

School Improvement Plan - 2010-2011

Generated on May 21, 2010 at 11:35 AM

Lanesville Elementary School (2611)

Lanesville Community School Corp

Lanesville, 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
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 9
- Strategies 11
- Strategy Data 13
- To-Do List 16
- Professional Development Summary 22
- Relationship Report: Areas of Concern / Strategies / Achievement Goals 25
- Force Field Excerpt 27
- Continuous Improvement Timeline 28

School Improvement Plan Introduction

Lanesville Elementary 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

- Allison Conrad - Parent/Guardian
- Marsha Himmelhaver - Administrator
- Robin Oelker - Community Representative (Business)
- Rebecca Uesseler - Teacher
- Robin Wolfe - Teacher

Strategy Chairs

- Shirley Bryant
- Erin Green
- Bethany Miller
- Liz Schigur
- Robin Wolfe

Community Council

- Lisa Cook - 4th Grade Gen Ed Parent, Healthcare Business
- Jennifer Dishman - 2nd grade general education parents
- Amy Edwards - General Education parent grades K & 2
- Angela Edwards - 4th grade general ed parent, Youth Service Organization
- Lee Hasken - 2nd grade parent, Community Agency, Business
- Karen Kaake - Youth Service, 5th Grade Gen Ed and Gifted Ed Parent
- Julia Keibler - 2nd and 5th Grade Gen Ed Parent, Community Agency
- Richard Kennedy - International Business/ 7th, 9th and 11th grade Gifted parent

- Denzil Mc Kim - School Board member, Community Service
- Nick Melton - Youth
- Monica Roadcap - 2nd grade Parent, Community Service
- Joan Schickel - Multiple Community Agencies
- Pete Schickel - Community, Multiple Community Agencies
- Sandy Tyree - 5th Grade Gen Ed Parent
- Julie Weathers - 1st and 5th grade parent, Federal Program Representative
- Roger Weathers - 1st and 5th grade parent, Federal program representative
- Mandy Wolfe - Parent of 3rd grade unique learning student and 5th grade student

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:

A school community that promotes respect, honesty, compassion, positive attitude, active listening, acceptance of uniqueness of others, and personal responsibility

A highly qualified staff that differentiates instruction to suit student's unique learning styles

A school community that makes students the central focus of our school while providing standards' based instruction

A school that is safe with an enjoyable learning environment

A school community that allows them to reach their maximum potential as they master all Indiana standards kindergarten through sixth grade

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

Honesty Respect Compassion Positive attitude Active listening Accept differences Look out for all team members Responsibility Provide a safe and enjoyable learning environment for students Self-motivated life long learners.

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

Will be self-motivated lifelong learners who enjoy learning Will be productive citizens Will be accepting of each person's uniqueness Will be active listeners Will be contributors to a safe, positive learning environment Will be supportive of each other Will be responsible Will be honest

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

- % of students who are at or above grade level - LA: 100%
- % of students who are at or above grade level - Math: 100%
- % of students who are passing ISTEP+: 100%
- % of students who are mastering standards set by CTB exam: 100%
- % of students who are on Lanesville's Mastery List: 100%
- % of students who are passing each grade: 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.

3rd Grade Students - Achieving Mastery of Reading Vocabulary on ISTEP Mastery of Standards

| 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 | |
| N/A | 86 | N/A | 84 | 88 | | 92 | | 96 | | 100 | | 100 |

All male students - Achieving Mastery of Math on ISTEP Mastery of Standards

| 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 | 79 | 84 | 77 | 83 | | 89 | | 95 | | 100 | | 100 |

All students - Achieving Pass Plus of Eng/LA on ISTEP Mastery of Standards

| 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 | |
| 10 | 11 | 14 | 10 | 15 | | 20 | | 25 | | 30 | | 100 |

All students - Achieving Pass Plus of Math on ISTEP Mastery of Standard

| 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 | |
| 17 | 20 | 22 | 15 | 18 | | 23 | | 27 | | 30 | | 100 |

