

ANCHORAGE SCHOOL DISTRICT  
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

MEMORANDUM #93 (2007-2008)

October 8, 2007

TO: SCHOOL BOARD

FROM: OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

SUBJECT: ANCHORAGE SCHOOL DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLAN FOR 2007-2008 SCHOOL YEAR

*ASD Goal: Increase student academic achievement using data to guide adoption of curriculum, methods, materials, and professional development specifically designed to ensure that each group as designated by No Child Left Behind makes adequate yearly progress.*

PERTINENT FACTS:

The Department of Education and Early Development issues its annual designations of districts in terms of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) each fall. As the Anchorage School District is in Level 4, or Corrective Action Status, the No Child Left Behind Act and Alaska state regulations require the district to submit an improvement plan to the Department of Education and Early Development (Attachment A). The plan's goals should address the specific areas wherein the District did not make AYP targets. The district also wanted to focus on the areas wherein schools made safe harbor rather than the designated target in order to continue the improvement gained over the previous year. For the Anchorage School District, the two categories in language arts are Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficient. In math, the one category is Students with Disabilities. Instructional strategies, activities, materials, and trainings in the plan should reflect changes to current practice as well as continuing efforts the district has deemed effective.

The District's Instructional Team crafted the plan with the additional involvement of parents and program advisory group members. The district's Six-Year Instructional Plan firmly guided the development of the District Improvement Plan.

The Anchorage School District continues to focus its efforts on educating all students for success in life. This improvement plan, and the Six-Year Instructional Plan from which it is drawn, will serve well in that mission.

CC/RG/VC

Attachments

Attachment A 2006-2007 District Improvement Plan

Attachment B Sample School Report Card

Attachment C Scientifically Based Research

Prepared by: Vernon Campbell, Director, Accountability

Approved by: Rhonda Gardner, Assistant Superintendent, Instruction



*Department of Education & Early Development*

*2007-2008 District Improvement Plan*  
*Anchorage School District*

**Due to EED – October 1, 2007**

**Contact:**

Ruth Baumgartner, School Improvement Program Manager  
Alaska Department of Education & Early Development  
801 West 10<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 200  
PO Box 110500, Juneau, AK 99811-0500  
[www.eed.state.ak.us](http://www.eed.state.ak.us)

[ruth.baumgartner@alaska.gov](mailto:ruth.baumgartner@alaska.gov)  
(907) 465-8706

# Overview of 2007-2008 District Improvement Plan Process

Each district receiving Title I funds that is identified at Level 2 or above is required by NCLB and Alaska statute and regulations to **create or revise a District Improvement Plan that meets federal and state requirements**. This plan should be reflective of the district's needs as a whole based on the analysis of student achievement data, demographic data and perception data. The needs of the district are identified through this initial data analysis and analyzed further to determine the causes for being unsuccessful in meeting AYP in relation to specific subject areas as well as subgroups. From this analysis, the district identifies district-wide goals and actions in which to assist the teachers and district staff in meeting the goals. These goals will be reflected in the School Improvement Plans including actions to guide implementation based on the needs of the individual school site.

**District Improvement Plans are due to EED no later than October 1, 2007.** Note: District Improvement Plans are being requested first to ensure the goals, as based on student achievement data, are identified prior to the writing of School Improvement Plans. School Improvement Plans should be driven by district goals with objectives identified that share the district goals with strategies and actions selected by the site to match the students being served. School Improvement Plans are now due at EED no later than November 1, 2007, but will be accepted earlier if reviewed and approved by the district.

**EED will review the District Improvement Plan to determine that federal and state requirements are met.** If the plan does not meet the requirements, the department will contact the district within 3 working days of receipt of the plan to specify any revisions needed to meet the federal and state requirements.

## Consequences for Districts

**District Improvement Plans that meet all federal and state requirements must be received by EED on or before October 1, 2007 or federal and state payments will be withheld until receipt.**

If the implementation of a District Improvement Plan does not result in making adequate yearly progress, the department will be required to take progressive consequences. Per 4 AAC 06.840(h), the department **may** take appropriate action while a district is at Level 2 or 3. The department **will be required** to take one of the corrective actions specified in 4 AAC 06.840(k) once a district has reached **Level 4**.

## Required elements of District Improvement Plan

4 AAC 06.850(b) 06.880; 1116 (c)(6 & 7)

<i>Plan Requirement</i>	<i>EED Review Criteria</i>
1. <b>Notify all district parents</b> by direct means (regular mail, email, school newsletters) as well as indirect means (internet, publications) of the reasons for the identification for improvement and how parents can participate in upgrading the quality of the local educational agency.	Description of notification process provided along with copy of notification.
2. <b>Consult</b> with parents, school staff, and other interested persons to write plan.	Provide list of names of participants showing representation from each group.
3. <b>Address the teaching and learning needs in the schools of the district</b> and the specific academic problems of low-achieving students, including a determination of <b>why any of the district's prior plans failed</b> to bring about increased student academic performance.	Describe why district's prior plans have not succeeded in improving student achievement.

4. Cover a <b>two-year period (submitted one year at a time)</b> ;	Include timeline and dates for current school year.
5. Incorporate <b>scientifically based research strategies</b> that strengthen the core academic program in the schools served by the district.	Briefly describe scientifically based research for each instructional strategy or curriculum proposed.
6. Identify actions that have the <b>greatest likelihood of improving the achievement of students</b> in meeting the academic performance requirements in 4 AAC 06.810.	Strategies proposed target reasons for not making AYP.
7. Address <b>professional development needs</b> of the instructional staff.	Professional development description provided in plan. It should reflect all ready submitted plans that include professional development needs.
8. <b>Spend 10% of district Title IA allocation each year</b> for professional development.	Signature required on cover/assurance page.
9. Include specific <b>measurable achievement objectives and targets</b> for all students collectively and each subgroup of students.	Measurable objective(s) and target(s) provided.
10. Incorporate, <b>as appropriate, activities before school, after school, during the summer,</b> and during an extension of the school year.	Extended learning opportunities described if included in plan.
11. Specify any <b>technical assistance</b> to be provided to the district.	Describe technical assistance, if any, to be provided to the district.
12. include strategies to promote <b>effective parental involvement</b> in the school.	Parent involvement strategies provided in plan.

### District Improvement Process

The department recommends a continuous improvement planning process. In the improvement process you may wish to include the following steps to ensure you are addressing the academic needs of your students. The process might contain the following steps: 1) analysis of data (achievement, demographic, perception), 2) determine measurable goals as based on needs identified through data analysis, 3) identify actions for implementation to support the goals (these will include professional development and parent involvement), 4) identify ways to progress monitor and evaluate meeting of the goals and 5) monitor implementation and effectiveness of plan. The process and plan presented are not intended to replace other more comprehensive reform or improvement efforts, but rather to complement those processes and focus on the specific areas that are causing the district to not meet adequate yearly progress targets.

The following companion documents are available on the Department of Education website under Forms & Grants, School Improvement (<http://www.eed.state.ak.us/forms/home>).

- School Improvement Plan Resource Guide – an optional step by step guide through the school improvement planning process



# District Improvement Plan School Years 2007-2008 Cover Sheet

District AYP Level (check one):      2       3       4       Year

<b>District Name:</b>	Anchorage School District
<b>Superintendent's Name:</b>	Carol Comeau
<b>District Mailing Address:</b>	5530 East Northern Lights Blvd
<b>City:</b>	Anchorage
<b>AK – Zip:</b>	AK, 99502
<b>Phone (907)</b>	742-4312
<b>Fax (907)</b>	742-4318
<b>Superintendent's Email:</b>	Comeau_Carol@asdk12.org

<b>District Improvement Contact:</b>	Rhonda Gardner
<b>Phone (907)</b>	742-4412
<b>Fax (907)</b>	742-4318
<b>District Contact Email:</b>	Gardner_Rhonda@asdk12.org

\*\*\*\*\*

*By my signature below, I assure that the requirements for districts at Level 2 or above as designated and outlined in NCLB Section 1116 and Alaska Regulations 4 AAC 06.835-880, have been met. The district will spend 10% of its Title I-A allocation each year for professional development to address the academic problems causing the district to be identified for improvement.*

<b>Superintendent's Signature:</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	

1. Check each cell in the following table to identify the areas in which the district did **NOT** meet AYP:

	All students	Ethnic group	SWD	LEP	Low-Income
Language Arts			X	SH	
Math			X		
Participation					
Grad Rate					

2. Describe why the district’s prior plans have not succeeded in improving student achievement.

In every case the district’s plans **have** succeeded in improving targeted subgroup achievement; however, the rate and span of improvement has not been sufficient to make district-wide AYP.

