

# School Improvement Plan - 2010-2011

Generated on June 21, 2010 at 8:27 AM

## Hauser Jr-Sr High School (0410)

Flat Rock-Hawcreek School Corp

Hope, IN

This plan will be revised annually. Updates may be found each June at <http://www.asainstitute.org/publicsip>. The plan was developed with assistance from the:



*Indiana Student Achievement Institute*  
931 25th Street  
Columbus, IN 47201  
Phone: 812-669-0009  
Email: [asai@asainstitute.org](mailto:asai@asainstitute.org)  
Website: <http://www.asainstitute.org>

# Table of Contents

- School Improvement Plan Introduction . . . . . 3
- Who Wrote this School Improvement Plan? . . . . . 4
- Vision Statement . . . . . 6
- Academic Goals . . . . . 7
- Needs Assessment / Areas of Concern . . . . . 11
- Strategies . . . . . 13
- Strategy Data . . . . . 15
- To-Do List . . . . . 18
- Professional Development Summary . . . . . 21
- Relationship Report: Areas of Concern / Strategies / Achievement Goals . . . . . 24
- Force Field Excerpt . . . . . 28
- Continuous Improvement Timeline . . . . . 29

# School Improvement Plan Introduction

Hauser Jr-Sr High School

This school improvement plan was developed using a vision-based and data-driven process called *Vision-to-Action* that was developed by the Indiana Student Achievement Institute. In addition to containing the strategies our school and community identified as key to raising student achievement and closing achievement gaps in our school, this plan contains strategies that meet the expectations of:

- Indiana Student Achievement Institute
- PL221

## **Participation**

The following people were involved in developing this School Improvement Plan

- Teachers
- Students
- Parent representatives
- Community representatives

## **Process**

Those involved in developing this School Improvement Plan participated in a series of discussions related to the *Vision-to-Action* steps:

1. Establish a local culture of high expectations
2. Create a common vision for student success
3. Analyze achievement data and set realistic data targets for each of the next three years
4. Analyze force field data and identify concerns within the following areas.
  - Academic expectations
  - Curriculum content
  - Instructional practices
  - Classroom assessment
  - Extra help
  - Student guidance
  - Learning environment
5. Research strategies to address our concerns and select high-leverage strategies to implement
6. Develop a to-do list for each strategy

## **Using Data for Decision-Making**

The Vision-to-Action process relies heavily on data as a foundation for decision-making.

1. Achievement Data – To what degree are students prepared for success at the next educational level, and ultimately for success in postsecondary education and a global economy?
2. Force Field Data – What conditions in the school and community interfere with high student achievement?
3. Strategy Data – Is the strategy having the desired impact on adults and students?

## **Implementation Next Year**

Our work next year will be guided by the to-do list that we have developed for each strategy.

Questions about the School Improvement Plan should be directed to the building principal.

# Who Wrote this School Improvement Plan?

Many individuals were involved in the creation of this school improvement plan.

## Groups and Roles

The **Steering Team** is comprised of educators, a parent, and a business representative. The Steering Team's role is to help the Full Faculty and Community Council 1) analyze data, 2) discuss key questions related to school improvement planning in an open and honest manner, and 3) reach consensus in decisions related to school improvement.

The **Full Faculty** is made up of all educators. The role of the Full Faculty is to 1) analyze data, 2) discuss key questions related to school improvement planning in an open and honest manner, and 3) reach consensus with each other and the Community Council for decisions related to school improvement.

The **Community Council** is comprised of parents and representatives of community stakeholder groups. All parents were invited to be part of the Community Council and any interested parent was welcome to join the Council. The role of the Community Council is to 1) analyze data, 2) discuss key questions related to school improvement planning in an open and honest manner, and 3) reach consensus with each other and the Full Faculty in decisions related to school improvement.

The **Student Body** includes every student enrolled in the school. The role of the Student Body is to 1) review data, 2) discuss key questions related to school improvement planning in an open and honest manner, and 3) provide input for the Full Faculty and Community Council.

## Discussion Topics

The Full Faculty, Community Council and Student Body participated in guided discussions about the following topics. Written summaries of all discussions were developed and are on file at the school.

- Discussion 1: Global Economics
- Discussion 2: Vision for Student Success
- Discussion 3: Achievement Data Analysis and Achievement Goals
- Discussion 4: Force Field Data Analysis (student needs) and Areas of Concern
- Discussion 5: Strategy Selection

## Steering Team

- Cindi Foster - Teacher
- Chuck Goode - Community Representative
- Kim Harsh - Administrator
- Doug Heighway - School Counselor
- Sandra Miller -
- Julie Patterson - Teacher
- Wanda Siebert - Teacher

## Strategy Chairs

- Cindi Foster
- Kim Harsh
- Doug Heighway
- Julie Patterson

## Community Council

- David, Kim Clark - Parents of military bound student
- Susie Glick - Youth Service organization
- Lori Goode - Parent of college bound
- Spencer Gross - Business Member
- Dani, Donald Hewitt - Parents
- Andy and Mindy Hunnicutt - Parents of special needs student
- Glen Keller - Service Club representative and business rep

- Bill, Sherri Lentz - School Board member
- Lisa, John Long - Parents of students in college
- Lorraine, Robert Low - teacher from community college
- Sandy, Tom Miller - business member
- Lori Robertson - Teacher from feeder school
- Jeff, Cindy Shoaf - Parents of students in multiple grades
- Brian and Denise Spalding - Parents of students from parochial feeder school
- Jenny Wallace - Teacher from career center

# Vision Statement

The Vision Statement was developed by all educators, all students, and members of the community and is reviewed and updated annually. The foundation of the statement identifies the core convictions upon which this school improvement plan is built and answers the question, "What do our students deserve in order to be successful learners, responsible citizens, and productive members of a global economy?" The second part of the vision statement describes ideal adults who are striving to provide students with the things they deserve in order to achieve at a rigorous level. The third part of the vision statement describes ideal students in a school and community where adults live by their convictions. The last part of the vision statement includes ideal data that represent the community's dreams. This lofty data serves as the focal point for the remainder of the school improvement plan and requires the school and community to work toward every student succeeding at a high level.

