



DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Office of District and School Improvement, Milwaukee Public Schools
Required as a part of Corrective Action for Milwaukee Public Schools, 2011-2012

Table of Contents

Overview	-----	3
Section I: Data Analysis	-----	6
Section II: Corrective Action Requirements	-----	8
Ensuring Highly Qualified Teachers and Leaders in Every School		10
Improving Student Performance		
• Implementing a Successful Response to Intervention System		11
• Implementing a Successful Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports System		15
Ensuring Accountability at the District, School and Student Levels		18
Section III: School Improvement Plan	-----	20
Section IV: School Improvement Grant Activities	-----	21
Section V: Appendix - Results	-----	26

MPS District Improvement Plan 2010-2011

Overview

The Department of Public Instruction (DPI) is required by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) to annually identify schools and districts that did not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward meeting the state’s established objectives in four areas. These objectives include:

- Testing 95 percent of their enrolled students in the statewide reading and mathematics assessments;
- Meeting state established targets in reading, based on Wisconsin’s statewide standardized test;
- Meeting state established targets in mathematics, based on Wisconsin’s statewide standardized test; and
- Maintaining either a high school graduation rate of at least 85 percent or show growth of two percentage points each year and elementary and middle school attendance rates of at least 85 percent of the statewide average, or show growth.

[Milwaukee Public Schools](#) (MPS) has not made AYP for seven consecutive years in reading and mathematics at the elementary, middle, and high school grade spans. MPS did not meet AYP in reading and mathematics for the 2010-2011 school year and is now a District Identified for Improvement-Level 5 (DIFI). Because MPS is a DIFI Level 5, all MPS schools are held accountable to Corrective Action Requirements (CAR) enacted by the DPI for MPS.

History of Corrective Action Requirements for Milwaukee Public Schools

Year	Action
2004-2005	MPS missed AYP
2005-2006	MPS missed AYP. MPS was a district identified for improvement (DIFI Level 1)
2006-2007	MPS missed AYP MPS remained identified for improvement (DIFI Level 2)
2007-2008	MPS missed AYP MPS remained identified for improvement (DIFI Level 3). As DIFI Level 3, MPS was identified as in need of corrective action The State Superintendent issued updated and revised corrective action requirements.
2008-2009	MPS missed AYP MPS remained identified for improvement and subject to corrective action (DIFI Level 4) The State Superintendent issues updated and revised corrective action requirements.
2009-2010	MPS missed AYP for the sixth consecutive year MPS remained identified for improvement and subject to corrective action (DIFI Level 5)
2010-2011	MPS missed AYP for the seventh consecutive year MPS remained identified for improvement and subject to corrective action (DIFI Level 5) The State Superintendent issued updated and revised corrective action requirements.

The 2011-2012 District Improvement Plan builds on prior work of the district. In the past several years, through the District improvement Plan, the district developed structures to address specific areas of concern under former corrective action requirements such as:

- In 2010-2011 the district began work on the Comprehensive Mathematics and Science Plan (CMSP).
- In 2009-2010, the district developed the Comprehensive Literacy Plan (CLP) and integrated MPS' historical work around Response to Intervention (RtI) into this framework.
- At the same time the district in collaboration with the Milwaukee's Teacher Education Association (MTEA) rolled out the Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS) program in cohort I schools.
- In 2009-2010 the district adopted an action team for partnership model to engage families and communities with the schools to focus on student achievement. The action plan for partnerships and a district action team works with the Regional Home-School staff to support the school governance councils and the action teams for partnerships.
- In 2008 the Office of District and School Improvement was formed to provide technical support and monitoring of corrective actions at the district and school level.

The 2011-2012 District Improvement Plan is closely aligned with corrective action requirements placed on the District by the DPI as a result of the DIFI status. An RtI framework is embedded throughout the corrective action requirements. The RtI framework is designed to provide early academic and behavioral supports to struggling students and includes the DPI mandated essential elements of a System of Early Intervening Services (SEIS):

- Scientific, research-based instructional delivery
- Differentiated instruction
- Curricula and instructional materials aligned to state standards
- Scientific, research-based classroom management
- System of behavioral support
- Reliable and valid universal screening of literacy for all students
- Reliable and valid universal screening of numeracy for all students
- Universal screening for all students taking content area courses required for graduation
- Reliable and valid universal screening for behavior
- Effective school leadership that supports instructional decisions based on data
- System of instructional support (professional development)
- System of classroom observations to determine integrity of implementation
- Follow-up procedures for instructional staff who have not met minimal criteria
- Parental/family and community Involvement

To ensure the district meets the 2011-2012 goals, the Corrective Action Requirement goals have been divided into general categories with a timeline of evidence requirements submitted to the DPI quarterly. These quarters are divided into the following time periods:

- Quarter 1: July 1, 2011—September 30, 2011
- Quarter 2: October 1, 2011—December 31, 2011
- Quarter 3: January 1, 2012—March 31, 2012

- Quarter 4: April 1, 2012—June 15, 2012.