The 06-07 ASD improvement plan targeted the following subgroups and subsequently attained the following increases in **Language Arts**:

- African Americans: 67.5% to 71.3% (Met AMO)
- Alaska Native: 67.2% to 69.9% (Met AMO)
- Low Income: 66.6% to 70.6% (Met AMO)
- Disabled: 42.6% to 43.4%
- LEP: 63.7% to 68.3% (Met AMO)

The 06-07 ASD improvement plan targeted the following subgroups and subsequently attained the following increases in **Math**:

- African Americans: 51.8% to 59.2% (Met AMO)
- Disabled: 34.8% to 39.2%
- LEP: 55.6% to 64.5% (Met AMO)

The 06-07 ASD improvement plan cited three subgroups that did not meet the AMO in **Language Arts**.

- For 07-08, that number has dropped to one subgroup.
- The ASD met five of its six Language Arts objectives.
- As seen above, in every targeted subgroup, the % proficient has increased.

The 06-07 ASD improvement plan cited three subgroups that did not meet the AMO in **Math**.

- For 07-08, that number has dropped to one subgroup.
- The ASD met two of its three Math objectives.
- As seen above, in every targeted subgroup, the % proficient has increased.

3. Describe the process used to notify all parents of the district status and of their opportunities to be involved in addressing the issues that caused the district to be identified for improvement. Please provide a copy of the notification parents received.

Through school report card mailings (sample attached), parents receive direct notification of the district’s AYP status, the reasons for identification, and invitation to participate in the improvement plan’s development. Additionally, parents were notified of the district’s AYP status and of their opportunity to be involved in the improvement planning process by way of an ad in the *Anchorage Daily News*. This information was also included as part of monthly ads the district runs in the *Daily News* to keep the public informed on a variety of district issues. Information encouraging parent and community involvement is also posted on the

district Website at *www.asdk12.org*. Additionally, through invitation, members of the ASD instructional leadership team who contributed to the improvement plan worked with parents, community members, and district staff in developing each portion of the plan. Please see page 7 and the plan itself for more details about parent, community, and staff involvement.

**4. Describe any technical assistance, if any, to be provided to the district in developing or implementing the plan. (Please contact the department if technical assistance is needed from EED.)**

The department's audio conferencing and responses to phone calls are appreciated and are helpful in every case. Each of these supports provides sufficient technical assistance for plan development.

The department's continued efforts to secure increased funding for education are appreciated. Acquisition of needed educational materials, training and professional development opportunities, and technology are helpful in the implementation of our improvement plan.

## District Improvement Planning Team

The planning team should represent a variety of participants from the schools and the community: teachers, administrators and other school staff, parents, and the community to be served. Please list members of the team and their roles.

<b>Printed Name</b>	<b>Role within the district/school/community (i.e. 4<sup>th</sup> Grade teacher, PTA parent, etc.)</b>	<b>Roles/Responsibilities tied to District Improvement Plan</b>
<b>Parents:</b>		
<i>Michelle Quier</i>	<i>Eagle River HS Parent Volunteer</i>	<i>HS Advisory Input</i>
<i>Crystal Peltola</i>	<i>Dimond HS Parent Volunteer</i>	<i>HS Advisory Input</i>
<i>Kristy Darr</i>	<i>Service HS PTSA President</i>	<i>HS Advisory Input</i>
<i>Bo Seward</i>	<i>South HS PTSO President</i>	<i>HS Advisory Input</i>
<i>Richard Garcia</i>	<i>Benson Parent Volunteer</i>	<i>HS Advisory Input</i>
<i>Megan Cross</i>	<i>CPAC Board Member</i>	<i>Title I Advisory input</i>
<i>Cindy Philby</i>	<i>CPAC Board Member</i>	<i>Title I Advisory input</i>
<i>Deborah Narang</i>	<i>UAA Math Professor, Parent</i>	<i>Math Dept. Advisory Input</i>
<i>Heidi Hurliman</i>	<i>Nurse Practitioner, Parent</i>	<i>Math Dept. Advisory Input</i>
<i>Meg Kremer-Sterns</i>	<i>Geologist, Parent</i>	<i>Math Dept. Advisory Input</i>
<i>Lynda A Limón</i>	<i>Attorney, Parent</i>	<i>Math Dept. Advisory Input</i>
<i>Cleo Burgett</i>	<i>UAA Instructor, Parent</i>	<i>Math Dept. Advisory Input</i>
<i>Frank Paskvan</i>	<i>BP, Parent</i>	<i>Math Dept. Advisory Input</i>
<i>Danika Paskvan</i>	<i>South High Student</i>	<i>Math Dept. Advisory Input</i>
<i>Dorothy Nitz</i>	<i>Bilingual/Multicultural Parent</i>	<i>BMEP Advisory Input</i>
<i>Sandy Traini</i>	<i>SPED Advisory Council Member</i>	<i>SPED Advisory Input</i>
<i>Katy Parrish</i>	<i>SPED Advisory Council Member</i>	<i>SPED Advisory Input</i>
<b>Teachers &amp; other staff:</b>		
<i>Rhonda Gardner</i>	<i>Assistant Superintendent of Instruction</i>	<i>DIP Technical Support and Developer</i>
<i>Mike Henry</i>	<i>High School Education, Executive Director</i>	<i>DIP Technical Support and Developer</i>
<i>Leslie Vandergaw</i>	<i>Middle School Ed., Executive Director</i>	<i>DIP Technical Support and Developer</i>
<i>Patricia McRae</i>	<i>Elementary Education, Executive Director</i>	<i>DIP Technical Support and Developer</i>
<i>Jerry Sjolander</i>	<i>Special Education, Executive Director</i>	<i>DIP Technical Support and Developer</i>
<i>Vernon Campbell</i>	<i>District Accountability, Director</i>	<i>DIP Technical Support and Developer</i>
<i>Cindy Anderson</i>	<i>Secondary Special Education, Director</i>	<i>DIP developer and implementer</i>
<i>Dana Dugdale</i>	<i>Elementary Special Education, Director</i>	<i>DIP developer and implementer</i>
<i>Rebecca Case</i>	<i>SPED Special Programs, Asst. Principal</i>	<i>DIP developer and implementer</i>
<i>Margie Waggoner</i>	<i>Title I Program, Supervisor</i>	<i>DIP developer and implementer</i>
<i>Christine Garbe</i>	<i>Act. Bilingual Multicultural Prog. Superv.</i>	<i>DIP developer and implementer</i>
<i>Sandy Schoff</i>	<i>Math Program, Coordinator</i>	<i>DIP developer and implementer</i>
<i>Texas Gail Raymond</i>	<i>Science Program, Coordinator</i>	<i>DIP developer and implementer</i>
<i>Mary Wegner</i>	<i>Elem. Educational Tech., Coordinator</i>	<i>DIP developer and implementer</i>
<i>Darla Jones</i>	<i>Secondary Educational Tech., Coordinator</i>	<i>DIP developer and implementer</i>
<i>Mark VanArsdale</i>	<i>ERHS Science Department Chair</i>	<i>HS DIP developer and implementer</i>
<i>Jennifer Childress</i>	<i>DHS Teacher</i>	<i>HS DIP developer and implementer</i>
<i>Gary Veater</i>	<i>SHS math department chair</i>	<i>HS DIP developer and implementer</i>
<i>Renee Wood</i>	<i>SAHS Librarian</i>	<i>HS DIP developer and implementer</i>
<i>Jane Marcum</i>	<i>Benson Teacher</i>	<i>HS DIP developer and implementer</i>
<i>Jan Thompson</i>	<i>Online Remediation Coordinator</i>	<i>HS DIP developer and implementer</i>
<i>Marjorie Waggoner</i>	<i>Title I Supervisor</i>	<i>Title I DIP development and implementation</i>
<i>Lou Ann Clark</i>	<i>Title I Literacy Coach</i>	<i>Title I advisory and input</i>
<i>Marina Gantz</i>	<i>BMEP High School Specialist</i>	<i>BMEP Committee member</i>
<i>LaVon Bridges</i>	<i>BMEP Elementary Specialist</i>	<i>BMEP Committee member</i>
<i>Beth Hartley</i>	<i>BMEP Middle School Specialist</i>	<i>BMEP Committee member</i>
<i>Sandy Schoff</i>	<i>ASD Math Curriculum Coordinator</i>	<i>Math DIP developer and implementer</i>
<i>Ruth Mount</i>	<i>ASD Middle School Math Support</i>	<i>Math DIP developer and implementer</i>
<i>Penny Williams</i>	<i>ASD Elementary Math Support</i>	<i>Math DIP developer and implementer</i>