## **We believe all students deserve:**

### HAUSER JR.-SR. HIGH SCHOOL Vision Statement

The staff of Hauser Jr.-Sr. High School shares the following core convictions, all students deserve: 1. To be taught to be good citizens in their local and global communities. 2. To receive quality instruction. 3. To be stretched academically and socially so that they may realize their potential. 4. To be in a physically and emotionally safe environment, one in which they are free from fear, violence, harassment, and/or torment. 5. To be prepared to make the transition into a realistic post-secondary situation. 6. To be encouraged/supported in a variety of pursuits. 7. To have an adult at school and at home to whom they talk regularly about their futures, life choices, and concerns and whom they may emulate. 8. To have self-discipline and well-developed work ethics.

## **All adults in our community are living by these core convictions daily and as a result, show the following attitudes and actions:**

All adults in our community are living by these core convictions daily and as a result, show certain attitudes and actions. All teachers, parents and community members: 1. Model and teach appropriate behaviors and interactions, positive involvement in their communities, good morals and ethics, and tolerance/respect for those with different backgrounds. 2. Recognize students learn differently and intentionally design lessons that implement instructional best practices to teach an articulated curriculum. 3. Are involved in all elements of their students's lives. 4. Provide a safe, appropriate learning environment at home and at school. 5. Hold students to high expectations in all their endeavors.

## **In this environment where all adults are living by their core convictions, all students:**

In this environment where all adults are living by their core convictions, all students : 1. Have high expectations for themselves. 2. Accept guidance in acquiring appropriate social behaviors and are involved in their communities. 3. Are present for and receptive to instructional opportunities. 4. Do their best all the time. 5. Talk to positive adult mentors about questions, concerns, and life choices.

## **As a result of these efforts, our school's student achievement data is as follows:**

- % of students who are Mastering 8th, 9th, 10th Grade ISTEP + Tests 100%: 100%
- % of students who are Passing all classes: 100%
- % of students who are Scoring 1600 on SAT: 100%
- % of students who are Earning a 4.3 GPA on a 4.3 scale: 100%
- % of students who are Passing 1st Year Algebra: 100%
- % of students who are Passing Geometry: 100%
- % of students who are Passing 2nd Year Algebra: 100%
- % of students who are Passing math beyond 2nd Year Algebra: 100%
- % of students who are Passing most rigorous English courses: 100%
- % of students who are Earning postsecondary credit: 100%
- % of students who are Graduating: 100%
- % of students who are passing all End-of-Course Assessments: 100%

# Academic Goals

The academic goals were established after a thorough analysis of multiple achievement data assessments including the state math assessment, state English / language arts assessment, student mastery of each Indiana Academic Standard, and report card grades. A full list of academic assessments is found in the "Force Field Excerpts" section of this plan. Other types of data are discussed in the Needs Assessment section of this plan.

The Full Faculty, Community Council (including parent representatives), and Student Body were involved in the analysis of the achievement data. The following questions were addressed during the data analysis.

- How does this data compare to our vision (ideal) data?
- What specific data fields disturb us?
- What specific data fields please us?
- Where do we observe achievement gaps?

Using a consensus based decision-making model, the Full Faculty and Community Council (including parents) first identified a small number of broad academic areas on which the school and community agreed to focus their energy next year. Then, the teachers and Community Council members "drilled down" the data within those areas and identified specific courses or academic standards that, if improved, would impact the broader academic areas. Both the broad academic areas and the specific academic areas are included as goals below. Data targets that the educators and community members felt most strongly about were then provided to the students for their input. Finally, the educators and community members agreed to numerical goals that the school would strive to reach by the end of next school year. These goals fall between the current student data and the vision (ideal) data.

When reading the data tables below, please note that the title of each table includes:

- The group of students targeted to meet the goal
- The benchmark that those students will reach

The numbers in the tables reflect baseline data for past years and the target data for future years. The vision data represents our ideal data. It is the mission of our school to work toward this ideal.

## 7-8th graders taking the (Spring beginning 2008-09) ISTEP+ - Percentage who pass the Writing Applications portion

2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
70	80	81	75	82		83		84		85		

## 7th Graders - Percentage who pass ISTEP L.A. test (beginning spring, 2009)

2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
		72	70	73		74		75		76		

## 7th graders - Percentage who pass ISTEP Math test (beginning spring, 2009)

2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
		78	73	79		80		81		82		

**7th-9th graders - Percentage of students are reading at grade level**

2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
66	64	68	68	70	68	72		74		76		100

**8th Grade Free/Reduced Lunch Students - Percentage of students passing the 8th Grade L.A. ISTEP tests**

2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
64	75	76	69	77	64	78		79		80		100

**8th Grade Free/Reduced Lunch Students - Percentage of students passing the 8th Grade Math ISTEP tests**

2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
64	72	73	69	74	64	75		76		77		100

**8th Grade Special Needs Students - Percentage of students will pass the 8th Grade L.A. ISTEP Tests**

2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
20	29	39	21	33	22	35		37		39		100

**8th Grade Special Needs Students - Percentage of students will pass the 8th Grade Math ISTEP Tests**

2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
42	59	60	26	47	28	50		53		56		100

**9th Graders - Percentage of students passing two semesters of Algebra I**

2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
82	61	67	58	70		75		78		81		100%



**All graduates - Percentage students taking an AP exam who earn an average score of 3 on all AP tests taken**

2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
2	0	3	0	4		4		5		6		100

**All graduates - Percentage who earn a Core 40 Diploma**

2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
70	60	71	64	72		73		74		75		100

**All graduates - Percentage who earn an IAHD**

2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
33	18	34	20	35		36		37		38		100

**All Students - graduation rate**

2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
90	80	85	83	87		90		91		92		100

**All students - Percentage who pass all functional Core 40 End-of-Course Exams**

2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
58	41	50	48	53		55		57		59		100

**All Students (126 days) - ISTEP PL221 Category Placement Performance**

2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
75	79	75	79	80	76.8	82		84		86		100

**Free/Reduced Lunch Students Completing English 10 - Percentage of students passing the 10th grade L.A. ISTEP tests OR English 10 ECA (beginning 2009)**

2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
65	60	66	48	53	57	55		57		59		100

**Free/Reduced Lunch Students Enrolled in Algebra I - Percentage of students passing the 10th Grade Math ISTEP OR Algebra I ECA (beginning 2009)**

2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
66	72	80	83	85	96	87		89		91		100

**Special Needs Students Enrolled in Algebra I - Percentage of students who pass the 10th Grade Math ISTEP OR Algebra I ECA (beginning 2009)**

2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
35	56	58	33	36	33	39		42		45		100

**Special Needs Students Enrolled in English 10 - Percentage of students passing the L.A. ISTEP OR English 10 ECA (beginning 2009)**

2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
35	25	35	17	35	17	36		37		38		100

## Needs Assessment / Areas of Concern

The Areas of Concern were established after a comprehensive needs assessment that included a survey of all educators, all students, parents and community members. Survey data for students and parents were disaggregated by ethnicity and economic level. The needs assessment also included a collection of data that reflected specific student needs (e.g. attendance rate), and a summary of discussion responses to inquiry questions about areas that might be interfering with learning in the school and community. The collection of data provided information about the school's expectations for student achievement, curriculum, instruction, classroom assessment, extra help, student guidance and the learning environment.