Grades K - 2 Students - Achieving Low-Risk Benchmark of Eng/LA on DIBELS from Spring Assessment

| 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 | |
| | | 76 | | 81 | | 86 | | 92 | | 100 | | 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... There is a performance gap between male and female students on ISTEP+

13% of male in grade 3 - 6 disagree or don't know if they pay attention in class while only 4% of females disagree. 15% of males and 8% of females in grade 3-6 don't ask questions in class. 12% of males and 4% of females in grades 3 - 6 do not turn in homework. 11% of males and 2% of females grade 3 - 6 don't know if they will master Indiana Academic Standards

We are concerned that... Language Arts curriculum is not addressing reading comprehension

Faculty members agree that not all students are engaged in learning and that differentiated lessons are needed to address the concern. In addition, faculty and staff believe instruction isn't always applied to real world situations. 76 % of parents strongly agree that students will master the Indiana academic standards. 59% of students strongly agree they will master Indiana academic standards. 69% of all 4th grade students and 67% of all 5th and 6th grade students expect to pass ISTEP. 12% of primary children, 5% of grades 3-6 students, and 6% of parents disagree that the teachers provide extra help when needed. 24% of primary students, 19% of grades 3-6 students, and 11% of parents disagree that teachers allow extra time for assignments when needed. 5% of the community disagree that their children's teacher push them to do their best work. 32% of primary students and 14% of grades 3-6 students disagree they ask questions when they don't understand. 36% of primary students and 10% of 3-6 students disagree that the teacher goes at a pace comfortable to them. 17% of students grades 3-6 and 43% of parents disagree that computers are used to help students learn at least one time per week.

We are concerned that... All students will receive lessons that meet the needs of all learners

15% of students in grades 3 - 6 disagree that teachers relate what they are teaching to their personal interests. 13% of primary students disagree that they receive extra help and that they have enough time to finish their work 19% of students in grades 3 - 6 disagree they receive extra time for assignments if needed 14% of students in grades 3 - 6 disagree and 17% don't know that they can describe their preferred learning style. 32% of the faculty disagree and 23% don't know whether students could describe their preferred learning style.

We are concerned that... Student Achievement identified on report cards does not coincide with student ISTEP+ results

91% of parents believe their child's report card reflects the degree to which he/she has learned the Indiana academic standards. 96% of the faculty assigned grades that reflect the degree to which their students have learned the Indiana academic standards.

We are concerned that... Technology Coordination

17% of all students 3-6 disagree that they use a computer to help them learn at least once a week.

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

Common Benchmark Assessments

Grade level teams (Kindergarten through Grade 6) will develop a common benchmark assessment for Reading Language Arts or Math during the 2010-2011 school year.

Impact Level: High Impact - Inside

Focus: Specific

Technology Use

Teachers will use technology during their scheduled lab time to increase student knowledge of computer applications as identified in the Lanesville Elementary Technology curriculum guide.

Impact Level: Low Impact

Focus: General

Required Strategies

F. Encourage Rigorous Curriculum: Differentiated Instruction

Teachers will participate in research based professional development activities that assist in developing differentiated lessons that will align to State Standards, include appropriate assessment, and provide the rigor that supports high academic achievement throughout the year. The professional development activities include, but are not limited to, book studies with an emphasis on Robert Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching, internet resources, speakers, trainers, observations, and seminars.

Impact Level: High Impact - Inside

Focus: General

I. Focused Academic Area: Reading Instructional Practices K-2

Kindergarten, First, and Second grade teachers will implement identified research based reading strategies throughout the year. Teachers will assess reading skills over the school year by using DIBELS (Dynamic Indicator of Basic Early Literary Skills) and adjust instruction as needed.

Impact Level: High Impact - Inside

Focus: Specific

U. Focused Student Group: Academic Performance of Male Students

Teachers will learn and then implement research based strategies within their classrooms that focus on improving male achievement throughout the year.