<i>Patty Kennedy</i>	<i>ASD Elementary Math Support</i>	<i>Math DIP developer and implementer</i>
<i>Mary Murphy</i>	<i>ASD Elementary Math Support</i>	<i>Math DIP developer and implementer</i>
<i>Carolyn Crosby</i>	<i>CITC Elementary Math Support</i>	<i>Math DIP developer and implementer</i>
<i>Rick Volk</i>	<i>High School Principal</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input and implementer</i>
<i>Laketa Pollard</i>	<i>Bartlett High Math Department Chair</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input and implementer</i>
<i>Scott Roleff</i>	<i>Chugiak High Math Department Chair</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input and implementer</i>
<i>Teresa Moore</i>	<i>Dimond High Math Department Chair</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input and implementer</i>
<i>Jan Slattery</i>	<i>East High Math Department Chair</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input and implementer</i>
<i>Lolly Rader</i>	<i>Eagle River High Math Department Chair</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input and implementer</i>
<i>Chuck Strauss</i>	<i>South High Math Department Chair</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input and implementer</i>
<i>Gary Veater</i>	<i>Service High Math Department Chair</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input and implementer</i>
<i>Gayle Heywood</i>	<i>West High Math Department Chair</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input and implementer</i>
<i>Jennifer Strauss</i>	<i>Steller Math Department Chair</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input and implementer</i>
<i>Ruth Dene</i>	<i>Elementary Principal</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input and implementer</i>
<i>Patty Gallego</i>	<i>Central Math Department Chair</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input and implementer</i>
<i>Gerard Bagsby</i>	<i>Clark Math Department Chair</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input and implementer</i>
<i>Jessica Graziano</i>	<i>Begich Math Department Chair</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input and implementer</i>
<i>John Wilson</i>	<i>Girdwood Math Department Chair</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input and implementer</i>
<i>Laura Wrenn</i>	<i>Gruening Math Department Chair</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input and implementer</i>
<i>Maureen Petrunic</i>	<i>Hanshew Math Department Chair</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input and implementer</i>
<i>Lynne Seitz</i>	<i>Mears Math Department Chair</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input and implementer</i>
<i>BobbiJo Erb</i>	<i>Mirror Lake Math Department Chair</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input and implementer</i>
<i>Matt Neel, Joella Buswell</i>	<i>Romig Math Department Chairs</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input and implementer</i>
<i>Marshall Pendleton</i>	<i>Wendler Math Department Chair</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input and implementer</i>
<i>Jani Oviatt</i>	<i>Polaris Math Department Chair</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input and implementer</i>
<i>Jan Thompson</i>	<i>Secondary Educational Technology</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input and implementer</i>
<i>Mary Wegner</i>	<i>Elementary Education Technology</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input</i>
<i>Marjory Waggoner</i>	<i>Title I Supervisor</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input and implementer</i>
<i>Amy Goodman</i>	<i>Middle School Lang. Arts Support Teacher</i>	<i>MS Implementation of training components</i>
<i>Ruth Mount</i>	<i>Middle School Math Support Teacher</i>	<i>MS Implementation of training components</i>
<i>Cessilye Williams</i>	<i>Principal</i>	<i>MS Monitoring assistance</i>
<i>Linda Richardson</i>	<i>Special Education Support staff</i>	<i>MS Implementation of training components</i>
<b>Additional Members:</b>		
<i>Kathie Maloney</i>	<i>UAA Instructor, ACTM</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input</i>
<i>Alison Mall</i>	<i>UAA Instructor,</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input</i>
<i>Dr. Len Smiley</i>	<i>UAA Professor</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input</i>
<i>Jim Seitz</i>	<i>UAA Instructor</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input</i>
<i>Dr. Ted Munsch</i>	<i>APU Professor</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input</i>
<i>Linda Smith</i>	<i>UAA Instructor</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input</i>
<i>Julia Smith</i>	<i>Statistician, Southcentral Foundation</i>	<i>Math Advisory Input</i>

**DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLAN 2007-2008 School Year**  
**Complete one sheet for each goal – expand sections as appropriate**

**DISTRICT MEASURABLE GOAL (to include specific target):**

*All student subgroups not meeting the target for AYP (or attaining AYP through Safe Harbor) in **Language Arts** will show at least a 10% decrease in the percent of students not proficient in order to meet safe harbor targets. All performance standards will be addressed as required for individual student and subgroup growth.*

**CURRENT PERFORMANCE LEVEL ON SBAs:**

*Results from ASD 2006-2007 District-wide AYP **Language Arts** % proficient*

- *Students with Disabilities – 43.4% proficient*
  - *Performance target for 07-08 is 49.06% proficient*
- *LEP – 68.3% proficient (met Safe Harbor)*
  - *Performance target for 07-08 is 71.47% proficient*

**Scientifically based research to support each strategy listed below (reference or brief description):**

*See attached scientifically based research appendix.*

ACTION TO IMPLEMENT <u>Action, strategies and interventions</u> (include professional development, mentoring, parent involvement-not programs)	TIMELINE Milestones for current school year	RESOURCES (MATERIALS), ESTIMATED COSTS, FUNDING SOURCES	PERSONS RESPONSIBLE	PROGRESS MONITORING AND EVALUATION	
				EVALUATION (INSTRUMENT(S) USED TO ASSESS)	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING (OUTCOMES – REVIEW AT DISTRICT ONLY PER MILESTONE)
Prescriptive remediation in language arts for struggling high school students offered during the school day, in after school programs, and in summer school via Plato.	Ongoing	Est. Cost: \$150,000 Source: High School Division remediation budget.	Mike Henry and High School Principals	Student performance on State Assessments and Plato assessments.	
Fast ForWord offered in five comprehensive and four alternative high schools.	Ongoing	Est. Cost: \$120,000 Source: High School Division remediation budget.	Mike Henry and High School Principals	Gates MacGinitie pre and post reading assessments. Progress Tracker in FFW gives teachers a daily snapshot of student progress.	

Achieve 3000, a web-based literacy tool for differentiating instruction, will be used in all comprehensive and alternative high schools.	Ongoing	Est. Cost: \$50,000 Source: High School Division remediation budget.	Mike Henry, Darla Jones, and Jan Thompson	Achieve 3000 formative assessment tools and Statewide Assessments	
Contract with Consortium on Reading Excellence (CORE) for consultation and coaching in research-based reading curriculum implementation for ten Title I schools.	August 2007 through May 2008	Est. Cost: \$360,000 Source: Title I Professional Development Budget	Patricia McRae, Marjorie Waggoner, and ten Title I Principals	Increase in the percent proficient in language arts on the SBAs in all subgroups at the ten Title I school comparing 06/07 AYP results to 07/08 results	
Title I Literacy Coaches support Title I schools with research-based reading curriculum adoption through classroom coaching and consultation	August 2007 through May 2008	Est. Cost: \$1,326,000 in salaries and benefits. Source: Title I Administration and Professional Development Budgets	Patricia McRae, Marjorie Waggoner, and ten Title I Literacy Coaches	Increase in the percent proficient in language arts on the SBAs in all subgroups at the ten Title I school comparing 06/07 AYP results to 07/08 results	
Monthly professional development in the use of Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) with Elem., MS, and HS language arts teachers.	Fall 2007-Spring 2008	Est. Cost: \$151,800 for 3.0 FTE ESL teachers' salaries. Source: UAA funds credit courses, individual schools may fund out of Title implementer salaries, and Title III Acct 310	Bilingual/Multi-cultural Specialists and Elementary, Middle, and High School Resource Teachers	MLP, Evaluations, Surveys, and SBA scores	
Monthly professional development in the use of Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) with HS Bilingual Tutors.	Fall 2007-Spring 2008	Est. Cost: \$151,800 for 3.0 FTE ESL teachers' salaries. Source: Title III Acct 310	Bilingual/Multi-cultural Specialists and Elementary, Middle, and High School Resource Teachers	MLP, Evaluations, Surveys, and SBA scores	

Professional development of new staff in the continued implementation of ELLIS at two Middle Level and six Elementary Schools.	Fall 2007-Spring 2008	Est. Cost: \$151,800 for 3.0 FTE ESL teachers' salaries. Source: Title III Acct 310	IT Department BMEP staff Classroom teachers at ELLIS schools	ELLIS pre / post tests and SBA scores	
20 training sessions with ESL parents in PASSport for Success	Fall 2007-Spring 2008	Est. Cost: \$10,000 Source: Title III added duty/days Acct 310	BMEP Staff	Attendance evidenced through registration forms and sign-in sheets. Training effectiveness assessed via evaluation forms	
Two 3.5 hour (as needed) Aspire professional development sessions for Bilingual Tutors – new to district and from all levels. Strategies for reading, writing, and collaborating with teachers.	Fall 2007-Spring 2008	Est. Cost: \$151,800 for 3.0 FTE ESL teachers' salaries. Source: Title III Acct 310	BMEP Staff	MLP Surveys	
Secondary Special Education will continue to implement research-based curriculum in reading/language arts for self-contained special education classes as an extension of the general and remedial curriculum, expanding curriculum for self-contained special education classes to all high school.	2007-2008	Est. Cost: \$20,000 for expanding curriculum. Source: SPED budget through ASD general fund	Jerry Sjolander and Cindy Anderson	State Wide Assessments; Gates McGinitie and SBAs.	
Continuation of collaboration with regular education, special education teachers will participate in professional development and implementation of general and remedial reading/language arts curriculum to support special education students in K-12.	2007-2008	Est. Cost: \$100,000 Source: SPED budget through ASD general fund	Jerry Sjolander, Cindy Anderson, and Dana Dugdale	State Wide Assessments; Gates McGinitie and SBAs.	