Implementation of the District Improvement Plan (DIP) is supported and monitored by the Regional System of Support leadership teams. The Regional leadership teams consist of the Regional Executive Specialist, who provides an accountability check for principals; the Regional Director of School Support who supports, supervises and provides feedback to principals/school leaders on all phases of the school's operations; the Regional Coordinator of Curriculum and Instruction, who supports, monitors and provides feedback to principals/school leaders on all phases of teaching and learning in the school; the Regional Coordinator of Specialized Services, who provides an accountability checks for special education; and the DIFI/SIFI School Achievement Supervisor, who provides an accountability checks for corrective action.

Section I – Data and Analysis

MPS Compared to the State in Reading: **WKCE (Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examination)**

Students at all grades in the Milwaukee Public Schools performed below the state’s annual measurable objective of 80% proficient/advanced in reading for 2010-11. District proficiency in reading on the WKCE-WAA across all grades assessed was about two full percentage points higher in 2010-11 than it was the year before, the largest annual increase in five years. Individual grades varied from this overall trend. In reading, five of the seven grades assessed (3, 4, 5, 6, 7) showed an increase in proficiency from the year before, while grade 8 proficiency was unchanged and grade 10 declined slightly. Of the 171 MPS schools with WKCE-WAA assessment results the last two years, nearly two-thirds recorded proficiency gains.

The table below details the percentage of students enrolled who scored at/above the proficient level in reading across each grade assessed, for each sub-group, in 2010-11.

Milwaukee Public Schools **2010-11 WKCE-CRT** **Reading** **Percent of Students Enrolled - Scoring At/Above Proficient** **By Student Sub-Group**

Student Group	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 10	All Grades
African-Am	53.8%	54.3%	55.3%	58.6%	58.5%	56.4%	32.6%	52.5%
Asian	70.7%	67.7%	72.6%	65.9%	75.3%	72.8%	43.7%	66.2%
Hispanic/Latino	59.4%	63.6%	65.5%	65.9%	71.1%	69.7%	40.0%	62.3%
Native-Am	65.2%	81.0%	71.1%	75.0%	76.6%	76.3%	43.6%	
White	80.0%	77.2%	79.7%	80.3%	80.2%	79.9%	66.7%	78.1%
Female	65.4%	66.0%	66.9%	67.5%	69.1%	68.5%	42.2%	63.5%
Male	55.1%	56.5%	58.8%	60.6%	62.2%	58.7%	35.0%	55.3%
SpEd	28.8%	25.1%	28.8%	28.5%	29.2%	26.9%	13.1%	25.9%
Non-SpEd	67.8%	70.4%	72.6%	73.9%	75.7%	73.5%	45.1%	68.2%
ELL	50.3%	52.8%	51.4%	45.3%	55.7%	52.9%	15.3%	47.1%
Non-ELL	61.7%	62.3%	64.1%	66.1%	66.7%	64.7%	41.1%	60.8%
FRL	56.0%	56.8%	59.0%	59.9%	61.7%	60.1%	35.1%	55.7%
Non-FRL	80.9%	83.1%	80.9%	83.9%	82.0%	77.0%	49.9%	75.4%
Total	60.2%	61.0%	62.7%	63.8%	65.5%	63.4%	38.6%	59.3%

Students at all grades in the Milwaukee Public Schools perform below the state’s annual measurable objective of 68% proficient/advanced in mathematics for 2010-11. District proficiency in math rose significantly the previous two years – 2008-09 and 2009-10 -- in most grades. From 2007-08 to 2009-10, years district math proficiency rose an average of nearly 6 percentage points across grades assessed. In 2010-11, however, the overall district proficiency in math declined by a full percentage point (48.8% to 47.8%). Individual grades varied from these overall trends. Four of the seven grades assessed (3, 4, 7, 8) showed a slight decrease in proficiency in 2010-11 from the year before, while grade 5 was unchanged and grades 6 and 10 increased slightly. Of the 171 schools with assessment results the last two years, about 40% registered proficiency increases; the others declined slightly.

The table below details the percentage of students enrolled that scored at/above the proficient level in math across each grade assessed, for each sub-group, in 2010-11.

**Milwaukee Public Schools
2010-11 WKCE-CRT
Mathematics
Percent of Students Enrolled - Scoring At/Above Proficient
By Student Sub-Group**

Student Group	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 10	All Grades
African-Am	38.5%	44.6%	44.7%	43.7%	38.3%	34.9%	21.9%	37.9%
Asian	62.5%	64.6%	71.6%	72.3%	69.0%	63.5%	42.2%	63.1%
Hispanic/Latino	51.1%	62.4%	57.3%	58.7%	56.0%	54.5%	34.6%	53.9%
Native-Am	52.2%	69.0%	62.2%	62.5%	59.6%	52.6%	36.4%	
White	72.7%	72.8%	75.5%	74.0%	71.4%	66.3%	56.8%	70.6%
Female	49.0%	53.6%	54.1%	54.3%	48.0%	43.4%	27.7%	47.1%
Male	47.6%	55.6%	54.3%	52.0%	49.6%	46.5%	31.7%	48.4%
SpEd	30.2%	31.7%	30.5%	25.6%	21.5%	21.4%	10.6%	24.7%
Non-SpEd	52.6%	60.6%	61.1%	60.9%	56.5%	51.5%	34.5%	53.9%
ELL	49.7%	54.4%	48.0%	47.9%	42.9%	39.8%	17.7%	44.1%
Non-ELL	48.1%	54.7%	55.0%	53.7%	49.6%	45.7%	31.0%	48.2%
FRL	43.6%	50.8%	50.1%	49.0%	44.5%	41.0%	27.1%	44.0%
Non-FRL	71.3%	75.1%	74.6%	74.1%	68.0%	61.5%	38.2%	64.5%
Total	48.3%	54.7%	54.2%	53.1%	48.8%	45.0%	29.7%	47.8%