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

Common Benchmark Assessments

Percentage of grade level teams with at least two common benchmark assessments for Reading/Language Arts

| Baseline 09-10 | Follow Up 10-11 1st Semester / 1st Trimester | | Follow Up 10-11 2nd Semester / Last Trimester | |
|-------------------|--|--------|---|--------|
| | Target | Actual | Target | Actual |
| 29% | 43% | | 71% | |

Percentage of grade level teams with at least two common benchmark assessments for Math

| Baseline 09-10 | Follow Up 10-11 1st Semester / 1st Trimester | | Follow Up 10-11 2nd Semester / Last Trimester | |
|-------------------|--|--------|---|--------|
| | Target | Actual | Target | Actual |
| 57% | 86% | | 100% | |

Technology Use

% of teachers who devoted time to computer applications as found in the Technology Curriculum Guide- per semester

| Baseline 09-10 | Follow Up 10-11 1st Semester / 1st Trimester | | Follow Up 10-11 2nd Semester / Last Trimester | |
|-------------------|--|--------|---|--------|
| | Target | Actual | Target | Actual |
| 93% | 100% | | 100% | |

The percent of teachers who use the system as an assessment tool.

| Baseline 09-10 | Follow Up 10-11 1st Semester / 1st Trimester | | Follow Up 10-11 2nd Semester / Last Trimester | |
|-------------------|--|--------|---|--------|
| | Target | Actual | Target | Actual |
| 38% | 70% | | 70% | |

Required Strategies

F. Encourage Rigorous Curriculum: Differentiated Instruction

The percent of teachers using Bloom's New Taxonomy levels as reported on their submitted record sheet.

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

The number of times teachers use Marzano's first seven strategies as reported on their submitted record sheet.

| Baseline 09-10 | Follow Up 10-11 1st Semester / 1st Trimester | | Follow Up 10-11 2nd Semester / Last Trimester | |
|-------------------|--|--------|---|--------|
| | Target | Actual | Target | Actual |
| | 750 | | 800 | |

The percent of teachers using standards and assessment vocabulary in their classrooms as reported on their submitted record sheet.

| Baseline 09-10 | Follow Up 10-11 1st Semester / 1st Trimester | | Follow Up 10-11 2nd Semester / Last Trimester | |
|-------------------|--|--------|---|--------|
| | Target | Actual | Target | Actual |
| NA | 85 | | 90 | |

I. Focused Academic Area: Reading Instructional Practices K-2

Number of research based reading strategies used in K - 2 classrooms

| Baseline 09-10 | Follow Up 10-11 1st Semester / 1st Trimester | | Follow Up 10-11 2nd Semester / Last Trimester | |
|-------------------|--|--------|---|--------|
| Actual | Target | Actual | Target | Actual |
| 27 | 45 | | 45 | |

U. Focused Student Group: Academic Performance of Male Students

The number of teachers using new instructional strategies to improve male achievement.

| Baseline 09-10 | Follow Up 10-11 1st Semester / 1st Trimester | | Follow Up 10-11 2nd Semester / Last Trimester | |
|-------------------|--|--------|---|--------|
| Actual | Target | Actual | Target | Actual |
| 16 | 12 | | 14 | |

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.

Common Benchmark Assessments

Apr 1, 2010: Collect baseline data: Percentage of grade level teams with at least two common benchmark assessments for Math

Person: Erin Green

Apr 1, 2010: Collect baseline data: Percentage of grade level teams with at least two common benchmark assessments for

Reading/Language Arts **Person:** Erin Green

May 12, 2010: Suggestion Sheet **Person:** Rebecca Uessler

Aug 2, 2010: Grade level teachers will use bimonthly guidance time to develop common benchmark exams. **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Aug 2, 2010: Guidance Time for development **Person:** Marsha Himmelhaver

Sep 2, 2010: Grade level teachers will use bimonthly guidance time to develop common benchmark exams. **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Sep 2, 2010: Guidance Time for development **Person:** Marsha Himmelhaver

Oct 18, 2010: Grade level teachers will use bimonthly guidance time to develop common benchmark exams. **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Oct 18, 2010: Guidance Time for development **Person:** Marsha Himmelhaver

Nov 2, 2010: Grade level teachers will use bimonthly guidance time to develop common benchmark exams. **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Nov 2, 2010: Guidance Time for development **Person:** Marsha Himmelhaver