All educators and the Community Council (including parent representatives) were involved in the analysis of the student needs data. Specific attention was given to areas within the classroom that are interfering with learning. The following questions were addressed during the data analysis.

- What data indicate an area that is interfering with achievement in our targeted academic areas for improvement?
- What data indicate an area that is interfering with achievement for the student group we have targeted for improvement?

The student body was asked to respond to an open ended question, "What is interfering with learning at our school?"

Using a consensus based decision-making model, the Full Faculty and Community Council identified key areas that concerned them because they were interfering with students' ability to reach the established academic goals and more specifically, were interfering with the achievement of the targeted student group. The Full Faculty and Community Council agreed to address these "Areas of Concern" through targeted strategies next year.

The student needs assessment will be conducted again in the future to analyze the impact of the strategies included in this plan.

The Areas of Concern identified by our Full Faculty and Community Council (including parents) are listed below.

### Local Areas of Concern

#### **We are concerned that... Availability of extra help**

15-18% of 7-12th graders disagree that teachers provide extra help when they need it.

#### **We are concerned that... Consistency in writing instruction and assessment**

Only 50% of teachers respond to a survey that they integrate writing and assessment it for those elements addressed on the ISTEP Writing Rubric regularly.

#### **We are concerned that... Existence of a meaningful relationship between every student and a caring adult**

22% of 7-12th graders do not feel that they have an adult in their life who talks with them regularly about their future goals or current concerns/problems.

#### **We are concerned that... Intentional plan to reach REALISTIC, appropriate post-secondary goals**

--40% of C/D and D/F students at different grade levels think they'll continue on to college. --46% of 7-12th graders disagree or don't know if they will compete with students from other countries for jobs. --21% of students disagree that students could identify post-secondary educational opportunities --13-21% of students can't identify career areas appropriate for them

#### **We are concerned that... Number of disciplinary referrals and lack of students earning mastery grades in core courses of free/reduced lunch population**

\*19%(F/R) vs. 9%(All students) were assigned OSS \*41% (F/R) vs. 35% (all students) were assigned ISS \* F/R lunch students earning master grade in math and history courses are around 20 percentage points less than the entire student population.

**We are concerned that... Student perception of expectations held of them by faculty, community, and themselves.**

--23-38% of students in different grade levels report disagreeing or not knowing that they participate in class. --13-30% of 7th-9th graders disagree that they pay attention in class. --10-20% of 7th-11th graders disagree that they turn in homework.

**We are concerned that... Teachers using best practices in instruction**

--15-40% of students report that they are unsure or disagree that teachers push them. --40% of students don't know if they're teachers enjoy teaching.

## **Required Areas of Concern**

**F. Encourage Rigorous Curriculum**

**I. Focused Academic Area**

**U. Focused Student Group**

# Strategies

Strategies were established after identifying 1) Achievement Goals (see the Achievement Goals section), and 2) Areas of Concern (see the Needs Assessment & Areas of Concern section). Educators researched possible strategies for addressing each Area of Concern and then presented possible strategies to Full Faculty and Community Council for their consideration. The student body was provided with a list of Areas of Concern and asked to provide their input regarding strategies the school and community could employ to address the concerns. Using a consensus based decision-making model, the Full Faculty and Community Council (including parent representatives) agreed to several strategies to implement next year.

**Strategy Data:** Strategy data will help the Full Faculty and Community Council determine the degree to which the strategy has changed adult practices. Baseline data was collected this year. Follow-up data will be analyzed at the end of each semester next year. Combined with the needs assessment data (including student surveys) and the achievement data, our school will have a good understanding of the success of the strategies in meeting student needs. The strategy data tables can be found in the Strategy Data section of this plan.

**Strategy To-Do Lists:** Each strategy has been assigned a Strategy Chair. In some cases, the Strategy Chair asked others to form a Strategy Task Force. For almost all strategies, the Strategy Chair developed a detailed "To-Do" list that includes activities related to 1) implementation, 2) professional development, 3) anti-resistance (helping those impacted by the strategy to embrace the strategy), and 4) strategy evaluation. The strategy to-do lists can be found in the Strategy To-Do List section of this plan.

The strategy titles and descriptions are listed below:

## Local Strategies

### Focused Academic Area--Reading Initiative

Hauser High School as well as all Flat Rock-Hawcreek Schools are entering the second year of their RTI programs, of which reading will be the initial focus. The second year will involve expanding the initiative into grades 9 and 10 and using iSTEEP to monitor and provide comprehension interventions. 1. Tier 1: Content area and L.A. teachers will implement best practices in reading strategies in their classes through reading activity design and direct instruction. All students will be given a comprehensive cloze maize test and then potentially a fluency test to determine initial placement in intervention tiers. 2. Tier 2: Students in grades 7-8 identified to be two or more grade levels below their current grade in reading and who score in the lower two quartiles on the comprehensive assessment will be placed in an intensive reading recovery course utilizing the Jamestown Reading Navigator interactive reading recovery program along with small group direct instruction of reading strategies. The program will be multi-faceted and will be able to address several concerns, including phonemic awareness, fluency, decoding, and comprehension. Students in grades 9-10 will utilize small group intervention strategies in BSD courses or an intensive reading class. For 2010-11, professional development in fluency and comprehension strategies and assessment will be a focus as well as reporting functions /progress monitoring through iSTEEP.

**Impact Level:** High Impact - Inside

**Focus:** Specific

## Required Strategies

### F. Encourage Rigorous Curriculum: 4-Year Planning Seminars

Parents and students will meet with the guidance director at the conclusion of the students' eighth grade year to receive information on diploma track options, graduation requirements, post-secondary requirements, and scheduling. They will then create academic course plans for their high school careers to fulfill their future goals. Each subsequent year students, their parents, and guidance staff will use these plans as a foundation for their schedules. In the students' 11th and 12th grade years, additional seminars are offered to inform parents of financial aid options and college admission requirements.