For more MPS data analysis, please go to <http://www2.milwaukee.k12.wi.us/acctrep/mpsrc.html>

Section II – Corrective Action Requirements

MPS is committed to the goals of the **Corrective Action Requirements (CAR)** for Milwaukee Public Schools. (See Table 1 for a summary of the following: the Corrective Action Actions Requirement Multiyear Goal and School Year Goals)

- Ensuring highly qualified teachers and leaders in every school
- Improving Student performance
- Ensuring accountability at the district, school and student levels

Summary of the 2011-2012 Corrective Action Requirements

Table 1: *Summary of the 2011 - 2012 Corrective Action Requirements*

Section	Multiyear Goal	School Year Goal(s)
<p>Section 1: Ensuring Highly Qualified Teachers and Leaders are in every classroom.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure 100 percent of MPS teachers have teaching assignments that match their license(s). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure highly qualified teachers and leaders are in every classroom and in every school.
<p>Section 2: Improving Student Performance: Implementing a Successful Response to Intervention System (System of Early Intervening Services).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase student achievement in literacy and numeracy demonstrated by using multiple measures that indicate positive student growth for each subgroup of students. • Implement a successful Rtl system. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement the Comprehensive Literacy Plan (CLP), providing instruction in reading for all students, maximizing instructional time. 2. Implement the Comprehensive Math Plan (CMP), providing instruction in mathematics for all students, maximizing instructional time. 3. Collect data to document fidelity of implementation of CLP and CMP using tools approved by DPI. 4. Use universal screening data of at least 95 percent of K-12 students on reading and mathematics conducted at least three times during the 2011-12 school year to determine levels of need and progress in performance in core instruction of reading and mathematics. 5. Provide DPI approved Tier 2 interventions in reading and mathematics to K-8 students identified as being in need based on analysis of universal screening data. 6. Conduct approved progress monitoring on each student receiving Tier 2 interventions in reading and mathematics for grades K-8. 7. Implement the district-wide plan for parent/family/community involvement in Response to Intervention (Rtl) at each school.

<p>Section 3: Improving Student Performance: Implementing a Successful Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports System</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully implement PBIS Tiers 1-3 in 100 percent of PK-12 schools by 2013-2014. • Decrease suspensions and office referrals to state averages. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conduct DPI approved universal screening for behavior in all schools throughout the school year. 2. Develop and implement Rapid Compliance Plans for schools that do not show evidence for readiness to move to subsequent tiers of implementation. 3. Tier I implementers (2011-2012) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Implement Tier 1 throughout the 2011-2012 school year with fidelity to the national PBIS model with all schools meeting national guidelines for preparedness. b. Complete all training for Tier 2 per the national PBIS model with all schools meeting national guidelines for preparedness. 4. Tier 2 implemented (2011-2012): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Implement Tiers 1 and 2 throughout the 2011-2012 school year with fidelity to the national model.
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Tier 3 implemented (2011 -2012): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Implement Tiers 1, 2, and 3 throughout the 2011-2012 school year with fidelity to the national PBIS model.
<p>Section 4: Ensuring Accountability at the District, School, and Student Levels</p>	<p>Ensure a consistent, transparent, and high quality system of accountability in MPS for school improvement and teacher quality.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use the district's accountability structure to ensure that the Corrective Action Requirements are implemented in all MPS schools. 2. Maximize resources to improve student outcomes.

The District Improvement Plan summarizes the Corrective Action Requirements and indicates key personnel responsible for each section. Please refer to the complete 2011-2012 Corrective Action Plan on the DPI website for detailed information.

http://dpi.wi.gov/esea/pdf/2011-12_Corrective_Action_MPS.pdf

Ensuring High Quality Teachers and Leaders in Every School

School Year Goal(s)

1. Ensure highly qualified teachers and leaders are in every classroom and in every school.

Indicator Due Date	Person(s) Responsible
Quarter 1: July 1, 2011 – September 30, 2011	
1.1: Ensure the district has highly qualified teachers and leaders in every school.	K. Jackson; Executive Director of Human Resources
Quarter 2: October 1, 2011 – December 31, 2011	
1.2: Ensure the district has highly qualified teachers and leaders in every school.	K. Jackson; Executive Director of Human Resources
Quarter 3: January 1, 2012 – March 31, 2012	
1.3: Ensure the district has highly qualified teachers and leaders in every school.	K. Jackson; Executive Director of Human Resources
Quarter 4: April 1, 2012 – June 30, 2012	
1.4: Ensure the district has highly qualified teachers and leaders in every school.	K. Jackson; Executive Director of Human Resources