Nov 30, 2010: Collect fall data: Percentage of grade level teams with at least two common benchmark assessments for Math

Person: Erin Green

Nov 30, 2010: Collect fall data: Percentage of grade level teams with at least two common benchmark assessments for

Reading/Language Arts **Person:** Erin Green

Dec 2, 2010: Grade level teachers will use bimonthly guidance time to develop common benchmark exams. **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Dec 2, 2010: Guidance Time for development **Person:** Marsha Himmelhaver

Jan 11, 2011: Grade level teachers will use bimonthly guidance time to develop common benchmark exams. **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Jan 11, 2011: Guidance Time for development **Person:** Marsha Himmelhaver

Feb 2, 2011: Grade level teachers will use bimonthly guidance time to develop common benchmark exams. **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Feb 2, 2011: Guidance Time for development **Person:** Marsha Himmelhaver

Mar 2, 2011: Grade level teachers will use bimonthly guidance time to develop common benchmark exams. **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Mar 2, 2011: Guidance Time for development **Person:** Marsha Himmelhaver

Apr 5, 2011: Grade level teachers will use bimonthly guidance time to develop common benchmark exams. **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Apr 5, 2011: Guidance Time for development **Person:** Marsha Himmelhaver

May 2, 2011: Grade level teachers will use bimonthly guidance time to develop common benchmark exams. **Person:** K-6 Teachers

May 2, 2011: Guidance Time for development **Person:** Marsha Himmelhaver

Jun 30, 2011: Collect spring data: Percentage of grade level teams with at least two common benchmark assessments for Math

Person:

Jun 30, 2011: Collect spring data: Percentage of grade level teams with at least two common benchmark assessments for

Reading/Language Arts **Person:**

Encourage Rigorous Curriculum

Apr 1, 2010: Collect baseline data: The percent of teachers using standards and assessment vocabulary in their classrooms as reported on their submitted record sheet. **Person:** Robin Wolfe

Jul 25, 2010: K-12 Instruction/discussion of Marzano's strategies from a Handbook of Classroom Instruction that Works. **Person:** Strategy Team

Jul 25, 2010: Standards and Assessment Vocabulary **Person:** Strategy Team

Aug 2, 2010: Teacher will develop and incorporate lessons using standards and assessment vocabulary. **Person:** K-12 teachers

Aug 2, 2010: Teachers will develop and incorporate lessons using Bloom's New Taxonomy. **Person:** K - 6 teachers

Aug 2, 2010: Teachers will develop and incorporate lessons using Marzano's first seven strategies. **Person:** K-6 teachers

May 2, 2011: Teachers will develop and incorporate lessons using Marzano's first seven strategies. **Person:** K-6 teachers
May 9, 2011: Teacher will develop and incorporate lessons using standards and assessment vocabulary. **Person:** K-12 teachers
May 9, 2011: Teachers will develop and incorporate lessons using Bloom's New Taxonomy. **Person:** K - 6 teachers
May 9, 2011: Teachers will develop and incorporate lessons using Marzano's first seven strategies. **Person:** K-6 teachers
May 16, 2011: Teacher will develop and incorporate lessons using standards and assessment vocabulary. **Person:** K-12 teachers
May 16, 2011: Teachers will develop and incorporate lessons using Bloom's New Taxonomy. **Person:** K - 6 teachers
May 16, 2011: Teachers will develop and incorporate lessons using Marzano's first seven strategies. **Person:** K-6 teachers
May 23, 2011: Teacher will develop and incorporate lessons using standards and assessment vocabulary. **Person:** K-12 teachers
May 23, 2011: Teachers will develop and incorporate lessons using Bloom's New Taxonomy. **Person:** K - 6 teachers
May 23, 2011: Teachers will develop and incorporate lessons using Marzano's first seven strategies. **Person:** K-6 teachers
Jun 30, 2011: Collect spring data: The number of times teachers use Marzano's first seven strategies as reported on their submitted record sheet. **Person:** Robin Wolfe
Jun 30, 2011: Collect spring data: The percent of teachers using standards and assessment vocabulary in their classrooms as reported on their submitted record sheet. **Person:** Robin Wolfe
Jun 30, 2011: Collect spring data: The percent of teachers using Bloom's New Taxonomy levels as reported on their submitted record sheet. **Person:** Robin Wolfe