**Impact Level:** High Impact - Inside

**Focus:** General

### I. Focused Academic Area: Expanding 6+1! Write Traits

Beginning in 2007, the Hauser L.A. Department was trained in the 6+1! Write Traits model. In subsequent time, content area teachers have been trained as well and some review opportunities for previously trained teacher have been offered. Today, the initiative looks like the following: Students in grades 7-10 are taught to write in the Write Traits model. Each trait is taught individually in the core L.A. classes. Several writing assignments in these classes are given per quarter to assess the students' understanding of the individual traits as well as their understanding of how the traits fit together. Additionally each quarter, content area course teachers assign at least one essay and assess it for a prescribed trait using the Write Traits rubric. To help teachers implement these goals, follow-up training will also be offered to continue to refine content area teachers understanding

of model and to broaden how it is utilized in the classroom. In 2009-10, L.A. teachers will additionally be provided in-servicing on Writer's Workshop, another writing construct in which the 6+1! Write Traits model fits very easily. This model will provide other ideas to engage students in the writing process. In 2010-11, Hauser administration and L.A. Department members will conduct follow up in-services with science and social studies teachers of students in grades 7-10 as well as other text-laden courses who service students who traditionally struggle academically. These in-services will focus upon creating intentional, consistent reading interventions, 6+1! Write Traits instruction/assessment, and vocabulary instruction. Content area teachers have participated in various workshops concerning these topics over the last 3 years; this year implementation will be a focus.

**Impact Level:** High Impact - Inside

**Focus:** Specific

#### **U. Focused Student Group: Engaging and Motivating Free/Reduced Lunch Students Not Earning 2 Credits in Core Courses**

ZAP Program (Zeroes Aren't Permitted)--Students will be assigned lunch "detention" or "study tables" after school each day they do not have their work completed. They earn their way out of this setting once completed work is turned in. Students who fail to attend these mandated sessions will receive disciplinary consequences. Many of our free/reduced lunch students will be impacted through this initiative. Also, this year we will be trying to host a guided study hall each period of the day. Through budget cuts, we were forced to release our study hall monitor, but had also worried that students were not often on task in a "mass" study hall. For the last two years, we've piloted guided study halls in the senior high wherein teachers monitor not only the study hall, but also the students grades, posted/missing assignments, and discipline as well as talk to his/her teachers and to the student about post-secondary goal setting and task completion.

**Impact Level:** High Impact - Inside

**Focus:** Specific

## Strategy Data

Strategy data will help the teachers and Community Council determine the degree to which the strategy has changed adult practices. Baseline data was collected this year. Follow-up data will be analyzed at the end of each semester next year. Combined with the needs assessment data (including student surveys) and the achievement data, our school will have a good understanding of the strategy's success in meeting student needs. The strategy data tables below indicate 1) the group of adults or students that are expected to change as a result of this strategy, 2) the desired practice(s), and 3) what the school will count to determine the degree to which the practice(s) changed.

## Local Strategies

### Focused Academic Area--Reading Initiative

The percentage of teachers reporting implementing targeted reading strategies

Baseline 09-10	Follow Up 10-11 1st Semester / 1st Trimester		Follow Up 10-11 2nd Semester / Last Trimester	
Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
63	75		80	

The percentage of targeted students who make gains of one or more grade levels on the STAR Reader assessment by the end of the year

Baseline 09-10	Follow Up 10-11 1st Semester / 1st Trimester		Follow Up 10-11 2nd Semester / Last Trimester	
Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
70	72		75	

The percentage of targeted students who reach the 50th percentile or higher of the national norm on the CBM fluency or cloze maize tests

Baseline 09-10	Follow Up 10-11 1st Semester / 1st Trimester		Follow Up 10-11 2nd Semester / Last Trimester	
Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual

## Required Strategies

### I. Focused Academic Area: Expanding 6+1! Write Traits

The percentage of L.A. teachers who report on a survey that they are confident in their ability to improve a student's attitude towards writing

Baseline 09-10	Follow Up 10-11 1st Semester / 1st Trimester		Follow Up 10-11 2nd Semester / Last Trimester	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
100	100			

The percentage of targeted content area teachers who report on a survey each semester that they feel they impact the general writing proficiency of students through instruction and assignments in their courses

Baseline 09-10	Follow Up 10-11 1st Semester / 1st Trimester		Follow Up 10-11 2nd Semester / Last Trimester	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
65	75			

The percentage of targeted applied skills ISTEP+ essays scored the same by all L.A. teachers on the 6+1! Write Traits Rubric

Baseline 09-10	Follow Up 10-11 1st Semester / 1st Trimester		Follow Up 10-11 2nd Semester / Last Trimester	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
72	n/a		80	

**U. Focused Student Group: Engaging and Motivating Free/Reduced Lunch Students Not Earning 2 Credits in Core Courses**

The percentage of targeted teachers whose students have zeroes in their classes who sign students up for lunch detentions for missing homework

Baseline 09-10	Follow Up 10-11 1st Semester / 1st Trimester		Follow Up 10-11 2nd Semester / Last Trimester	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
58	75		85	

The percentage of targeted students with no zeroes for homework in their classes

Baseline 09-10	Follow Up 10-11 1st Semester / 1st Trimester		Follow Up 10-11 2nd Semester / Last Trimester	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
45	55		60	



The percentage of core classes for which students in guided study halls earned credits

Baseline 09-10	Follow Up 10-11 1st Semester / 1st Trimester		Follow Up 10-11 2nd Semester / Last Trimester	
Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
n/a	70		74	

## To-Do List

After the strategies were selected for next year, each strategy was assigned to a Strategy Chair. In some cases, the Strategy Chair asked others to form a Strategy Task Force. For almost all strategies, the Strategy Chair developed a detailed "To-Do" list that includes activities related to 1) implementation, 2) professional development, 3) anti-resistance (helping those impacted by the strategy to embrace the strategy), and 4) strategy evaluation. At the beginning of next year, each strategy chair will go over their strategy's "To-Do" list with the entire faculty. Throughout the year, each strategy chair will check off each strategy activity as it is completed. At the end of the first semester, each strategy chair will present the percentage of completed activities to the Full Faculty and Community Council. If the strategy activities were not fully implemented, the chair will facilitate a discussion about changes that will occur during the second semester to ensure that all activities are completed.

Report by strategy. Showing completed and yet-to-be-completed action steps.