Implementing a Successful Response to Intervention System

School Year Goal(s)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement the Comprehensive Literacy Plan (CLP), providing instruction in reading for all students, maximizing instructional time. 2. Implement the Comprehensive Math Plan (CMP), providing instruction in mathematics for all students, maximizing instructional time. 2. Collect data to document fidelity of implementation of CLP and CMP using tools approved by DPI. 3. Prepare to report in 2012-2013 on students identified in need of Tier 3 interventions in reading and mathematics by school, grade, teacher, individual student, the intervention(s), and DPI approved progress monitoring tools to be used in grades K-8. 4. Prepare to report in 2012-2013 on students identified in need of Tier 2 interventions in reading and mathematics by school, grade, teacher, individual student, the intervention(s), and DPI approved progress monitoring tools to be used in grades 9-12. 5. Use universal screening data of at least 95 percent of K-12 students on reading and mathematics conducted at least three times during the 2011-12 school year to determine levels of need and progress in performance in core instruction of reading and mathematics. 6. Provide DPI approved Tier 2 interventions in reading and mathematics to K-8 students identified as being in need based on analysis of universal screening data. 7. Conduct approved progress monitoring on each student receiving Tier 2 interventions in reading and mathematics for grades K-8. 8. Implement the district-wide plan for parent/family/community involvement in Response to Intervention (RtI) at each school in making decisions about how the school will implement response to intervention services and provide training in all schools to parents on RtI including how to understand universal screening data.

Indicator Due Date	Person(s) Responsible
Quarter 1: July 1, 2011 – September 30, 2011	
2.1: Ensure the district has implemented the MPS Comprehensive Literacy Plan and Comprehensive Mathematics Plan.	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.2: Ensure the district has implemented the district's Response to Intervention System (System of Early Intervening Services)	Marcia Staum; Director, District and School Improvement
2.3 Use universal screening data with district designated decision rules as part of the district's ClasStat process to inform teachers of students' needs in reading and mathematics at the beginning of the year	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.4: Report on 2011 summer school programs that have mathematics or reading focus.	Anita Pietrykowski; Director, Office of School Administration

2.5: Report on Tier 2 interventions in Reading (K-8).	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.6: Involve parents and the community in RtI implementation at each school.	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services
Quarter 2: September 1, 2011 – December 31, 2011	
2.7: Update the Comprehensive Literacy Plan	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.8: Update the Comprehensive Mathematics Plan	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.9: Implement the district-wide Comprehensive Literacy Plan and Comprehensive Mathematics plan curricula	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.10: Ensure that RtI is integrated into school improvement plans	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.11: Report on Tier 2 interventions in mathematics	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.12: Use DPI approved Tier 2 interventions in reading and mathematics to respond to the needs of groups of K-8 students	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.13: Use DPI approved progress monitoring tools to measure Tier 2 interventions in K-8 reading and mathematics	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.14: Use implementation integrity tools for core instruction in mathematics, reading, and DPI approved universal screening	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.15: Provide professional development to teachers focused on the Comprehensive Mathematics Plan	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.16: Provide instruction in reading for all students maximizing instructional time, as defined by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Implementing 90 minutes of reading instruction daily for grades K-3 in all schools b) Implementing 60 minutes of reading instruction daily in grades 4-8 in all schools. c) Implementing reading intervention courses for grades 9-12 and other grades as identified. 	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.17: Report K-12 universal screening data in reading and mathematics.	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.18: Provide updates on the 9-12 universal screening system (SAIL).	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.19: Prepare to report on students identified in need of Tier 3 interventions in reading and/or mathematics by school, by grade, by teacher, by student, and the interventions.	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.20: Collect data on fidelity of implementation of DPI approved universal screening, Tiers 1 and 2 in reading and mathematics instruction/interventions and progress monitoring.	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.21: Provide updates to the fidelity of implementation (FOI) tools.	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer

2.22: Provide training at schools (that includes parents as presenters) and resources to parents at schools that will help them understand what Rtl is and how they can understand their child's universal screening data and benchmark results.	Patricia Gill; Director of Student and Family Services
2.23: Involve parents and the community in decision making about Rtl implementation.	Patricia Gill; Director of Student and Family Services
Quarter 3: January 1, 2012 – March 31, 2012	
2.25: Report on the district's ClasStat process to inform teachers of students' needs in reading and mathematics.	Chief Academic Officer Chief Academic Officer
2.26: Use universal screening data with district designated decision rules as part of the district's ClasStat process to inform teachers of students' needs in reading and mathematics.	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.27: Collect data on fidelity of implementation of DPI approved universal screening, Tiers 1 and 2 in reading and mathematics instruction/interventions and progress monitoring.	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.28: Revise the process of selecting Tier 3 interventions and DPI approved progress monitoring	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.29: Report on Tier 2 interventions in mathematics K-8.	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.30: Use DPI approved progress monitoring tools to measure response to Tier 2 interventions in K-8 reading and	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
Quarter 4: April 1, 2012 – June 30, 2012	
2.31: Provide professional development to teachers focused on the Comprehensive Mathematics Plan.	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.32: Update Comprehensive Literacy Plan	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.33: Update Comprehensive Mathematics Plan	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.34: Provide updates to the fidelity of implementation (FOI) tools and submit for approval by DPI.	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.35: Finalize selections of DPI approved Tier 3 interventions and progress monitoring tools.	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.36: Report on K-12 universal screening data in reading and mathematics.	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.37: Use universal screening data with district designated decision rules as part of the district's ClasStat process to inform teachers of students' needs in reading and mathematics.	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.38: Use DPI approved progress monitoring tools to measure response to Tier 2 Interventions in K-8 reading and mathematics.	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.39: Provide training at schools (that includes parents as presenters) and resources to parents at schools that will help them understand what Rtl is and how they can understand their child's universal screening data and benchmark results.	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services
2.40: Involve parents and the community in decision making about Rtl implementation.	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services