Continued training for special education teachers in direct instruction reading (Corrective Reading, <i>Language!</i> Strategic Instruction Model) will be provided to improve student reading performance.	2007-2008	Est. Cost: \$100,000 Source: SPED budget through ASD general fund	Jerry Sjolander and Cindy Anderson	State Wide Assessments; Gates McGinitie and SBAs.	
Special Education will continue to provide an intensive reading clinic featuring Lindamood Bell strategies during the summer for those elementary and middle school students at a severe deficit level.	2007-2008	Est. Cost: \$40,000 Source: SPED budget through ASD general fund	Jerry Sjolander and Dana Dugdale	State Wide Assessments; Gates McGinitie and SBAs.	
Increase Middle School teacher proficiency in use of writing and reading instructional strategies. (1) Professional development for all new to mid-level teachers (2) Offer credit class on writing strategies open to MS staff from all content areas	August-New to mid-level professional development completed.  October – credit class Step Up To Writing	Est. Cost: Mid-level support teachers provide the training— one day’s salary. Source: MS Budget, ASD general fund	Amy Goodman	MLP registration	
Conduct a review of the middle school language arts curriculum with an emphasis on identifying how well our resources/curriculum address the GLE’s and meet the needs of all students (particularly special needs and ELL)	October-Teacher survey completed Nov.–Jan. - Committee reviews curriculum	Est. Cost: \$12,000 for 5 days of release time/substitutes for 20 committee members Source: MS unallocated, ASD general fund	Amy Goodman	Curriculum Review Committee Summary document	
Provide remedial writing support for Middle School students (Step-Up to Writing)	07-08 school year	Est. Cost: \$8600 Source: (SPED Dept. budget) for materials for all self-contained SPED classrooms and students	Amy Goodman and Linda Richardson	SBA scores	

Provide opportunity for after school tutoring for Middle School students identified as below proficient	07-08 school year	Est. Cost: \$75,000 for teacher addenda Source: MS unallocated, ASD general fund	Leslie Vandergaw	Student participation records	
Utilize on-line learning tools to differentiate instruction to Middle School students	07-08 school year	Est. Cost: \$69,500 for site license fees Source: MS unallocated, ASD general fund	Darla Jones	SBA scores	
Provide inquiry-based science notebook teacher professional development to teachers K-12 related to language arts.	Ongoing	Est. Cost: \$40,000 and three support teacher salaries at \$193,080 + benefits Source: Title IIA and ASD General Fund.	Texas Gail Raymond, Judy Onslow, Trisha Herminghaus, and Joanna Hubbard	MLP data, number of science notebooks printed for teachers through KCC, and evaluations.	
Continued implementation of Parent Information Resource Center (PIRC) program to help implement successful and effective parental involvement policies, programs, and activities that lead to improvements in student academic achievement and strengthen partnerships among parents, teachers, principals, administrators, and other school personnel in meeting the educational needs of children.	2007-2011	Est. Cost: \$152,664 annually. Source: APIRC Grant Project Budget.	Mike Travis, Julie Jessal, Margie Waggoner, and four Language and Cultural Liaisons	Activities evidenced in PIRC year-end report and any workshop/meeting registration/sign-in forms.	
All School Action Plans (SAP) to include parental communication component.	07-08	Est. Cost: None Source: SAP development and implementation is a function of regular duties and school processes.	Division Executive Directors and School Principals	As documented in each MLP Web-based SAP with year-end evaluation.	

All SAP to include a Parental Involvement Plan (PIP) to include measurable parental involvement objectives and plans for each SAP goal.	07-08	Est. Cost: None Source: PIP development and implementation is a function of regular duties and school processes.	Division Executive Directors and School Principals	As documented in each MLP Web-based PIP with year-end evaluation.	
Summer school will be offered to all elementary students who are below and far below proficient in language arts. A large percentage of total students served will be in the LEP and Students with Disabilities groups.	June, July 2008	Est. Cost: \$493,000 Source: ASD budget	Patricia McRae, Marjorie Waggoner, and Glen Nielsen	Gates-McGinitie, CR spelling and reading assessments	
Implementation of research-based literacy instruction in 51 elementary schools. 7 of those are new to implementation in 2007-2008, 14 are in the second year of implementation and 30 are in the third year of implementation. Provide on-site coaching in all Title I schools, and in schools that are in the first and second year of implementation. Provide 2 days of staff development in research and practice of effective literacy instruction for teachers from 44 schools.	2007-2008 school year	Est. Cost: \$650,000 Source: ASD budget	Patricia McRae, Marjorie Waggoner, and school principals	Developmental Reading Assessment and SBA	
Provide instructional interventions and additional targeted language arts instruction to identified students who are below or not proficient in language arts, in 60 elementary schools.	2007-2008 school year	Est. Cost: \$240,000 Source: ASD budget	Patricia McRae and School Principals	Developmental Reading Assessment and SBA	
Provide ½ day literacy in-service to all teaching staff (certificated and classified) on the role of fluency and vocabulary in literacy instruction.	August, 2007	Est. Cost: No cost	Patricia McRae and Jack Pikulski	Developmental Reading Assessment and SBA	

Parent involvement in literacy will be promoted in parent workshops offered throughout elementary summer school.	June, July 2008	Est. Cost: \$2,100 Source: ASD budget	Patricia McRae and district reading teachers	Parent participant survey	
“Below level” readers will be purchased for all ASD elementary resource rooms and professional development for resource teachers in the use of these readers will be provided.	2007-2008 school year	Est. Cost: \$126,000 Source: ASD budget	Patricia McRae, Dana Dugdale, and district reading teachers	Developmental Reading Assessment and SBA	

**DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLAN 2007-2008 School Year**  
**Complete one sheet for each goal – expand sections as appropriate**

**DISTRICT MEASURABLE GOAL (to include specific target):**

*All student subgroups not meeting the target for AYP in **Math** will show at least a 10% decrease in the percent of students not proficient in order to meet safe harbor targets. All performance standards will be addressed as required for individual student and subgroup growth.*

**CURRENT PERFORMANCE LEVEL ON SBAs:**

*Results from ASD 2006-2007 District-wide AYP **Math** % proficient*

- *Students with Disabilities – 39.2% proficient*
  - *Performance target for 07-08 is 45.28% proficient*

**Scientifically based research to support each strategy listed below (reference or brief description):**

*See attached scientifically based research appendix.*

ACTION TO IMPLEMENT <u>Action, strategies and interventions (include professional development, mentoring, parent involvement-not programs)</u>	TIMELINE Milestones for current school year	RESOURCES (MATERIALS), ESTIMATED COSTS, FUNDING SOURCES	PERSONS RESPONSIBLE	PROGRESS MONITORING AND EVALUATION	
				EVALUATION (INSTRUMENT(S) USED TO ASSESS))	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING (OUTCOMES – REVIEW AT DISTRICT ONLY PER MILESTONE)
Prescriptive remediation in math for struggling high school students offered during the school day, in after school programs, and in summer school via Plato.	Ongoing	Est. Cost: \$150,000 Source: High School Division remediation budget.	Mike Henry and High School Principals	Student performance on Statewide Assessments and Plato assessments	

Working with student Center Comprehensive Student Assessment Data System, counselors will develop a template for individual learning plans for each new student with parent input.	Ongoing	Est. Cost: \$20,000 Source: High School Division remediation budget.	Mike Henry	Student performance on Statewide Assessments.	
Larson Math, computer assisted instruction that aligns with ASD math curriculum will be used in all Title I schools. Teachers will receive professional development in the use of this resource.	August 2007 through May 2008	Est. Cost: \$77,000 for purchase of program for four new Title I schools. \$4,500 in training costs. Source: Title I Administration and Professional Development Budgets	Marjorie Waggoner, Sandy Schoff, and Mary Wegner	Increase in the percent proficient in math on the SBAs for all subgroups from the 06/07 school year to the 07/08 school year in schools using Larson Math	
Monthly professional development in the use of Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) with Elem., MS, and HS math teachers.	Fall 2007-Spring 2008	Est. Cost: \$151,800 for 3.0 FTE ESL teachers' salaries. Source: UAA funds credit courses, individual schools may fund out of Title implementer salaries, and Title III Acct 310	BMEP staff	MLP and effectiveness surveys	
Middle School Math ESL Pacemaker Math implemented at two Middle Schools with students	Fall 2007-Spring 2008	Est. Cost: \$3500 Source: Math Department and Title III Acct 450	BMEP staff in collaboration with Math Dept.	Growth on SBA Math scores, Survey-increase in academic vocabulary, and Math vocabulary test	