## Encourage Rigorous Curriculum

**Feb 22, 2011:** Advertise four year planning meetings for 8th graders and their parents **Person:** Doug Heighway

**Mar 8, 2011:** Conduct planning seminars **Person:** Doug Heighway

**Mar 15, 2011:** Conduct planning seminars **Person:** Doug Heighway

**Mar 22, 2011:** Conduct planning seminars **Person:** Doug Heighway

**Apr 5, 2011:** Compile course requests and four year planning information to enter into student management software program **Person:** Doug Heighway

**Apr 8, 2011:** Count number of plans not accounted for and call those parents/students in individually **Person:** Doug Heighway

## Focused Academic Area

**Sep 20, 2010:** L.A. teachers create review activity for targeted text-laden course teachers over 6+1! Write Traits in the content area classroom **Person:** Cindi Foster

**Oct 21, 2010:** Conduct review session **Person:** Cindi Foster

**Oct 21, 2010:** Targeted social studies and science teachers work on developing intentional inclusion of 6+1! Write Traits writing into their weekly lesson plans **Person:** Kim Harsh

**Nov 11, 2010:** Jr. high L.A. teachers trained on implementing Writer's Workshop into their writing lessons **Person:** Emily Silverman

**Nov 30, 2010:** Collect fall data: The percentage of L.A. teachers who report on a survey that they are confident in their ability to improve a student's attitude towards writing **Person:** Cindi Foster

**Nov 30, 2010:** Collect fall data: The percentage of targeted applied skills ISTEP+ essays scored the same by all L.A. teachers on the 6+1! Write Traits Rubric **Person:** Cindi Foster

**Nov 30, 2010:** Collect fall data: The percentage of targeted content area teachers who report on a survey each semester that they feel they impact the general writing proficiency of students through instruction and assignments in their courses **Person:** Cindi Foster

**Dec 23, 2010:** Targeted social studies and science teachers work on developing intentional inclusion of 6+1! Write Traits writing into their weekly lesson plans **Person:** Kim Harsh

**Feb 24, 2011:** Targeted social studies and science teachers work on developing intentional inclusion of 6+1! Write Traits writing into their weekly lesson plans **Person:** Kim Harsh

**Jun 30, 2011:** Collect spring data: The percentage of L.A. teachers who report on a survey that they are confident in their ability to improve a student's attitude towards writing **Person:** Cindi Foster

**Jun 30, 2011:** Collect spring data: The percentage of targeted applied skills ISTEP+ essays scored the same by all L.A. teachers on the 6+1! Write Traits Rubric **Person:** Cindi Foster

**Jun 30, 2011:** Collect spring data: The percentage of targeted content area teachers who report on a survey each semester that they feel they impact the general writing proficiency of students through instruction and assignments in their courses **Person:** Cindi Foster

## Focused Academic Area--Reading Initiative

**Apr 1, 2010:** Collect baseline data: The percentage of targeted students who reach the 50th percentile or higher of the national norm on the CBM fluency or cloze maize tests **Person:** Bekah Breeden

**Aug 26, 2010:** Identify students to whom the universal assessment will be administered **Person:** Bekah Breeden

**Aug 30, 2010:** Schedule students into appropriate intervention **Person:** Bekah Breeden

**Sep 7, 2010:** In-service new high school L.A. teachers on RTI reading process through iSTEEP **Person:** Cindi Foster

**Sep 8, 2010:** In-service all RTI Reading teachers on administering cloze maize and using the new iSTEEP software **Person:** Cindi Foster

**Sep 10, 2010:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Sep 17, 2010:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Sep 24, 2010:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Sep 27, 2010:** Meet with targeted teachers in science and social studies to develop intentional reading strategy inclusion plans  
**Person:** Kim Harsh  
**Oct 1, 2010:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Oct 8, 2010:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Oct 12, 2010:** Followup inservicing with senior high L.A. teachers concerning implmenting Tier II reading interventions **Person:** Cindi Foster  
**Oct 15, 2010:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Oct 18, 2010:** Implement Tier I interventions in targeted content area courses **Person:** Kim Harsh  
**Oct 22, 2010:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Oct 28, 2010:** Identify students to whom the universal assessment will be administered **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Oct 29, 2010:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Nov 1, 2010:** Schedule students into appropriate intervention **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Nov 5, 2010:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Nov 12, 2010:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Nov 19, 2010:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Nov 26, 2010:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Nov 30, 2010:** Collect fall data: The percentage of targeted students who make gains of one or more grade levels on the STAR Reader assessment by the end of the year **Person:**  
**Nov 30, 2010:** Collect fall data: The percentage of targeted students who reach the 50th percentile or higher of the national norm on the CBM fluency or cloze maize tests **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Nov 30, 2010:** Collect fall data: The percentage of teachers reporting implementing targeted reading strategies **Person:**  
**Dec 3, 2010:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Dec 10, 2010:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Dec 14, 2010:** Followup inservicing with senior high L.A. teachers concerning implmenting Tier II reading interventions **Person:** Cindi Foster  
**Dec 17, 2010:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Dec 24, 2010:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Dec 30, 2010:** Identify students to whom the universal assessment will be administered **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Dec 31, 2010:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Jan , 2011:** Meet with targeted content area teachers to continue developing reading strategy interventions **Person:** Kim Harsh  
**Jan 3, 2011:** Schedule students into appropriate intervention **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Jan 7, 2011:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Jan 14, 2011:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Jan 21, 2011:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Jan 28, 2011:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Feb 4, 2011:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Feb 11, 2011:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Feb 15, 2011:** Followup inservicing with senior high L.A. teachers concerning implmenting Tier II reading interventions **Person:** Cindi Foster  
**Feb 18, 2011:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Feb 25, 2011:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Mar 3, 2011:** Identify students to whom the universal assessment will be administered **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Mar 4, 2011:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Mar 7, 2011:** Schedule students into appropriate intervention **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Mar 11, 2011:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Mar 18, 2011:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Mar 25, 2011:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Apr 1, 2011:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Apr 8, 2011:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Apr 15, 2011:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Apr 22, 2011:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**Apr 29, 2011:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**May 5, 2011:** Identify students to whom the universal assessment will be administered **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**May 6, 2011:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**May 9, 2011:** Schedule students into appropriate intervention **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**May 13, 2011:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden  
**May 20, 2011:** Progress monitor during Tier II and III interventions **Person:** Bekah Breeden

**Jun 30, 2011:** Collect spring data: The percentage of targeted students who make gains of one or more grade levels on the STAR Reader assessment by the end of the year **Person:**  
**Jun 30, 2011:** Collect spring data: The percentage of targeted students who reach the 50th percentile or higher of the national norm on the CBM fluency or cloze maize tests **Person:**  
**Jun 30, 2011:** Collect spring data: The percentage of teachers reporting implementing targeted reading strategies **Person:**