2.41: Prepare to implement Tier 3 for kindergarten through 8 th grade in reading and mathematics including interventions and K-8 DPI approved progress monitoring tools in 2012-2013.	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.42: Prepare to implement Tier 2 for 9 th through 12 th grade in reading and mathematics including DPI approved interventions and progress monitoring tools in 2012-2013.	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.43: Use DPI approved Tier 2 interventions in reading and mathematics to respond to the needs of groups of K-8 students	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.44: Provide professional development in all MPS schools to collect, analyze, and use universal screening data.	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer
2.45: Identify the training and implementation timeline of Rtl in all schools for the 2012-2013 school year.	Heidi Ramirez; Chief Academic Officer

Implementing a Successful Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports System

School Year Goal(s)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conduct DPI approved universal screening for behavior in all schools throughout the school year. 2. Develop and implement Rapid Compliance Plans for schools that do not show evidence for readiness to move to subsequent tiers of implementation. 3. Tier 1 Implementers(2011-2012): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Implement Tier 1 throughout the 2011-2012 school year with fidelity to the national model (pbis.org) for all schools meeting national guidelines for preparedness. b. Complete all training for Tier 2 per the national model for all schools meeting national guidelines for preparedness. 4. Tier 2 implementers (2011-2012): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Implement Tiers 1 and 2 throughout the 2011-2012 school year with fidelity to the national model. b. Complete all training for Tier 3 per the national model for all schools meeting national guidelines for preparedness. 5. Tier 3 implementers (2011-2012): 6. Implement Tiers 1, 2, and 3 throughout the 2011-2012 school year with fidelity to the national model.

Indicator	Due Date	Person(s) Responsible	Results
Quarter 1: July 1, 2011 – September 30, 2012			
3.1: Ensure the district has implemented the district's plan for PBIS (System of Early Intervening Services).		Patricia Gill; Director of Student and Family Services	
3.2: Use universal screening data with district designated decision rules as part of the district's PBIS Universal Team process to inform teachers of students' needs in behavior at the beginning of the year.		Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services	
3.3: Use DPI approved progress monitoring tools to measure response to Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions.		Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services	
3.4: Conduct DPI approved universal screening for behavior.		Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services	
Quarter 2: October 1, 2011 – December 31, 2011			
3.5: Ensure that PBIS is integrated into school improvement		Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services	

3.6: Collect data on fidelity of implementation of universal screening, Tiers 1 and 2 for PBIS	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services
3.7: Provide instruction in positive behaviors for all students.	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services
3.8: Use universal screening data with district designated decision rules as part of the district's PBIS Universal Team process to inform teachers of students' needs in behavior at the beginning of the year.	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services
3.9: Use DPI approved Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions to respond to the needs of groups of students.	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services
3.10: Use DPI approved progress monitoring tools to measure response to Tier 2 and/ or Tier 3 interventions.	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services
3.11: Prepare for implementation of Tier 3.	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services
3.12: Report on Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 data.	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services
3.13: Ensure that all schools consistently collect and report attendance and office referral data using a standard district definition. of students receiving interventions by school, by grade, by tier of intervention, and by teacher.	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services
3.14: Ensure that all teachers have received appropriate level of PBIS tier training.	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services
Quarter 3: January 1, 2012 – March 31, 2012	
3.15: Provide training for next tiers for all eligible schools.	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services
3.16: Ensure that all schools have the appropriate level of readiness to move to the next stage of implementation.	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services
3.17: Use DPI approved progress monitoring tools to measure response to Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions.	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services
3.18: Provide instruction in positive behaviors for all students.	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services
3.19: Make revisions to the process of selecting Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions and progress monitoring tool and submit to DPI	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services
Quarter 4: April 1, 2012 June 30, 2012	
3.20: Ensure that all schools have the appropriate level of readiness to move to the next stage of implementation.	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services
3.21: Ensure that all teachers have received appropriate level of PBIS tier training.	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services
3.22: Collect data on fidelity of implementation of universal screening, Tiers 1 and 2 for PBIS.	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services
3.23: Prepare to use 2011-2012 PBIS fidelity data to modify school practices for 2012- 2013 in all	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services
3.24: Finalize selections of DPI approved Tier 3 interventions and progress monitoring tools.	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services
3.25: Report on Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 data.	Patricia Gill; Director of Student and Family Services
3.26: Use universal screening data with district designated decision rules as part of the district's PBIS Universal Team process to inform teachers of students' needs in behavior at the beginning of	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services

the year.	
3.27: Ensure that all schools consistently collect and report attendance and office referral data using a standard district definition.	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services
3.28: Use DPI approved progress monitoring tools to measure response to Tier 2 and Tier3 Interventions.	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services
3.29: Use DPI approved Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions to respond to the needs of groups of students.	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services
3.30: Identify the training and implementation timeline of PBIS in all schools for the 2012-13 school year (consistent with Table 1).	Patricia Gill; Director, Student and Family Services

Ensuring Accountability at the District, School, and Student Levels

School Year Goal(s)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use the district’s structure to ensure that the Corrective Action Requirements are implemented in all MPS schools. 2. Maximize resources to improve student outcomes.