Focused Academic Area

Aug 18, 2010: Teachers will use research based reading instructional materials in the classroom. **Person:** K-2 Teachers
Sep 15, 2010: Teachers will use research based reading instructional materials in the classroom. **Person:** K-2 Teachers
Oct 4, 2010: DIBELS Assessment **Person:** K-2 Teachers
Oct 18, 2010: Teachers will use research based reading instructional materials in the classroom. **Person:** K-2 Teachers
Nov 18, 2010: Teachers will use research based reading instructional materials in the classroom. **Person:** K-2 Teachers
Nov 30, 2010: Collect fall data: Number of research based reading strategies used in K - 2 classrooms **Person:** Liz Schigur
Dec 3, 2010: Create a handout of research based strategies **Person:** Strategy Team
Dec 15, 2010: Teachers will use research based reading instructional materials in the classroom. **Person:** K-2 Teachers
Jan 12, 2011: Teachers will record use of reading strategies on record sheet **Person:** K-2 teachers
Jan 18, 2011: Teachers will use research based reading instructional materials in the classroom. **Person:** K-2 Teachers
Feb 18, 2011: Teachers will use research based reading instructional materials in the classroom. **Person:** K-2 Teachers
Mar 10, 2011: Teachers will use research based reading instructional materials in the classroom. **Person:** K-2 Teachers
Mar 11, 2011: DIBELS Assessment **Person:** K-2 teachers
Apr 18, 2011: Teachers will use research based reading instructional materials in the classroom. **Person:** K-2 Teachers
May 18, 2011: Teachers will use research based reading instructional materials in the classroom. **Person:** K-2 Teachers
Jun 2, 2011: DIBELS Assessment **Person:** K-2 teachers
Jun 2, 2011: Teaches will record use of reading strategies on record sheet **Person:** K-2 teachers
Jun 30, 2011: Collect spring data: Number of research based reading strategies used in K - 2 classrooms **Person:** Liz Schigur

Focused Student Group

Apr 22, 2010: Phonics Dance Training for K-2 Teachers **Person:** Liz Schigur
Aug 16, 2010: Distribute tip sheet of researched based male achievement strategies. **Person:** Bethany Miller
Aug 23, 2010: Teachers choose at least one new strategy from tip sheet to implement in their classroom first semester. **Person:** K-6 teachers
Aug 23, 2010: Teachers will implement chosen strategy in their classroom during the first semester. **Person:** K-6 teachers
Sep 8, 2010: Record teacher discussion of strategy. **Person:** Strategy Team
Sep 8, 2010: Teacher discussion of strategies **Person:** K-6 teachers
Sep 23, 2010: Teachers will implement chosen strategy in their classroom during the first semester. **Person:** K-6 teachers
Oct 13, 2010: Teacher discussion of strategies **Person:** K-6 teachers
Oct 20, 2010: Record teacher discussion of strategy. **Person:** Strategy Team
Oct 20, 2010: Teachers will implement chosen strategy in their classroom during the first semester. **Person:** K-6 teachers
Nov 10, 2010: Record teacher discussion of strategy. **Person:** Strategy Team
Nov 10, 2010: Teacher discussion of strategies **Person:** K-6 teachers
Nov 23, 2010: Teachers will implement chosen strategy in their classroom during the first semester. **Person:** K-6 teachers
Nov 30, 2010: Collect fall data: The number of teachers using new instructional strategies to improve male achievement. **Person:** Bethany Miller
Dec 8, 2010: Record teacher discussion of strategy. **Person:** Strategy Team
Dec 8, 2010: Teacher discussion of strategies **Person:** K-6 teachers
Dec 22, 2010: Teachers will implement chosen strategy in their classroom during the first semester. **Person:** K-6 teachers

Jan 10, 2011: Teachers choose at least one new strategy from tip sheet to implement in their classroom second semester. **Person:** K-6 teachers