Monthly professional development in the use of Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) with HS Bilingual Tutors.	Fall 2007-Spring 2008	Est. Cost: \$151,800 for 3.0 FTE ESL teachers' salaries. Source: Title III Acct 310	Bilingual/Multi-cultural Specialists and Elementary, Middle, and High School Resource Teachers	MLP, Evaluations, Surveys, and SBA scores	
K-6 pacing guides for all math programs will be implemented to help teachers teach all the content and GLE's required for their grade level.	In place and revised yearly to reflect the current calendar	Est. Cost: Math Support Teacher salaries \$394,692 Source: Title IIa #251705	Sandy Schoff and Elem. Math Support Teachers	Increase in the percent proficient in math on the SBAs for all subgroups, particularly subgroups targeted w/in ASD DIP, when comparing 0607 AYP results to 0708.	
Assessment Recording System (ARS) professional development will be provided to all elementary and middle schools that did not receive training last year. Teachers will use student data on ARS to individualize instruction, particularly for targeted subgroups.	Ongoing 0708	Est. Cost: Addenda \$28,712 Source: Title V Funding. Also Math Support Teacher salaries (As per above)	Sandy Schoff, A&E staff, and Math Support Teachers	Increase in the percent proficient in math on the SBAs for all subgroups, particularly subgroups targeted w/in ASD DIP, when comparing 0607 AYP results to 0708.	
Continued ARS and math standards support for Elementary and Middle schools with below the district average AYP scores	Ongoing 0708	Est. Cost: Addenda \$28,712 Source: Title V Funding. Also Math Support Teacher salaries (As per above)	Sandy Schoff, A&E staff, and Math Support Teachers	Increase in the percent proficient in math on the SBAs for all subgroups, particularly subgroups targeted w/in ASD DIP, when comparing 0607 AYP results to 0708.	
Larson Math, computer-based instructional support that aligns with the math curriculum, will be used in all Title I schools and some non-Title I elementary and all middle schools. Teachers will receive professional development in the use of this resource.	Ongoing 0708	Est. Cost: \$86,160 for software and sub teachers. Also, Math Support Teacher salaries (As per above) Source: Title I and Title IIa (As per above)	Marjorie Waggoner, Sandy Schoff, Mary Wegner, and Math Support teachers	Increase in the percent proficient in math on the SBAs for all subgroups, particularly subgroups targeted w/in ASD DIP, when comparing 0607 AYP results to 0708 – at schools using Larson Math.	

Multi-age teachers that are new to Everyday Math will receive a day of professional development in how to manage the teaching of multi grade levels of math at the same time, particularly addressing targeted subgroups.	Aug.–Sept. '07	Est. Cost: Sub teachers and instructor cost \$3,000 Source: ASD general fund Acct # 103611	Sandy Schoff and Elementary Math Support Specialist	Training events evidenced in MLP.com, attendance records and training effectiveness assessed using evaluation forms.	
One full day of math professional development for K-6 teachers who are new to the ASD to help them teach the adopted math curriculum, including a strand on differentiation.	Aug.–Sept. '07	Est. Cost: Sub teachers and instructor \$10,000 Math Support Teacher salaries (As per above) Source: ASD general fund Acct # 103611	Sandy Schoff and Elementary Math Support Teachers	Training events evidenced in MLP.com, attendance records, and training effectiveness assessed using evaluation forms	
Professional development and materials for middle school math teachers and SPED collaborators to implement new MathScape adoption, including support for targeted subgroups.	Ongoing 0708	Est. Cost: Sub teachers and math materials \$485,000 one-time funding Source: ASD general fund Acct # 103611	Sandy Schoff, Ruth Mount, and Linda Richardson	Increase in the percent proficient in math on the SBAs for all middle school 6 <sup>th</sup> , 7 <sup>th</sup> and 8 <sup>th</sup> graders, particularly the subgroups targeted w/in ASD DIP, from the 06-07 school year to the 07-08 school year.	
Develop course content and select materials for middle school Math Support class including support for the targeted subgroups.	Ongoing 0708	Est. Cost: Addenda \$8000 Source: ASD general fund Acct # 103611	Ruth Mount and middle school math teachers	Increase in the percent proficient in math on the SBAs for all middle school 6 <sup>th</sup> , 7 <sup>th</sup> and 8 <sup>th</sup> graders, particularly the subgroups targeted w/in ASD DIP, from the 06-07 school year to the 07-08 school year.	
Professional development for all HS teachers using Carnegie Bridge-to-Algebra and Algebra to implement curriculum aligned to GLEs and HSGQE.	Ongoing 0708	Est. Cost: Addenda \$54,000 Source: ASD general fund Acct # 103611-12	Sandy Schoff and high school math teachers	Increase in the percent proficient in math on the SBAs for all 9 <sup>th</sup> and 10 <sup>th</sup> graders, particularly subgroups targeted w/in ASD DIP, from the 06-07 school year to the 07-08 school year.	

Support Carnegie Bridge-to-Algebra in HSGQE Prep elective classes	Ongoing 0708	Est. Cost: Addenda, software, and materials -- as per cell above. Source: ASD general fund Acct # 103611-12	Sandy Schoff, Jan Thompson, and high school math teachers	Decrease the number of 11 <sup>th</sup> and 12 <sup>th</sup> grade students who must retake the Math HSGQE, particularly those in the targeted subgroup.	
Utilize on-line learning tools to differentiate instruction at Middle Level	07-08 school year	Est. Cost: \$20,000 per Larson site Source: ASD General Fund Math Program	Darla Jones	SBA scores	
Offer parent nights at all middle schools to showcase and answer questions regarding the new math curriculum—emphasis on program strengths related to ELL, SPED, etc.	October-November 2007	Est. Cost: \$4,500 for addenda for staff Source: MS unallocated, ASD general fund	Ruth Mount	District calendar of events	
Develop math remediation curriculum for non-proficient students	November 2007-April 2008	Est. Cost: \$3,000 for substitutes and release time Source: MS Unallocated, ASD general fund	Ruth Mount	Summary document from math remediation curriculum committee	
Provide opportunity for after school tutoring for Middle Level students identified as below proficient	October 2007-April 2008	Est. Cost: \$75,000 for teacher addenda Source: MS unallocated, ASD general fund	Leslie Vandergaw	School participation records	
Provide inquiry-based science notebook teacher professional development to teachers K-12 related to mathematics.	Ongoing	Est. Cost: \$40,000 and three support teacher salaries at \$193,080 + benefits Source: Title IIA and ASD General Fund	Texas Gail Raymond, Judy Onslow, Trisha Herminghaus, and Joanna Hubbard	MLP data, number of science notebooks printed for teachers through KCC, and evaluations.	

Continued implementation of Parent Information Resource Center (PIRC) program to help implement successful and effective parental involvement policies, programs, and activities that lead to improvements in student academic achievement and strengthen partnerships among parents, teachers, principals, administrators, and other school personnel in meeting the educational needs of children.	2007-2011	Est. Cost: \$152,664 annually. Source: APIRC Grant Project Budget.	Mike Travis, Julie Jessal, Margie Waggoner, and four Language and Cultural Liaisons	Activities evidenced in PIRC year-end report and any workshop/meeting registration/sign-in forms.	
All School Action Plans (SAP) to include parental communication component.	07-08	Est. Cost: None Source: SAP development and implementation is a function of regular duties and school processes.	Division Executive Directors and School Principals	As documented in each MLP Web-based SAP with year-end evaluation.	
All SAP to include a Parental Involvement Plan (PIP) to include measurable parental involvement objectives and plans for each SAP goal.	07-08	Est. Cost: None Source: PIP development and implementation is a function of regular duties and school processes.	Division Executive Directors and School Principals	As documented in each MLP Web-based PIP with year-end evaluation.	
Provide instructional interventions and additional targeted math instruction to identified students who are below or not proficient in math, in 60 elementary schools.	2007-2008 school year	Est. Cost: \$240,000 Source: ASD budget	Patricia McRae and School Principals	Criterion-referenced math assessments, SBA	

Summer school will be offered to all elementary students who are below and far below proficient in math. A large percentage of total students served will be in the LEP and Students with Disabilities groups.	June, July 2008	Est. Cost: \$493,000 Source: ASD budget	Patricia McRae, Marjorie Waggoner, and Glen Nielsen	Criterion-referenced math assessment aligned to summer school curriculum	
Parent involvement in math will be promoted in parent workshops offered throughout elementary summer school.	June, July 2008	Est. Cost: \$2,100 Source: ASD budget	Patricia McRae and Mary Murphy	Parent participant survey	
Continued professional development for special education teachers in Math (Transition Math) will be provided to improve student math performance.	2007-2008	Est. Cost: \$100,000 Source: SPED budget through ASD general fund	Jerry Sjolander and Cindy Anderson	SBAs	
Implement year one of Number Worlds (SRA McGraw Hill) remedial math in grades pre-K through 6 <sup>th</sup> at 15 schools to include 2 teacher professional development sessions in the fall, onsite visits by implementation experts, and a February follow-up session.	2007-2008	Est. Cost: \$110,000 Source: Title VI B	Dana Dugdale and McGraw Hill Trainers	SBAs and post training evaluations	

**Anchorage School District Improvement Planning**  
Scientifically Based Research to Support Strategies and Curricula

---

These instructional strategies and curricula are listed alphabetically on the following pages.