Indicator	Due Date	Person(s) Responsible	Results
Quarter 1: July 1, 2011 – September 30, 2012			
4.1: Ensure the district’s system of support is fully-staffed throughout the 2011-2012.		Marcia Staum; Director, District and School Improvement	
4.2: Ensure the district has implemented the district’s system of accountability at the district, school, and student levels.		Anita Pietrykowski; Director, Office of School Administration.]	
4.3: Articulate the MPS RtI initiative including academics and behavior through a well-designed plan.		Marcia Staum; Director, District and School Improvement	
4.4: Maintain regular and ongoing communication with the DPI.		Marcia Staum; Director, District and School Improvement	
4.5: The MPS Director of District and School Improvement, key administrators, and the Board President or designee will meet monthly with the DPI Director of District and School Improvement and key DPI administrators to monitor implementation of the Corrective Action Requirements.		Gerald Pace; Chief Financial Officer	
Quarter 2: October 1, 2011 – December 31, 2011			
4.6: Implement the district’s procedures for rapid compliance with the corrective action requirements		Marcia Staum; Director, District and School Improvement	
4.7: Ensure that the district maximizes resources to improve student outcomes.		Gerald Pace; Chief Financial Officer	

4.8: Articulate the MPS RtI initiative including academics and behavior through a well-designed plan.	Marcia Staum; Director, District and School Improvement
Quarter 3: January 1, 2012 – March 31, 2012	
4.9: Implement the district's procedures for rapid compliance with the corrective action requirements	Marcia Staum; Director, District and School Improvement
4.10: Ensure that the district maximizes resources to improve student outcomes.	Gerald Pace; Chief Financial Officer
Quarter 4: April 1, 2011 – June 30, 2011	
4.11: Implement the district's procedures for rapid compliance with the corrective action requirements.	Marcia Staum; Director, District and School Improvement
4.12: Ensure the district has implemented the district's system of accountability at the district, school, and student levels.	Anita Pietrykowski; Director, Office of School Administration
4.13: Ensure that the district maximizes resources to improve student outcomes.	Gerald Pace; Chief Financial Officer
4.14: Articulate the MPS RtI initiative including academics and behavior through a well-designed plan.	Marcia Staum; Director, District and School Improvement

Section III: School Improvement Plan

In addition to the Corrective Action Requirement (CAR), the District Improvement Plan further aligns two other key areas:

- The School Improvement Plan (SIP)
- The School Improvement Grant (SIG)

School Improvement Plan

The School Improvement Plan is a required document and planning process for all MPS schools. The purpose of the school improvement planning process is:

- To develop a process to help drive meaningful school improvement work in schools
- To make it easier for school staff and Central Services to support schools
- To align efforts with the "Working Together, Achieving More" strategic plan, District Identified for Improvement (DIFI) Plan, Instructional Improvement and Professional Development Functional Plans
- To improve data collection and quality, for more robust data analysis

As a part of the school improvement planning process, school learning teams:

- Work under universal district goals and yearly targets derived from the Strategic Plan
- Provide support strategies for teaching staff
- Delineate goals and strategies for parent participation
- Assign appropriately licensed teachers to classes and submit this data to HR (school leaders)

- Conduct universal screening assessments for all students in grades K through 12
- Participate in mini-data retreats using the ClasStat process at least three times each year
- Choose tier 1, 2 and 3 instructional strategies
- Choose tier 1 strategies for parents
- Choose professional development to support all strategies
- Monitor strategies monthly
- Review School Improvement Plans (SIP) within 90 days of submission by the Regional Core Team
- Conduct a needs assessment at end of school year

Section IV: School Improvement Grant Activities

School Improvement Grant Requirements for selected Schools Identified for Improvement (SIFI) receiving grant funds:

The Obama Administration, under the leadership of Secretary Arne Duncan, has set aside funds to support school districts in turning around schools that have been identified as underperforming for the past three years. A federal formula based on three years of WKCE data is used by the DPI to identify Wisconsin schools as Persistently Low Performing. Seventeen current MPS schools are identified as Persistently Low Performing (refer to chart below). The district applied for SIG funds to support twelve of the schools. All twelve schools are within the Metro Region.