Jan 10, 2011: Teachers will implement chosen strategy in their classroom during the second semester. **Person:** K-6 teachers

Jan 12, 2011: Record teacher discussion of strategy. **Person:** Strategy Team

Jan 12, 2011: Teacher discussion of strategies **Person:** K-6 teachers

Feb 9, 2011: Record teacher discussion of strategy. **Person:** Strategy Team

Feb 9, 2011: Teacher discussion of strategies **Person:** K-6 teachers

Feb 10, 2011: Teachers will implement chosen strategy in their classroom during the second semester. **Person:** K-6 teachers

Mar 9, 2011: Record teacher discussion of strategy. **Person:** Strategy Team

Mar 9, 2011: Teacher discussion of strategies **Person:** K-6 teachers

Mar 10, 2011: Teachers will implement chosen strategy in their classroom during the second semester. **Person:** K-6 teachers

Apr 11, 2011: Teachers will implement chosen strategy in their classroom during the second semester. **Person:** K-6 teachers

Apr 13, 2011: Record teacher discussion of strategy. **Person:** Strategy Team

Apr 13, 2011: Teacher discussion of strategies **Person:** K-6 teachers

May 10, 2011: Teachers will implement chosen strategy in their classroom during the second semester. **Person:** K-6 teachers

May 11, 2011: Record teacher discussion of strategy. **Person:** Strategy Team

May 11, 2011: Teacher discussion of strategies **Person:** K-6 teachers

Jun 30, 2011: Collect spring data: The number of teachers using new instructional strategies to improve male achievement. **Person:** Bethany Miller

Technology Use

Aug 4, 2010: CPS Mentoring **Person:** Technology Team

Aug 9, 2010: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Aug 9, 2010: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Aug 11, 2010: CPS Teacher Review **Person:** Joe Dotson

Aug 16, 2010: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Aug 16, 2010: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Aug 23, 2010: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Aug 23, 2010: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Aug 30, 2010: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Aug 30, 2010: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Sep 7, 2010: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Sep 7, 2010: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Sep 13, 2010: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Sep 13, 2010: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Sep 20, 2010: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Sep 20, 2010: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Sep 27, 2010: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Sep 27, 2010: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Oct 4, 2010: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Oct 18, 2010: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Oct 18, 2010: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Oct 25, 2010: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Oct 25, 2010: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Nov 1, 2010: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Nov 1, 2010: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Nov 8, 2010: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Nov 8, 2010: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Nov 15, 2010: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Nov 15, 2010: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Nov 22, 2010: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Nov 22, 2010: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Nov 29, 2010: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Nov 29, 2010: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Nov 30, 2010: Collect fall data: % of teachers who devoted time to computer applications as found in the Technology Curriculum Guide- per semester **Person:** Shirley Bryant

Nov 30, 2010: Collect fall data: The percent of teachers who use the system as an assessment tool. **Person:** Shirley Bryant

Dec 6, 2010: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Dec 6, 2010: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers

Dec 13, 2010: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Dec 13, 2010: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Dec 20, 2010: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Dec 20, 2010: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Jan 10, 2011: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Jan 10, 2011: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Jan 10, 2011: Tally the percent of teachers who are teaching computer applications 1st semester. **Person:** Shirley Bryant
Jan 10, 2011: Tally the percent of teachers who are using the CPS System 1st semester **Person:** Shirley Bryant
Jan 17, 2011: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Jan 17, 2011: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Jan 24, 2011: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Jan 24, 2011: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Jan 31, 2011: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Jan 31, 2011: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Feb 7, 2011: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Feb 7, 2011: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Feb 14, 2011: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Feb 14, 2011: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Feb 21, 2011: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Feb 21, 2011: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Feb 28, 2011: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Feb 28, 2011: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Mar 7, 2011: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Mar 7, 2011: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Mar 28, 2011: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Mar 28, 2011: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Apr 4, 2011: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Apr 4, 2011: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Apr 11, 2011: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Apr 11, 2011: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Apr 18, 2011: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Apr 18, 2011: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Apr 25, 2011: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Apr 25, 2011: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers
May 2, 2011: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers
May 2, 2011: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers
May 9, 2011: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers
May 9, 2011: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers
May 16, 2011: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers
May 16, 2011: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers
May 23, 2011: Assessing with the CPS system **Person:** K-6 Teachers
May 23, 2011: Computer Application Use **Person:** K-6 Teachers
Jun 2, 2011: Tally the percent of teachers using the CPS System 2nd semester **Person:** Shirley Bryant
Jun 2, 2011: Tally the percent of teachers who are teaching computer applications 2nd semester. **Person:** Shirley Bryant
Jun 30, 2011: Collect spring data: % of teachers who devoted time to computer applications as found in the Technology Curriculum Guide- per semester **Person:** Shirley Bryant
Jun 30, 2011: Collect spring data: The percent of teachers who use the system as an assessment tool. **Person:** Shirley Bryant

