

School Improvement Plan - 2012-2013

Generated on September 19, 2012 at 2:31 PM

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 15
- Professional Development Summary 19
- Relationship Report: Areas of Concern / Strategies / Achievement Goals 22
- Force Field Excerpt 25
- Continuous Improvement Timeline 26

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
- Indiana Rules and Regulations

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
- Lee Hasken - Community Representative (Business)
- Marsha Himmelhaver - Administrator
- Rebecca Uessler - Teacher
- Robin Wolfe - Teacher

Strategy Chairs

- Marsha Himmelhaver
- Bethany Miller
- Liz Schigur
- Robin Wolfe

Community Council

- Tammy Arbuckle - Local Business and unique learning parent
- Lisa Cook - Gen Ed Parent, Healthcare Business
- Jennifer Dishman - 1st and 4th grade general education parents
- Lee Hasken - 4th grade parent, Community Agency, Business
- Karen Kaake - Youth Service, Parent of Former Students
- Julia Keibler - Gen Ed Parent, Community Agency
- Shelley Leffler - 1st Grade Gen Ed Parent
- Denzil Mc Kim - School Board member, Community Service
- Melissa Overstreet - 2nd Grade Gen Ed Parent

- Monica Roadcap - 4th grade Parent, Community Service
- Joan Schickel - Multiple Community Agencies
- Pete Schickel - Community, Multiple Community Agencies

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 and research based instruction

A school that is safe with an enjoyable and motivating learning environment

A school community that expects them to reach their maximum potential as they master all Indiana standards kindergarten through sixth grade and are prepared for higher education and the global workforce

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 Enthusiasm and positive attitude Active listening Accept differences Participate in the collaborative community 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 enthusiastic 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 Will be respectful Will be an active member of the collaborative community

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 IN state standards: 100%
- % of students who are passing each grade level: 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

2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-2014		2014-2015		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
88	83	92	87	96	86	100		100		100		100

All Female Students - Achieving Pass on End of Year Math Acuity

2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-2014		2014-2015		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
				N/A	79	85		90		95		100

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

2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-2014		2014-2015		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
15	13	20	14	20	17	25		30		35		100

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

2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-2014		2014-2015		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
18	22	23	18	25	29	30		35		40		100

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

2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-2014		2014-2015		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
81	68	86	87	92	92	100		100		100		100

K-2 - Achieving low risk benchmark of Math on MClass

2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		2012-2013		2013-2014		2014-2015		Vision Data
Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	
NA	60	70	69	80	63	90		100		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 percentage of females who do not know if they will pursue education beyond high school

6% of females don't know if they will get education beyond high school. 28% of females don't know if they expect to master Indiana Academic Standards compared to 11% of males. 55% of females don't know if teachers assign real world projects each marking period, 17% of females say that they do not. 35% of females don't know if teachers relate what they are teaching to their personal interests.

We are concerned that... Student learning styles are unknown by students and teachers

35% of student grade 3-6 reported not being able to describe their preferred learning style. 29% of teachers don't know if their students can describe their preferred learning style.

We are concerned that... All students 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.

Required Areas of Concern

F. Encourage Rigorous Curriculum

G. Attendance

I. Focused Academic Area

U. Focused Student Group

X. Graduation Plan

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:

Required Strategies

F. Encourage Rigorous Curriculum: Differentiated Instruction and Assessment

Classroom Teachers and Support Staff will incorporate differentiated lessons into their instruction. The differentiated lessons will contain elements of Marzano's nine instructional strategies, Bloom's taxonomy, learning styles and methods of differentiation (content, process, products). Implementation will be on-going with documentation required from teachers once per grading period. Each teacher will share the differentiated lesson with their Professional Learning Community group throughout the year. When implemented fully, all classroom teachers will use differentiated lessons to meet the needs of all learners.