COHORT I Schools 2010/11 through 2012/13				COHORT II Schools 2011/2012 through 2013/2014			
Tier I		Tier II		Tier I		Tier II	
School	Model	School	Model	School	Model	School	Model
School of Career & Technical Education (formerly Custer)	Restart	Bay View High School	Transformation	Washington High School	Closure	Community High School	No Service
Milwaukee African American Immersion	Restart	Downtown Institute of Arts and Letters (DIAL)	Closure	Washington High School Information Technology	Transformation	Northwest Secondary	Turnaround
Vincent High School	Transformation	Foster and Williams School of the Visual Arts and Communications	Closure	Wings Academy	No Service	Alliance High School	No Service
W.E.B. Du Bois High School	Closure	James Madison Academic Campus	Transformation	Advanced Language and Academic Studies (ALAS)	Turnaround	Montessori IB High School	No Service
Washington High School of Law, Education and Public Service	Merger (Closure Model)	Lynde & Harry Bradley Technology and Trade High School	Transformation	Pulaski High School	Transformation	Wisconsin Career Academy	No Service
		Montessori IB High School	No Service			Hamilton High School	Transformation
		South Division High School	Transformation				

Identified by the Department of Public Instruction as a part of the Federal School Improvement Grant

8/16/2011

Persistently Low Performing Schools are eligible for School Improvement Grant (SIG) funding if a district determines to serve the schools with one of four federally prescribed reform models. The four intervention models are as follows:

1. Turnaround

- Replace the principal
- Provide the principal sufficient operational flexibility including staffing calendars/time and budgeting
- Replace at least 50 percent of the staff
- Implement new methods to recruit, place and retain staff
- Provide staff ongoing, high quality, job embedded professional development
- Adopt a new governance structure
- Implement an instructional program that is research-based, vertically aligned from one grade to the next, and aligned with state academic standards
- Use student data (formative, interim and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction
- Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time
- Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students

2. Transformation

- Replace the principal
- Provide the new principal sufficient operational flexibility including staffing, calendars/time and budgeting
- Use rigorous, transparent and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals
- Identify and reward effective staff, and remove ineffective personnel who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so
- Implement new methods to recruit, place and retain staff
- Provide staff ongoing, high quality, job embedded professional development
- Implement an instructional program that is research-based, vertically aligned from one grade to the next, and aligned with state academic standards
- Use student data (formative, interim and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction
- Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time
- Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement
- Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the Local Educational Agency (Milwaukee Public Schools serves as the Local Educational Agency or LEA), State Educational Agency (Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction serves as the State Educational Agency or SEA), or a designated external lead partner organization (Lead Partner Organizations maybe defined as a Charter Management Organization or some other charter entity charged with the day-to-day operation of a school).

3. Restart

- An LEA converts a school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO).
- A rigorous review process is completed.
- A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.

4. Closure

- An LEA closes a school;
- Students who attended that school are given the opportunity to enroll in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving.

- The other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.

Milwaukee Public Schools has elected to implement the four intervention models. Two schools are implementing the *Restart Model*, four identified schools have *Closed*, eight schools are implementing the *Transformation Model* and two schools have implemented the *Turnaround Model*. There are two cohorts of Persistently Low Performing schools. (attachment). Cohort I schools began receiving support from the SIG in 2010-11, Cohort II schools began receiving SIG support during the current school year. All eight schools are placed in the Metro Region

Metro Region Supports

A comprehensive regional team including district staff and external providers provide technical support, monitoring and professional development to schools. Substantial professional development opportunities are provided to each of the schools in the Metro region. Professional development for staff and leadership includes workshops, after school in-service opportunities and a full range of the coaching continuum. The professional development and coaching is matched to school needs and aligned with district initiatives.

SIG funds support external providers, intervention staff, and teacher pay for after hours training. SIG funds also support the work of the Regional Team. The Regional Team is enhanced by additional coaches and staff for monitoring. The additional regional staff serves two purposes, 1) to provide direct support to school staff and 2) to develop capacity to support sustainability of SIG implementation after external vendors leave the school. The Regional Support Team participates in a monthly strategy meeting with individual principals and their supporting school staff in order to discuss current school data and provide necessary supports and guidance in moving forward the work in each school. School based resource alignment is ongoing within the Metro schools as a means of building principal and staff capacity. Ultimately the Regional Leadership team assumes responsibility for the success or failure of the reform efforts.

The Superintendent convenes a weekly solution-focused meeting with representatives from the Metro regional team, the MTEA, and central office leads. Additionally, the Metro region team meets at least weekly to review progress at the schools. The DPI conducts quarterly reviews of each school in the Metro region. The data from the above meetings, as well as, data capturing student achievement, discipline and staff professional development is reviewed by the Regional team. Any changes that are needed in staffing, provider services and district support are made on an ongoing basis.

The Department of Public Instruction (DPI) monitors the implementation of the SIG activities at each school. Metro schools use an online monitoring tool to measure the progress schools are making on each SIG activity. This process replaces the School Improvement Plan in Metro schools. DPI teams conduct quarterly monitoring visits at each of the Metro schools. The monitoring visits are focused on specific SIG activities and are followed up with feedback for the schools.