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.

Common Benchmark Assessments

No professional development is needed for this strategy.

Technology Use

CPS Mentoring

Brief Description: As needed, teachers will be assigned a mentor as a support for using the CPS system.

Intended Participants: Teachers

Date: Aug 4, 2010

Activity Purpose: Skill Building

Activity Format: Talk to, Presentation

Funding: None needed

Does this activity occur during the school day? Yes

F. Encourage Rigorous Curriculum: Differentiated Instruction

Differentiated summative assessment development

Brief Description: K-6 teachers will be trained by resident experts in the area of differentiated summative assessments.

Intended Participants: Teachers

Dates: Sep 17, 2010; Nov 24, 2010; Feb 15, 2011; Apr 28, 2011

Activity Purpose: Information, Skill Building

Activity Format: Presentation, Study Group

Funding: Corporation

Does this activity occur during the school day? Yes

K-12 Instruction/discussion of Marzano's strategies from a Handbook of Classroom Instruction that Wo

Brief Description: All K-12 teachers will meet to learn about Marzano's seventh instructional strategy.

Intended Participants: Teachers, Counselors, Administrators

Date: Jul 25, 2010

Activity Purpose: Information, Skill Building

Activity Format: Presentation, Professional Reading

Funding: Corporation

Does this activity occur during the school day? Yes

Standards and Assessment Vocabulary

Brief Description: Teachers will be introduced to the standards and assessment vocabulary.

Intended Participants: Teachers, Counselors, Administrators

Date: Jul 25, 2010

Activity Purpose: Information, Skill Building

Activity Format: Presentation, Professional Reading

Funding: Corporation

Does this activity occur during the school day? Yes

Train the Trainers

Brief Description: Select teachers will be trained by resident experts in the area of differentiated summative assessments.

Intended Participants: Teachers

Dates: Aug 26, 2010; Sep 2, 2010; Sep 9, 2010

Activity Purpose: Information, Skill Building

Activity Format: Talk to, Presentation, Site Visit

Funding: Corporation

Does this activity occur during the school day? Yes

I. Focused Academic Area: Reading Instructional Practices K-2

No professional development is needed for this strategy.

U. Focused Student Group: Academic Performance of Male Students

Phonics Dance Training for K-2 Teachers

Brief Description: K-2 teachers will be trained on the Phonics Dance program.

Intended Participants: Teachers

Date: Apr 22, 2010

Activity Purpose: Information, Skill Building

Activity Format: Presentation

Funding: Corporation

Does this activity occur during the school day? Yes

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... There is a performance gap between male and female students on ISTEP+

Data Targets Influenced by This Concern:

- All male students -- Achieving Mastery of Math on ISTEP Mastery of Standards

Strategies to Impact This Concern:

- U. Focused Student Group: Academic Performance of Male Students

We are concerned that... Language Arts curriculum is not addressing reading comprehension

Data Targets Influenced by This Concern:

- 3rd Grade Students -- Achieving Mastery of Reading Vocabulary on ISTEP Mastery of Standards
- Grades K - 2 Students -- Achieving Low-Risk Benchmark of Eng/LA on DIBELS from Spring Assessment

Strategies to Impact This Concern:

- I. Focused Academic Area: Reading Instructional Practices K-2

We are concerned that... All students will receive lessons that meet the needs of all learners

Data Targets Influenced by This Concern:

- All male students -- Achieving Mastery of Math on ISTEP Mastery of Standards
- All students -- Achieving Pass Plus of Eng/LA on ISTEP Mastery of Standards
- All students -- Achieving Pass Plus of Math on ISTEP Mastery of Standard
- Grades K - 2 Students -- Achieving Low-Risk Benchmark of Eng/LA on DIBELS from Spring Assessment

Strategies to Impact This Concern:

- F. Encourage Rigorous Curriculum: Differentiated Instruction

We are concerned that... Student Achievement identified on report cards does not coincide with student ISTEP+ results

Data Targets Influenced by This Concern:

- All students -- Achieving Pass Plus of Eng/LA on ISTEP Mastery of Standards
- All students -- Achieving Pass Plus of Math on ISTEP Mastery of Standard
- Grades K - 2 Students -- Achieving Low-Risk Benchmark of Eng/LA on DIBELS from Spring Assessment

Strategies to Impact This Concern:

- Common Benchmark Assessments

We are concerned that... Technology Coordination

Data Targets Influenced by This Concern:

- 3rd Grade Students -- Achieving Mastery of Reading Vocabulary on ISTEP Mastery of Standards
- All students -- Achieving Pass Plus of Eng/LA on ISTEP Mastery of Standards
- All students -- Achieving Pass Plus of Math on ISTEP Mastery of Standard
- Grades K - 2 Students -- Achieving Low-Risk Benchmark of Eng/LA on DIBELS from Spring Assessment

Strategies to Impact This Concern:

- Technology Use

Required Areas of Concern

F. Encourage Rigorous Curriculum (PL221)

Data Targets Influenced by This Concern:

- 3rd Grade Students -- Achieving Mastery of Reading Vocabulary on ISTEP Mastery of Standards
- All male students -- Achieving Mastery of Math on ISTEP Mastery of Standards
- All students -- Achieving Pass Plus of Eng/LA on ISTEP Mastery of Standards
- All students -- Achieving Pass Plus of Math on ISTEP Mastery of Standard
- Grades K - 2 Students -- Achieving Low-Risk Benchmark of Eng/LA on DIBELS from Spring Assessment

Strategies to Impact This Concern:

- F. Encourage Rigorous Curriculum: Differentiated Instruction

I. Focused Academic Area (PL221)

Data Targets Influenced by This Concern:

- 3rd Grade Students -- Achieving Mastery of Reading Vocabulary on ISTEP Mastery of Standards
- Grades K - 2 Students -- Achieving Low-Risk Benchmark of Eng/LA on DIBELS from Spring Assessment

Strategies to Impact This Concern:

- I. Focused Academic Area: Reading Instructional Practices K-2

U. Focused Student Group (PL221)

Data Targets Influenced by This Concern:

- All male students -- Achieving Mastery of Math on ISTEP Mastery of Standards

Strategies to Impact This Concern:

- U. Focused Student Group: Academic Performance of Male Students

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.

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>A. Where is the public copy of your school's curriculum located?</p> | <p>Elementary School workroom - Social Studies curriculum is being updated this school year.</p> |
| <p>B. What rules or statutes would you like to waive in order to promote student learning?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identify the specific statute and and/or rule you wish to waive. ● Identify the educational strategies this waiver would allow you to implement that could not be implemented under current statute and rule. ● Explain the benefit to student achievement. ● Describe the evaluation process that would be used to measure the success of these strategies. | <p>None</p> |
| <p>C. List the titles of the assessment instruments that are used in addition to ISTEP+ / ECA and give a brief description of each.</p> | <p>Wireless Generation and DIBELS/M Class math is used by K-2nd grade. These tools monitor reading and math skills throughout the school year. Grades 3-6 use the Acuity testing system which aligns skills to the ISTEP+ assessment. CTB Terra Nova testing is used in primary grades for High Ability identification.</p> |

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 |
| First Year: Rationale + Organizational Structure After First Year: 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