- Bridges to Literature
- Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA)
- English Language Learning Instruction System (ELLIS)
- Everyday Mathematics (EDM)
- Fast ForWord
- First Steps in Mathematics
- Following the Leaders (FTL)
- Harcourt Brace
- Houghton Mifflin Reading
- Instructional Technology
- LANGUAGE!
- Larson Math
- Parental Involvement
- PLATO
- Read 180
- Reading Mastery and Success for All Reading Programs
- Rewards and Rewards Plus
- Science Notebooks (Inquiry-Based)
- Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP)
- Six Traits Writing
- Small Group Intervention / Remediation Instruction
- Strategic Instruction Model (SIM)

## **Anchorage School District Improvement Planning**

---

### Scientifically Based Research to Support Strategies and Curricula

#### **Bridges to Literature**

McDougal Littell's *Bridges to Literature* program meets the requirements of programs that work established in the No Child Left Behind Act. The program, designed to bridge the gap between grade level and reading ability for struggling readers in grades 6 through 12, was built on sound reading research and research-based instructional strategies demonstrated to be effective. The program components are based on solid research findings from *Put Reading First*. In addition, the *Teacher's Edition* provides explicit instruction lessons, teacher modeling and scaffolding, and student applications. The *Teacher's Edition* pages present direct instruction for each focus skill and include special *SkillBuilder Copymasters*. The *Bridges to Literature Assessment Book* provides diagnostic and prescriptive components, including placement, mid-year and end-of-year tests, which help teachers determine each student's progress. Finally, McDougal Littell correlated its program to nine research-based instructional strategies that have been proven to have a positive effect on learning and increased student achievement as shown by educational researchers Robert J. Marzano, Debra J. Pickering, and Jan E. Pollock in *Classroom Instruction That Works, Research-Based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement* published by the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD)

#### **Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA)**

CALLA is an instructional strategy used with students who are learning using a second language. For a description of its implementation, assessment of its success, and further research-based references -- download *The Bilingual Research Journal* article found online at [http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/nabe/brj/v19/19\\_34\\_chamot.pdf](http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/nabe/brj/v19/19_34_chamot.pdf) (October 2006).

#### **English Language Learning Instruction System (ELLIS)**

The document, "Applied Research in ELLIS," provides the research-based works that, when applied in ELLIS, make the program one of the best in the field. This work represents the fulfillment of curricula requirements in the No Child Left Behind Act. The research is based on more than 100 studies including benchmark studies spanning decades of research as well as some of the most current research in the relevant fields. The information is presented systematically: 1) An explanation of a principle or theory in language acquisition and instruction; 2) A description of how that principle is applied in ELLIS; and 3) A list of some of the significant empirical and meta-research studies supporting that theory or principle. "Applied Research in ELLIS," is available for download at [http://www.ellis.com/whyellis/esl\\_research.htm](http://www.ellis.com/whyellis/esl_research.htm) (October 2006).

#### **Everyday Mathematics**

*Everyday Mathematics* is a research-based curriculum developed by the University of Chicago School Mathematics Project. For research papers and other print materials, see <http://everydaymath.uchicago.edu/educators/references.shtml>. This Website includes the following abstract, [The Research Basis of the \*Everyday Mathematics\* Curriculum](#) by Andrew Isaacs, William Carroll, and Max Bell (2001).

According to David J. Hoff of Education Week, "*Everyday Mathematics*, which is used by 3 million U.S. students in 175,000 classrooms, was deemed to raise students' test scores by an average of 12 percentile points in a review of four studies reanalyzed by the What Works Clearinghouse at the U.S. Department of Education. Based on those results, the report said the curriculum has "potentially positive effects," the second-highest category on its ranking

## **Anchorage School District Improvement Planning**

---

### Scientifically Based Research to Support Strategies and Curricula

scale.” (September 20, 2006).

#### **Fast ForWord**

The *Fast ForWord* program has an extensive research base. A *Controlled Randomized Clinical Trial* (1994-1995) was conducted at Rutgers University in Newark, New Jersey. The clinical results were published in the January 1996 issue of *Science*, a peer-reviewed journal (Tallal, et. Al., *Scienc.* 271: 81-84). The early data showed rapid improvements in language skills with the research prototype of Fast ForWord Language, including significant gains in oral language comprehension, speech discrimination, grammar and syntax.

A Multi-Site Field Study conducted in 1996 in collaboration with over 60 independent professionals at 35 sites in the United States and Canada proved the results in a “real world” setting. After Fast ForWord Language participation, children experienced the same dramatic improvements in language as those who participated in the initial trial.

#### **First Steps in Mathematics**

First Steps in Mathematics is a research-based program that provides teachers with a robust mathematics background, diagnostic tools to assess student understanding, and learning activities to further students' conceptual growth. A key focus is on developing the ability to make accurate professional judgments and decisions about student learning. Time-tested by educators around the world, STEPS Professional Development's suite of courses and educational resources are researched and designed with the Education Department of Western Australia and Edith Cowan University in Perth, Western Australia. To learn more about the research base for First Steps, go online to <http://www.stepspd.org/> (October 2006).

#### **Following the Leaders**

*Following the Leaders* (FTL) is a standards driven technology based project designed to help teachers and students raise achievement and exceed the requirements of NCLB. Providing technology tools, educational resources and hands-on support, FTL allows teachers to better address individual needs and effectively communicate with everyone involved in a child's education. At the school level, FTL is implemented through the use of two internet-based programs: *Homeroom.com*, a formative assessment tool aligned to our Alaska State Standards and *SkillsTutor*, an interactive diagnostic and instructional program catered to meet the needs of individual students. The Educational Leaders Council (ELC), in partnership with Achievement Technologies and The Princeton Review, oversee the FTL project.

The research base for the use of technology in increasing student achievement is strong. In a 2000 study commissioned by the Software and Information Industry Association, Sivin-Kachala and Bialo (2000) reviewed 311 research studies on the effectiveness of technology on student achievement.

#### **Harcourt Brace**

*Harcourt Brace* is a research-based, developmental reading/language arts program. Explicit phonics instruction; direct reading instruction; guided reading strategies; phonemic awareness instruction; systematic, intervention strategies; integrated language arts components; and state-of-the-art assessment tools ensure every student successfully learns to read. [http://www.harcourt.com/bu\\_info/harcourt\\_school.html](http://www.harcourt.com/bu_info/harcourt_school.html) (September 2006).

### **Houghton Mifflin Reading**

The Houghton-Mifflin and meets the criteria for effective reading instruction as established by the National Reading Panel Report. In preliminary results of the effectiveness of the Houghton-Mifflin reading program, significantly positive effects were seen on students' vocabulary development. Third graders in classrooms where Houghton-Mifflin Reading is used as the primary reading curriculum show statistically significant gains on the vocabulary subtest on the ITBS. Compared to the control group of non-HMR users, there is a slightly higher proportion of grades 2 and 3 students in HMR classrooms who improve their vocabulary test scores from below grade level to at or above grade level over the course of one school year. (Executive Summary of the Scientific Research Base and Program Efficacy, Houghton-Mifflin Company, 2002).

### **Instructional Technology**

The research base for the use of technology in increasing student achievement is strong. In a 2000 study commissioned by the Software and Information Industry Association, Sivinkachala and Bialo (2000) reviewed 311 research studies on the effectiveness of technology on student achievement. Their findings revealed positive and consistent patterns when students were engaged in technology-rich environments, including significant gains and achievement in all subject areas, increased achievement in preschool through high school for both regular and special needs students, and improved attitudes toward learning and increased self-esteem.

O'Dwyer, Russell, Bebell, and Tucker-Seeley (2005) found that, while controlling for both prior achievement and socioeconomic status, fourth-grade students who reported greater frequency of technology use at school to edit papers were likely to have higher total English/language arts test scores and higher writing scores on fourth grade test scores on the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) English/Language Arts test.