## Focused Student Group

**Apr 1, 2010:** Collect baseline data: The percentage of core classes for which students in guided study halls earned credits **Person:** Julie Patterson  
**Apr 22, 2010:** Identify students for guided study halls **Person:** Kim Harsh  
**Apr 22, 2010:** Revise policies/procedures for lunch study tables **Person:** Shawn Price  
**Apr 29, 2010:** Revise policies/procedures for lunch study tables **Person:** Shawn Price  
**May 6, 2010:** Revise policies/procedures for lunch study tables **Person:** Shawn Price  
**May 13, 2010:** Revise policies/procedures for lunch study tables **Person:** Shawn Price  
**May 15, 2010:** Assign identified students to guided study halls **Person:** Doug Heighway  
**May 20, 2010:** Revise policies/procedures for lunch study tables **Person:** Shawn Price  
**May 27, 2010:** Revise policies/procedures for lunch study tables **Person:** Shawn Price  
**Jun 3, 2010:** Revise policies/procedures for lunch study tables **Person:** Shawn Price  
**Jun 10, 2010:** Revise policies/procedures for lunch study tables **Person:** Shawn Price  
**Jun 15, 2010:** Publish procedures for lunch study tables in student handbook **Person:** Shawn Price  
**Jun 24, 2010:** Identify students for guided study halls **Person:** Kim Harsh  
**Jul 17, 2010:** Assign identified students to guided study halls **Person:** Doug Heighway  
**Aug 13, 2010:** In-service full faculty on how new lunch study tables will work **Person:** Shawn Price  
**Aug 26, 2010:** Identify students for guided study halls **Person:** Kim Harsh  
**Sep 18, 2010:** Assign identified students to guided study halls **Person:** Doug Heighway  
**Oct 28, 2010:** Identify students for guided study halls **Person:** Kim Harsh  
**Nov 20, 2010:** Assign identified students to guided study halls **Person:** Doug Heighway  
**Nov 30, 2010:** Collect fall data: The percentage of core classes for which students in guided study halls earned credits **Person:** Julie Patterson  
**Nov 30, 2010:** Collect fall data: The percentage of targeted students with no zeroes for homework in their classes **Person:** Julie Patterson  
**Nov 30, 2010:** Collect fall data: The percentage of targeted teachers whose students have zeroes in their classes who sign students up for lunch detentions for missing homework **Person:** Julie Patterson  
**Dec 30, 2010:** Identify students for guided study halls **Person:** Kim Harsh  
**Jan 22, 2011:** Assign identified students to guided study halls **Person:** Doug Heighway  
**Mar 3, 2011:** Identify students for guided study halls **Person:** Kim Harsh  
**Mar 26, 2011:** Assign identified students to guided study halls **Person:** Doug Heighway  
**Jun 30, 2011:** Collect spring data: The percentage of core classes for which students in guided study halls earned credits **Person:** Julie Patterson  
**Jun 30, 2011:** Collect spring data: The percentage of targeted students with no zeroes for homework in their classes **Person:** Julie Patterson  
**Jun 30, 2011:** Collect spring data: The percentage of targeted teachers whose students have zeroes in their classes who sign students up for lunch detentions for missing homework **Person:** Julie Patterson

# Professional Development Summary

**Alignment with the School Improvement Plan:** The Professional Development Plan is directly aligned with strategies found in the School Improvement Plan. Professional development activities enhance educator's knowledge within one or more of the following areas: a) expectations, b) curriculum content, c) classroom instruction, d) classroom assessment, e) extra help, f) guidance, and g) the learning environment. The amount of funding allocated for each professional development activity and the funding source is listed for each professional development activity.

**Effective Learning Process:** The Professional Development Plan was written by teacher-leaders and includes activities that will help teachers develop the knowledge and skills needed to successfully implement the strategies listed in the School Improvement Plan. The plan includes a variety of formats for professional development. Activities have been embedded in the school day as appropriate. The plan also includes activities designed to provide teachers with feedback over time. Finally, "strategy data" is collected for comprehensive strategies that identifies the degree to which the strategy has brought about a positive changes in adult practices.

**Professional Growth Environment:** Each strategy is supported by a "strategy chair." Strategy chairs are responsible for 1) writing (with support from colleagues) a strategy plan including on-going professional development activities, anti-resistance, and evaluation activities, 2) providing on-going mentoring their colleagues in the implementation of the strategy, 3) analyzing the effectiveness of the strategy, and 4) making a recommendation to the faculty with respect to whether or not the strategy should be sustained.

## Focused Academic Area--Reading Initiative

### Followup inservicing with senior high L.A. teachers concerning implementing Tier II reading intervent

**Brief Description:** Working with these teachers new to RTI to set up a senior high-compatible reading interventions

**Intended Participants:** Teachers

**Dates:** Oct 12, 2010; Dec 14, 2010; Feb 15, 2011

**Activity Purpose:** Skill Building, Feedback/Support, Refinement

**Activity Format:** Presentation, Collaborative Problem Solving

**Funding:** stimulus dollars and local funds

**Does this activity occur during the school day?** Yes

### In-service all RTI Reading teachers on administering cloze maize and using the new iSTEEP software

**Brief Description:** RTI Reading committee members will be in-serviced on how to administer, score, and analyze cloze maize tests

**Intended Participants:** Teachers, Administrators

**Date:** Sep 8, 2010

**Activity Purpose:** Information, Skill Building, Feedback/Support

**Activity Format:** Presentation, Peer Coaching

**Funding:** Stimulus dollars

**Does this activity occur during the school day?** Yes

### In-service new high school L.A. teachers on RTI reading process through iSTEEP

**Brief Description:** Teachers need in-serviced through Dr. Witt and the iSTEEP model in the RTI process

**Intended Participants:** Teachers, Administrators

**Date:** Sep 7, 2010

**Activity Purpose:** Information, Skill Building

**Activity Format:** Presentation

**Funding:** Stimulus dollars

**Does this activity occur during the school day?** Yes

**Meet with targeted content area teachers to continue developing reading strategy interventions**

**Brief Description:** This meeting will continue refining reading strategy interventions in targeted content area courses.