The tables below delineate key activities in each of the Metro schools supported by the SIG:

Bay View Cohort I	Bradley Tech Cohort I	Madison Academic Campus Cohort I
Vendor: Cambium NAEP	Vendor: Cambium NAEP	Vendor: Project GRAD
Reading intervention: 154 students Math intervention: 150 students	Reading intervention: 84 students Math intervention: 175 students	Reading intervention: 118 students Math intervention: 45 students
Professional development and staff coaching in the Comprehensive Math and Science Plan, standards-based instruction and assessment literacy	Professional development and staff coaching in the Comprehensive Math and Science Plan standards-based instruction, and assessment literacy	Professional development and coaching for intervention teachers. Staff support in areas of the Comprehensive Literacy Plan and data based decision making
Completed a professional development needs assessment	Completed a professional development needs assessment	College Access Coordinators met with all 9 th graders to develop a five year plan.
Preparation WKCE “bootcamp” for 10 th graders	Preparation WKCE “bootcamp” 10 th graders	After school and during school tutoring for struggling students
Leadership training and development	Summer recovery and transition programs	Individual student MAP data chats
Student feedback and action planning regarding MAP results	Leadership Training and Development	Success Academy evening program for struggling learners.
Participating in pilot teacher evaluation project based on Danielson model	Participating in pilot teacher evaluation project based on Danielson model	Participating in pilot teacher evaluation project based on Danielson model
E2020 Credit Recovery	E2020 Credit Recovery	E2020 Credit Recovery

North Division Cohort I	School of Career and Technical Education Cohort I	South Division Cohort I
Vendor: Mosaica	Vendor: Cambium NAEP	Vendor: Talent Development
Reading intervention: 116 students	Reading intervention: 120 students Math intervention: 150 students	Reading intervention: 70 students Math intervention: 75 students
Professional development and coaching for staff around the Danielson Model, training for implementation of project based learning	Professional development and staff coaching in the Comprehensive Math and Science Plan, standards-based instruction and assessment literacy	Professional development and coaching for staff in the Talent Development Model and curriculum, grading, data driven decision making and teacher teaming
Personalized Student Achievement Plans	Completed a professional development needs assessment	Summer recovery and transition programs
Collaboration with MATC for students to earn dual credits (high school and college)	Preparation WKCE “bootcamp” for 10 th graders	Ninth and Tenth Grade Academy Participating in pilot teacher evaluation project based on Danielson model
Leadership training and development	Leadership training and development	Nine City Year Corps Members support ninth and tenth graders
Support for leadership in the area of operations.	Partnership with Johnson Controls. Career and technical focus	Individual student data chats. Ongoing data analysis for struggling students
E2020 Credit Recovery	E2020 Credit Recovery	E2020 Credit Recovery

Vincent Cohort I	ALAS Cohort II	Hamilton Cohort II
Vendor: Project Grad	Vendor: Cambium NAEP	Vendor: Cambium NAEP
Reading intervention: 125 students Math intervention: 154 students	Reading intervention: 118 students	Reading intervention: 120 students Math intervention: 130 students
Professional development and coaching for intervention teachers. Staff support in areas of the Comprehensive Literacy Plan and data based decision making	Professional development and staff coaching in the Comprehensive Math and Science Plan, standards-based instruction and assessment literacy	Professional development and staff coaching in the Comprehensive Math and Science Plan, standards-based instruction and assessment literacy
College Access Coordinators meet with all 9 th graders to develop five year plans.	Completed a professional development needs assessment	Intensified Algebra offered to 9 th graders
After school and during school tutoring, E2020 Credit Recovery	Preparation WKCE “bootcamp” for 10 th graders	Completed a professional development needs assessment
Viking Academic evening program for struggling learners	Leadership training and development	Preparation WKCE “bootcamp” for 10 th graders
Leadership training and development	E2020 Credit Recovery	Leadership training and development
Summer recovery and transition programs hosted at Vincent	Used intercession to provide tutoring	E2020 Credit Recovery
Participating in pilot teacher evaluation project based on Danielson model		

Pulaski Cohort II	Northwest Secondary Cohort II	Washington IT Cohort II
Vendor: Cambium NAEP	Vendor: Pearson	Vendor: Cambium NAEP
Reading intervention: 97 students Math intervention: 125 students	Planning for second semester launch of intervention	Reading intervention: 135 students Math intervention: 140 students
Professional development and staff coaching in the Comprehensive Math and Science Plan, standards-based instruction and assessment literacy	Professional development sessions focus on Comprehensive Literacy Plan and Comprehensive Mathematics and Science Plan	Professional development and staff coaching in the Comprehensive Math and Science Plan, standards-based instruction and assessment literacy
Completed a professional development needs assessment	Middle school plan for 90 minutes Ramp Up core and intervention for all students below expectations	Completed a professional development needs assessment
Preparation WKCE “bootcamp” for 10 th graders	Average class sizes went from 41.2 in 2010-11 to 28.7 in 2011-12	Preparation WKCE “bootcamp” for 10 th graders
Leadership training and development	Ten City Year Corps Members support 6 th , 7 th and 8 th graders.	Leadership training and development
E2020 Credit Recovery	E2020 Credit Recovery	E2020 Credit Recovery

Milwaukee Public Schools and the Department of Public Instruction are working together throughout the 2011-2012 school year to successfully achieve the School Year goals of the Corrective Action Requirements.

Questions and comments can be addressed to Marcia Staum, Director of District and School Improvement at staumml@milwaukee.k12.wi.us or 414-777-7810.

Section V: Appendix - Results

Appendix A: Quarter 1 Results

Appendix B: Quarter 2 Results

Appendix C: Quarter 3 Results

Appendix D: Quarter 4 Results