### **LANGUAGE!**

Based in research and proven effective in schools across the country, *LANGUAGE!* was created for students in grades 3–12 who score at or below the 35th percentile on national norm-referenced reading tests. *LANGUAGE!* is appropriate for students in general education and also supports the special instructional needs of English language learners (ELL) and Individualized Education Program (IEP) populations. Through a six-step lesson design, *LANGUAGE!* teaches students the structure and use of all language systems necessary for successful reading and writing.

Phonemic Awareness and Phonics

Word Recognition and Spelling

Vocabulary and Morphology

Grammar and Usage

Listening and Reading Comprehension

Speaking and Writing

For documents speaking to the research base of *LANGUAGE!* Go on line to:

< <http://store.cambiumlearning.com/research.aspx> > (September 2006).

## **Anchorage School District Improvement Planning**

---

### Scientifically Based Research to Support Strategies and Curricula

#### **Larson Math**

*Larson Math* utilizes multimedia software programs developed with the National Council of Teachers in Mathematics Standards as a guide. *Larson Math* is a program that can be individualized to match a student proficiency level and correlates with Alaska GLE's and math content standards.

[http://meridiancg.com/menucontent/menu\\_correlations/correlations\\_ak.htm](http://meridiancg.com/menucontent/menu_correlations/correlations_ak.htm) (September 2006).

#### **Parental Involvement**

Parent involvement is a cornerstone in the No Child Left Behind Act. NCLB advocates through policy that when educators, families, and communities work together, schools get better. As a result, students get the high quality education they need to lead productive lives. For more information about parent involvement strategies and their basis in the NCLB Act, go to the U.S. Department of Education's

<http://www.ed.gov/admins/comm/parents/pntinv.html> (October 2006).

#### **PLATO**

As a leading provider of personalized instruction and standards-driven assessment and accountability, PLATO Learning helps sustain continuous academic improvement for K-12 learners. PLATO'S achievement model integrates research, professional services and technology to promote academic and career success. PLATO Learning has over 40 years of experience and a strong research basis. For extensive evidence of student success as well as the research, see <http://www.plato.com/research/index.asp> (September 2006).

#### **Read 180**

The Read180 Papalewis (2004) study explored the impact of implementing the Read 180 intervention among 8th grade struggling readers. Over the course of one academic year, 622 8th grade students from a large urban inner city school district received daily instruction from the Read 180 program. The Read 180 program is a comprehensive reading intervention that includes smaller class sizes, teacher training, software instruction, audio books, as well as individual, class, and small group practice. Standardized reading scores from 537 of the intervention students were compared with matched baseline data from the two academic years prior to the intervention. In addition, the standardized reading scores of the intervention group were compared with data from 536 students in a comparison group that did not receive a reading intervention. The comparison group was comprised of students from the same school district that were matched on pre-test scores, gender, ethnicity, and language proficiency. Students in the Read 180 intervention group demonstrated statistically significant reading gains from the baseline to posttest scores on the NCEs Reading and Language Arts tests. The Read 180 intervention group also demonstrated significantly higher gains on both the NCEs Reading and Language Arts posttests than the comparison group. In contrast to the reading gains demonstrated by the intervention group, the comparison group scored lower on the posttests. Overall, this study suggests that the Read 180 intervention as a whole may be effective for helping struggling middle school readers, but it is not clear how individual program elements, such as the reading software or smaller class sizes are impacting reading achievement. Additionally, given the unique characteristics of the study sample (high percentage of English language learners and ethnic minorities, severe reading difficulties/most were repeating the 8th grade), the findings and implications of the study

## **Anchorage School District Improvement Planning**

---

### Scientifically Based Research to Support Strategies and Curricula

should be evaluated in context. (Research conducted by Metiri Group).

#### **Reading Mastery and Success for All Reading Programs**

Staff development in reading and literacy curriculum and methods follows the recommendations from the National Reading Panel Report, 1999, and incorporates phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension instruction which are all necessary to student success in reading. Our school utilizes a research-based core curriculum that is based on these components.

#### **REWARDS and REWARDS Plus**

In the past, research on the acquisition of decoding skills has concentrated largely on monosyllabic (single-syllable) word reading. However, a need exists for research about multisyllabic (two or more syllables) word reading and how students accomplish the learning necessary to read these longer words. Beginning with fourth grade material, multisyllabic words account for anywhere from 10% to 80% of the words students read in a passage. Yet, few curriculum materials exist to teach students to read longer words. The development of the *REWARDS* program and conducting research regarding its effectiveness was initiated to meet these needs.

Various versions of the *REWARDS* program have been field-tested and used widely with poor readers and students with reading disabilities. Before any formal studies were conducted, data was collected in several field-tests and in at least four pilot studies. Using the grade equivalent (GE) scores of two subtests from the *Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests* (Word Attack and Word Identification; Woodcock, 1973), substantial gains in short periods of time were documented. In approximately five weeks, some students gained as little as one year's worth of reading, while other students showed a gain that was equivalent to eight years on the Word Attack subtest. Anita Archer (1981) found in the pilot studies that flexible syllabication procedures focusing on vowel sounds (e.g., ai, ea, ou), word parts vowel conversions, and approximate pronunciations, in conjunction with a word building strategy that taught students to break longer words down into smaller recognizable word parts, read part by part, then read the whole word, were effective in teaching low-performing fourth and fifth grade students to read multisyllabic words.

To validate the strong field-test and pilot test results, and confirm that the intervention was responsible for the results, two studies were completed using previous versions of the *REWARDS* program as the intervention. In the first study, the experimenter tried three different versions of *REWARDS* and compared them to a program not specifically designed to teach multisyllabic words. In the second study, different versions of the *REWARDS* program were implemented requiring different success levels for different groups (80% versus 90%) and providing different practice modes (sentence versus whole paragraphs). To learn more about each study for *REWARDS* and *REWARDS Plus* go online to [http://store.cambiumlearning.com/Resources/Research/pdf/sw\\_Research\\_REWARDS\\_RB01.pdf](http://store.cambiumlearning.com/Resources/Research/pdf/sw_Research_REWARDS_RB01.pdf)

#### **Science Notebooks (Inquiry-Based)**

Amaral et al., 2002 and Jorgenson and Vanosdall, 2002 provides evidence suggesting a strong relationship between inquiry-based science instruction and improved achievement not only in science, but also in reading, writing, and mathematics. Klentschy, 2002, shows a strong connection between science and literacy especially when student science notebooks

## **Anchorage School District Improvement Planning**

---

### Scientifically Based Research to Support Strategies and Curricula

play a majority role. The science notebook links science and literacy when it is used as a form of writing in constructing meaning with science experiences.

#### **Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol – SIOP**

Intervention curriculum and methodology (e.g. sheltered instruction, direct instruction) is grounded in research-based practices that promote learning for students with LEP learning profiles. (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2002).

The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model (Echevarria, Vogt & Short, 2004) was developed to provide teachers with a well-articulated, practical model of sheltered instruction. The SIOP Model is currently used in most of the 50 states and in hundreds of schools across the U.S. as well as in several other countries. The intent of the model is to facilitate high quality instruction for ELLs in content area teaching. The model is based on current knowledge and research-based practices for promoting learning with ELLs. Critical features of high quality instruction for ELLs are embedded within the SIOP Model. <<http://www.siopinstitute.net/about.shtml>> (September 2006).

#### **Six Traits Writing**

The traits-based approach to writing instruction is supported by numerous studies. Reference: Experimental Study on the Impact of the 6+1 Trait® Writing Model on Student Achievement in Writing, Dr. Michael Kozlow and Peter Bellamy, Paper Presented at the 2005 ASCD Annual Conference Orlando, Florida, April 3, 2005 @ <http://www.nwrel.org/ascd05/traits.pdf> (September 2006) for a comprehensive listing.

#### **Small Group Intervention / Remediation Instruction**

The historical success rate of increasing student achievement through small group tutoring is high as measured by pre/post assessments of student growth conducted at each school site as a part of the learning opportunity initiatives. This intervention is grounded in research. A meta-analysis of findings from 65 independent evaluations of school tutoring programs showed that these programs have positive effect on the academic performance and attitudes of those who receive tutoring (Cohen, Kulik, Kulik, 1982).

#### **Strategic Instruction Model (SIM)**

Strategic Instruction Model, or SIM, is about promoting effective teaching and learning of critical content in schools. SIM strives to help teachers make decisions about what is of greatest importance, what we can teach students to help them to learn, and how to teach them well. For scientifically based research supporting SIM, go online to <<http://www.kucrl.org/archives>> (September 2006).