**Intended Participants:** Teachers, Administrators

**Date:** Jan 0, 2011

**Activity Purpose:** Feedback/Support, Refinement

**Activity Format:** Peer Coaching, Collaborative Problem Solving

**Funding:** local funds

**Does this activity occur during the school day?** Yes

**Meet with targeted teachers in science and social studies to develop intentional reading strategy in**

**Brief Description:** These teachers have already been inserviced on reading strategies and vocab instruction in the content areas. These inservices would be to "tighten up" by having intentional, routinized plans for the inclusion of reading strategies as a Tier I intervention.

**Intended Participants:** Teachers, Administrators

**Date:** Sep 27, 2010

**Activity Purpose:** Skill Building, Feedback/Support, Refinement

**Activity Format:** Presentation, Peer Coaching, Collaborative Problem Solving

**Funding:** local funds

**Does this activity occur during the school day?** Yes

## **F. Encourage Rigorous Curriculum: 4-Year Planning Seminars**

No professional development is needed for this strategy.

## **I. Focused Academic Area: Expanding 6+1! Write Traits**

**Conduct review session**

**Brief Description:** L.A. teachers will review 6+1! Write Traits, a model on which all teachers were previously in-serviced.

**Intended Participants:** Teachers

**Date:** Oct 21, 2010

**Activity Purpose:** Skill Building, Feedback/Support, Refinement

**Activity Format:** Presentation, Peer Coaching

**Funding:** Local

**Does this activity occur during the school day?** Yes

**Jr. high L.A. teachers trained on implementing Writer's Workshop into their writing lessons**

**Brief Description:** self explanatory

**Intended Participants:** Teachers

**Date:** Nov 11, 2010

**Activity Purpose:** Information, Skill Building

**Activity Format:** Presentation, Collaborative Problem Solving

**Funding:** local

**Does this activity occur during the school day?** Yes

## **U. Focused Student Group: Engaging and Motivating Free/Reduced Lunch Students Not Earning 2 Credits in Core Courses**

No professional development is needed for this strategy.

# Relationship Report:

## Areas of Concern / Strategies / Achievement Goals

This report shows the relationship between the Areas of Concern, Strategies, and Achievement Goals. For each Area of Concern, the report shows 1) the strategies that will enable the school to successfully address the concern and 2) the achievement goals that will be positively impacted when the concern is successfully addressed.

### Local Areas of Concern

#### We are concerned that... Availability of extra help

##### Data Targets Influenced by This Concern:

- 7-8th graders taking the (Spring beginning 2008-09) ISTEP+ -- Percentage who pass the Writing Applications portion
- 7th Graders -- Percentage who pass ISTEP L.A. test (beginning spring, 2009)
- 7th graders -- Percentage who pass ISTEP Math test (beginning spring, 2009)
- 7th-9th graders -- Percentage of students are reading at grade level
- 8th Grade Free/Reduced Lunch Students -- Percentage of students passing the 8th Grade L.A. ISTEP tests
- 8th Grade Free/Reduced Lunch Students -- Percentage of students passing the 8th Grade Math ISTEP tests
- 8th Grade Special Needs Students -- Percentage of students will pass the 8th Grade L.A. ISTEP Tests
- 8th Grade Special Needs Students -- Percentage of students will pass the 8th Grade Math ISTEP Tests
- 9th Graders -- Percentage of students passing two semesters of Algebra I
- All Students -- graduation rate
- All students -- Percentage who pass all functional Core 40 End-of-Course Exams
- All Students (126 days) -- ISTEP PL221 Category Placement Performance
- Free/Reduced Lunch Students Completing English 10 -- Percentage of students passing the 10th grade L.A. ISTEP tests OR English 10 ECA (beginning 2009)
- Free/Reduced Lunch Students Enrolled in Algebra I -- Percentage of students passing the 10th Grade Math ISTEP OR Algebra I ECA (beginning 2009)
- Special Needs Students Enrolled in Algebra I -- Percentage of students who pass the 10th Grade Math ISTEP OR Algebra I ECA (beginning 2009)
- Special Needs Students Enrolled in English 10 -- Percentage of students passing the L.A. ISTEP OR English 10 ECA (beginning 2009)

##### Strategies to Impact This Concern:

- Focused Academic Area--Reading Initiative

#### We are concerned that... Consistency in writing instruction and assessment

##### Data Targets Influenced by This Concern:

- 7-8th graders taking the (Spring beginning 2008-09) ISTEP+ -- Percentage who pass the Writing Applications portion
- 8th Grade Free/Reduced Lunch Students -- Percentage of students passing the 8th Grade L.A. ISTEP tests
- 8th Grade Special Needs Students -- Percentage of students will pass the 8th Grade L.A. ISTEP Tests
- All students -- Percentage who pass all functional Core 40 End-of-Course Exams
- Free/Reduced Lunch Students Completing English 10 -- Percentage of students passing the 10th grade L.A. ISTEP tests OR English 10 ECA (beginning 2009)
- Special Needs Students Enrolled in English 10 -- Percentage of students passing the L.A. ISTEP OR English 10 ECA (beginning 2009)

##### Strategies to Impact This Concern:

- I. Focused Academic Area: Expanding 6+1! Write Traits



## **We are concerned that... Existence of a meaningful relationship between every student and a caring adult**

### **Data Targets Influenced by This Concern:**

- All Students -- graduation rate

### **Strategies to Impact This Concern:**

- U. Focused Student Group: Engaging and Motivating Free/Reduced Lunch Students Not Earning 2 Credits in Core Courses

## **We are concerned that... Intentional plan to reach REALISTIC, appropriate post-secondary goals**

### **Data Targets Influenced by This Concern:**

- 9th Graders -- Percentage of students passing two semesters of Algebra I
- All Students -- graduation rate

### **Strategies to Impact This Concern:**

- F. Encourage Rigorous Curriculum: 4-Year Planning Seminars
- U. Focused Student Group: Engaging and Motivating Free/Reduced Lunch Students Not Earning 2 Credits in Core Courses

## **We are concerned that... Number of disciplinary referrals and lack of students earning mastery grades in core courses of free/reduced lunch population**

### **Data Targets Influenced by This Concern:**

- 8th Grade Free/Reduced Lunch Students -- Percentage of students passing the 8th Grade Math ISTEP tests
- 9th Graders -- Percentage of students passing two semesters of Algebra I
- All graduates -- Percentage who earn a Core 40 Diploma
- All students -- Percentage who pass all functional Core 40 End-of-Course Exams
- Free/Reduced Lunch Students Enrolled in Algebra I -- Percentage of students passing the 10th Grade Math ISTEP OR Algebra I ECA (beginning 2009)

