAP (Measures of Academic Progress): MAP is an online, adaptive assessment developed by the [Northwest Evaluation Association \(NWEA\)](#) and is used to assess students’ learning in reading, language, and math in elementary and middle school.

Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS): [PBIS](#) is “a framework or approach for assisting school personnel in adopting and organizing evidence-based behavioral interventions into an integrated continuum that enhances academic and social behavior outcomes for all students.”

SWIS (School-wide Information System): The [SWIS](#) database houses MGSD behavior data and enables teachers and administrators to make data-driven decisions about promoting positive student behavior in school.