# Bartlett High

## About Our Students

### Bartlett High School Characteristics

	School	District	Source of Information
Membership	1,729	49,230	Fall OASIS
Capacity (7-12)	88%	N/A	Board Report - #202 3/12/07
Attendance Rate	87.6%	92.7%	Summer Oasis
Transiency Rate	32.9%	N/A	Summer Oasis
Economically Disadvantaged	698	18,444	Fall OASIS
Ave. Weekly Volunteer Hours	20	5,111	Dept of Ed Report Card Report
Graduation Rate	59.3%	64.9%	Summer Oasis & A&E Graduation File
Dropout Rate	7.92%	5.34%	Summer Oasis
AP courses offered in 2006-2007	18	168	SMS transcript file
Students successfully completing AP courses	128	1,451	SMS transcript file
AP courses completed by students	231	2,807	SMS transcript file
Students Taking the Alternate Assessment	17	230	SMS
# of students approved for an HSGQE Alternative Assessment (Gr. 11-12)	48	413	SMS
# of students meeting HSGQE requirement using an alternative assessment (Gr. 11-12)	23	201	SMS
Change in Enrollment	-3.9%	-1.0%	Fall Oasis

### Bartlett HSGQE - 10th Grade Results

Reading	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	School	District	School	District
2006-2007	88.9%	91.4%	11.1%	8.6%
2005-2006	69.8%	76.4%	30.2%	23.6%
2004-2005	62.2%	72.5%	37.8%	27.5%
2003-2004	66.6%	73.3%	33.3%	26.7%

Writing	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	School	District	School	District
2006-2007	77.0%	82.5%	23.0%	17.5%
2005-2006	88.8%	90.8%	11.2%	9.2%
2004-2005	79.3%	85.6%	20.7%	14.4%
2003-2004	83.3%	87.0%	16.7%	13.0%

Math	Proficient		Not Proficient	
	School	District	School	District
2006-2007	73.2%	82.3%	26.8%	17.7%
2005-2006	74.9%	79.9%	25.1%	20.1%
2004-2005	67.0%	76.3%	33.0%	14.4%
2003-2004	62.8%	69.8%	37.1%	30.2%

### Bartlett HSGQE Cumulative Proficiency for Grade 11 and Grade 12 Students (Spring 2007)

Grade 11			Grade 12		
Subtest	Number	Percent	Subtest	Number	Percent
Reading	340	91.4%	Reading	264	90.4%
Writing	334	89.8%	Writing	272	93.2%
Math	320	86.0%	Math	266	91.1%

In addition to meeting local school district requirements, Alaska students must pass the state's High School Graduation Qualifying Examination to earn a diploma. To pass, students must be rated proficient or advanced in all three sections of the exam: reading, writing, math. Students take the HSGQE for the first time in the spring of 10th grade. Sections not passed can be retaken once a semester during 11th and 12th grade until passed.

Non-Profit Organization  
U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
Permit No. 161  
Anchorage, AK

Anchorage School District  
5530 E. Northern Lights Blvd.  
Anchorage, AK 99504-3135



Anchorage School District  
*Enriching All Students for Success in Life*

Detailed information regarding the school's performance is available in the Profile of Performance. This document and the district report card are available online at [www.asdk12.org/depts/assess\\_eval/](http://www.asdk12.org/depts/assess_eval/) or through the district Communications department, 742-4153.

## Anchorage School District

# 2006-2007 School Report Card for Bartlett High School

Bartlett is one of eight large, comprehensive high schools in the Anchorage School District. Bartlett is located near Elmendorf Air Force Base and draws students from Elmendorf and Fort Richardson Army Post, as well as the Muldoon community. The staff at BHS is committed to meeting the individual needs of our diverse student population. These needs are met through varied instructional methods, extracurricular activities and support services.

The students at Bartlett have an opportunity to achieve their highest potential and develop a strong sense of community. Aware of the rapid pace of change, our school community provides students with the tools to function responsibly. We supply each student with the skills to be life-long learners. Bartlett High School is dedicated to excellence.

1101 N. Muldoon Road  
Elmendorf AFB, Alaska  
99504

phone: 907-742-1800

fax: 907-742-1825

Principal: Dan Gallego

[www.asdk12.org](http://www.asdk12.org)



## School Goals

### Goal Level of Attainment

The number of students rated as proficient on the math section of the state High School Graduation Qualifying Exam will increase from 52.1 to 56.9 percent. . . . . Attained

Bartlett’s graduation rate will increase from 68.1 to 70 percent . . . . . Not Attained

Bartlett will develop effective opportunities to improve and enhance communication with parents. . . . . Not Attained

Our school helps students succeed through quality staff, parent involvement and community partnerships.

## Parent Involvement

Parents play a crucial role in establishing school goals and making sure their children do well in school. Principals are required to share their school achievement data with parents and they actively seek parents’ suggestions, comments and participation in setting annual school goals. For schools that did not make Adequate Yearly Progress, principals will also work with parents and staff to develop detailed school improvement plans. Contact your school’s principal for information on how parents can become involved in these activities.

## School Business Partners

Qdoba  
Anchorage Society of Human Resources Mgt.  
Kid’s Cafe/Bean’s Cafe  
Totem Ocean Trailer Express

Parents and other community members volunteer an average of 20 hours per week in the school.

## Teacher Quality Information (2006-2007)

	# of teachers	% fully licensed	% with advanced degrees	# Nationally Board Certified	% of classes taught by “highly qualified teachers”
<b>Bartlett High School</b>	87	100%	53%	1	93%
<b>District Totals</b>	3090	100%	43%	17	82%

## Adequate Yearly Progress

According to the No Child Left Behind Act, the Anchorage School District is in Level 4 corrective status. Parents are invited to participate in the development of a district improvement plan that addresses the achievement of all students including the non-AYP subgroup involving disabled students in language arts and math performance. Contact your child’s principal or the district Accountability Department for more information on how parents can participate in school and district improvement planning.

The following table illustrates our school’s “Adequate Yearly Progress” status as defined by the federal No Child Left Behind Act. A complete explanation of AYP calculations is available at [www.asdk12.org](http://www.asdk12.org).

### Anchorage School District 2006-2007 Adequate Yearly Progress - Anchorage Status Report

Bartlett High School													
Does Not Meet AYP Level 5					AMO For Language Arts: 71.48%					AMO For Math: 57.61%			
Group	Participation Rate			"FAY"	Language Arts Performance				Math Performance				
If there are 20 or fewer students enrolled, value is "N/A"	(A) Number Enrolled	(B) Number Tested	(C) Participation Rate (%)	(D) Participation Rate Met	(E) Tested and Enrolled "FAY"	(F) Proficient on LA	(G) Percent Proficient on LA	(H) LA Target	(I) Met AMO for LA	(J) Proficient on Math	(K) Percent Proficient in Math	(L) Math Target	(M) Met AMO for Math
All Students	853	832	97.5%	Yes	751	556	74%	67.6%	Yes	452	60.2%	53.4%	Yes
African American	155	150	96.8%	Yes	136	90	66.2%	62.5%	Yes	62	45.6%	47.7%	Yes-SH
AkNa & Amln	132	127	96.2%	Yes	108	68	63%	61.4%	Yes	55	50.9%	46.5%	Yes
Asian	107	103	96.3%	Yes	96	73	76%	60.7%	Yes	62	64.6%	45.9%	Yes
Caucasian	357	351	98.3%	Yes	329	276	83.9%	65.7%	Yes	234	71.1%	51.3%	Yes
Hispanic	55	54	98.2%	Yes	45	24	53.3%	55.8%	No	16	35.6%	40.4%	Yes-SH
Multi-Ethnic	47	47	100%	Yes	37	25	67.6%	54.2%	Yes	23	62.2%	38.7%	Yes
Low Income	409	396	96.8%	Yes	342	223	65.2%	65.8%	Yes-SH	187	54.7%	51.4%	Yes
Disabled	119	118	99.2%	Yes	103	30	29.1%	61.1%	No	22	21.4%	46.3%	No
LEP	141	137	97.2%	Yes	120	73	60.8%	61.9%	Yes-SH	62	51.7%	47.1%	Yes

Graduation Rate: Met 59.3% (Threshold is 55.58%)

N/A is used to indicate:

- (1) Subgroups with 20 or fewer students enrolled on the first day of testing shall not be included in participation rate calculation.
- (2) Subgroups with 25 or fewer students enrolled for the “full academic year” shall not have the performance score computed.

\* For the groups where the number enrolled is less than or equal to 40, participation is met when no more than 2 miss the test. Groups can also meet this target using the average of the past two or three years.

\*\* Where a group achieves a “Yes” without meeting the listed target, it has done so using either the 99% confidence interval or Safe Harbor.

\*\*\* Results cannot be published without releasing personally identifiable information.

This document was prepared by the ASD Assessment and Evaluation

7/30/2007

**Alaska Standards Based Assessment:** The Alaska Standards Based Assessments (SBAs) are statewide tests designed to provide information about what students know and are able to do in reading, writing, and mathematics. They estimate the degree to which students have mastered the Academic Performance Standards for reading, writing, and mathematics outlined in the Grade Level Expectations. These assessments are written specifically for Alaska and are the foundation of the Alaska school-accountability system.