### **Strategies to Impact This Concern:**

- U. Focused Student Group: Engaging and Motivating Free/Reduced Lunch Students Not Earning 2 Credits in Core Courses

## **We are concerned that... Student perception of expectations held of them by faculty, community, and themselves.**

### **Data Targets Influenced by This Concern:**

- 9th Graders -- Percentage of students passing two semesters of Algebra I
- All graduates -- Percentage students taking an AP exam who earn an average score of 3 on all AP tests taken
- All graduates -- Percentage who earn a Core 40 Diploma
- All graduates -- Percentage who earn an IAHD
- All Students -- graduation rate
- All students -- Percentage who pass all functional Core 40 End-of-Course Exams

### **Strategies to Impact This Concern:**

- U. Focused Student Group: Engaging and Motivating Free/Reduced Lunch Students Not Earning 2 Credits in Core Courses

## **We are concerned that... Teachers using best practices in instruction**

### **Data Targets Influenced by This Concern:**

- 9th Graders -- Percentage of students passing two semesters of Algebra I
- All graduates -- Percentage who earn a Core 40 Diploma
- All students -- Percentage who pass all functional Core 40 End-of-Course Exams

### **Strategies to Impact This Concern:**

- Focused Academic Area--Reading Initiative

## **Required Areas of Concern**

### **F. Encourage Rigorous Curriculum (PL221)**

#### **Data Targets Influenced by This Concern:**

- 9th Graders -- Percentage of students passing two semesters of Algebra I
- All graduates -- Percentage students taking an AP exam who earn an average score of 3 on all AP tests taken
- All graduates -- Percentage who earn a Core 40 Diploma
- All graduates -- Percentage who earn an IAHD
- All Students -- graduation rate
- All students -- Percentage who pass all functional Core 40 End-of-Course Exams
- Free/Reduced Lunch Students Completing English 10 -- Percentage of students passing the 10th grade L.A. ISTEP tests OR English 10 ECA (beginning 2009)
- Free/Reduced Lunch Students Enrolled in Algebra I -- Percentage of students passing the 10th Grade Math ISTEP OR Algebra I ECA (beginning 2009)
- Special Needs Students Enrolled in Algebra I -- Percentage of students who pass the 10th Grade Math ISTEP OR Algebra I ECA (beginning 2009)
- Special Needs Students Enrolled in English 10 -- Percentage of students passing the L.A. ISTEP OR English 10 ECA (beginning 2009)

#### **Strategies to Impact This Concern:**

- F. Encourage Rigorous Curriculum: 4-Year Planning Seminars

### **I. Focused Academic Area (PL221)**

#### **Data Targets Influenced by This Concern:**

- 7-8th graders taking the (Spring beginning 2008-09) ISTEP+ -- Percentage who pass the Writing Applications portion
- 7th-9th graders -- Percentage of students are reading at grade level
- 9th Graders -- Percentage of students passing two semesters of Algebra I

#### **Strategies to Impact This Concern:**

- Focused Academic Area--Reading Initiative
- I. Focused Academic Area: Expanding 6+1! Write Traits

### **U. Focused Student Group (PL221)**

#### **Data Targets Influenced by This Concern:**

- 7th-9th graders -- Percentage of students are reading at grade level
- 8th Grade Special Needs Students -- Percentage of students will pass the 8th Grade L.A. ISTEP Tests
- 8th Grade Special Needs Students -- Percentage of students will pass the 8th Grade Math ISTEP Tests
- Special Needs Students Enrolled in Algebra I -- Percentage of students who pass the 10th Grade Math ISTEP OR Algebra I ECA (beginning 2009)

- Special Needs Students Enrolled in English 10 -- Percentage of students passing the L.A. ISTEP OR English 10 ECA (beginning 2009)

**Strategies to Impact This Concern:**

- U. Focused Student Group: Engaging and Motivating Free/Reduced Lunch Students Not Earning 2 Credits in Core Courses

## Force Field Excerpt

The Force Field reports are lengthy data reports that help the Full Faculty and Community Council (including parents) identify Areas of Concern (student needs). The Force Field excerpt found below contains information that must be included in the School Improvement Plan to meet various requirements of Public Law 221 and if applicable, Title I Schoolwide.

A. Where is the public copy of your school's curriculum located?	In the principal's office
<p>B. What rules or statutes would you like to waive in order to promote student learning?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Identify the specific statute and and/or rule you wish to waive.</li> <li>● Identify the educational strategies this waiver would allow you to implement that could not be implemented under current statute and rule.</li> <li>● Explain the benefit to student achievement.</li> <li>● Describe the evaluation process that would be used to measure the success of these strategies.</li> </ul>	None
C. List the titles of the assessment instruments that are used in addition to ISTEP+ / ECA and give a brief description of each.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. STAR Reader</li> <li>2. STAR Math</li> <li>3. Jamestown Reading Navigator (assesses reading comprehension )</li> <li>4. CBM Oral Fluency Tests to grades 7-8</li> <li>5. Math Benchmark tests</li> </ol>

## Continuous Improvement Timeline

DISCUSSION TOPIC	FACILITATOR TRAINING (Steering Teams)			FACULTY AND COMMUNITY COUNCIL DISCUSSIONS
	ORIGINAL PLAN	REVIEW & REVISE		
	1st Year Schools	2nd and 3rd Year Schools	Alumni Schools	
New Principal and Steering Team Member Training	n/a	Aug	Aug	n/a
<b>First Year:</b> Rationale + Organizational Structure <b>After First Year:</b> Kick Off / Year End Data Review (Transcripts / ISTEP / ECA)	Session 1 - Aug	Session 1 - Aug	Session 1 – Aug AM	First 2 weeks of Sept
Vision	Session 2 – Sept	n/a	Session 1 – Aug PM	First 2 weeks of Oct*
Data Targets	Session 3 - Oct	Session 1 - Aug	Session 1 – Aug AM	First 2 weeks in Nov
Areas of Concern	Session 4 - Dec	n/a	Session 2 – Dec PM	First 2 weeks in Jan*
Strategy Selection	Session 5 - Jan	Session 2 - Dec	Session 2 – Dec AM	First 2 weeks in Feb
Conference on Learning	Jan	Jan	Jan	
Strategy Selection: Title & Description	Feb	Feb	n/a	First 2 weeks in Mar
Strategy Implementation Plans	Mar Strategy Chair Training	Mar Strategy Chair Training	Optional Strategy Chair Training	First week of Apr

\* Our school will complete these tasks every three years  
We are next scheduled to complete these tasks during the 2010-2011 school year