Impact Level: High Impact - Inside

Focus: Specific

G. Attendance

Attendance will be monitored by the elementary office staff each 9 weeks and school/home communication will take place as needed. Good attendance habits will be recognized

Impact Level: Low Impact

Focus: Specific

I. Focused Academic Area: Systematic Reading Instruction K-3

Kindergarten through third grade teachers will implement a systemic approach for reading instruction over the course of the school year. The systematic approach will include a parent notification component that includes progress monitoring, frequent collaboration, and use of research based instruction techniques.

Impact Level: High Impact - Inside

Focus: Specific

U. Focused Student Group: Academic Performance of Female Students

Teachers will learn and then implement research based strategies to improve female achievement in mathematics throughout the year.

Impact Level: High Impact - Inside

Focus: Specific

X. Graduation Plan

A designated staff member will annually utilize classroom guidance time to present sixth grade students a developed curriculum that addresses high school graduation requirements. The Indiana Graduation Plan for each student will include goal setting, career searches, and career readiness and will be carried out over the course of the school year. The plan will be kept in the student's permanent record.

Impact Level: Low Impact

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.

Required Strategies

F. Encourage Rigorous Curriculum: Differentiated Instruction and Assessment

Percent of teachers specifically listing and using methods of differentiated instruction for a formal lesson.

Baseline 11-12	Follow Up 12-13 1st Semester / 1st Trimester		Follow Up 12-13 2nd Semester / Last Trimester	
Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
n/a	70		80	

The % of teachers using Bloom's New Taxonomy levels as reported on their submitted lesson plan.

Baseline 11-12	Follow Up 12-13 1st Semester / 1st Trimester		Follow Up 12-13 2nd Semester / Last Trimester	
Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
89	85		90	

The percent of teachers using Marzano's as reported on their differentiated lesson template.

Baseline 11-12	Follow Up 12-13 1st Semester / 1st Trimester		Follow Up 12-13 2nd Semester / Last Trimester	
Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
84	85		87	

Percent of teachers specifically listing standard and standards-based vocabulary on submitted lesson plan.

Baseline 11-12	Follow Up 12-13 1st Semester / 1st Trimester		Follow Up 12-13 2nd Semester / Last Trimester	
Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
83	85		87	

I. Focused Academic Area: Systematic Reading Instruction K-3

%age of teachers who bring one research-based instructional technique to discuss during scheduled collaboration

Baseline 11-12	Follow Up 12-13 1st Semester / 1st Trimester		Follow Up 12-13 2nd Semester / Last Trimester	
Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
100%	100%		100%	

Percentage of teachers sending progress monitoring information per nine weeks

Baseline 11-12	Follow Up 12-13 1st Semester / 1st Trimester		Follow Up 12-13 2nd Semester / Last Trimester	
Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
0	100%		100%	

U. Focused Student Group: Academic Performance of Female Students

The % of teachers using new instructional strategies to improve female achievement

Baseline 11-12	Follow Up 12-13 1st Semester / 1st Trimester		Follow Up 12-13 2nd Semester / Last Trimester	
Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
NA	70%		85%	

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

Apr 1, 2012: Collect baseline data: Percent of teachers specifically listing and using methods of differentiated instruction for a formal lesson. **Person:**

Apr 1, 2012: Collect baseline data: Percent of teachers specifically listing standard and standards-based vocabulary on submitted lesson plan. **Person:**

Apr 1, 2012: Collect baseline data: The % of teachers using Bloom's New Taxonomy levels as reported on their submitted lesson plan. **Person:**

Apr 1, 2012: Collect baseline data: The percent of teachers using Marzano's as reported on their differentiated lesson template. **Person:**

Jul 24, 2012: K - 12 Method of Differentiated Instruction Emphasis Groups **Person:** Allison Shalk/Nathan Barnickle

Aug 8, 2012: Differentiated Professional Development **Person:** Allison Shalk/Nathan Barnickle

Sep 19, 2012: Discuss data with teachers: Percent of teachers listing and using methods of differentiated instruction in submitted lesson plan. **Person:** Nathan Barnickle

Sep 19, 2012: Discuss data with teachers: Percent of teachers using Bloom's New Taxonomy levels as reported on their submitted lesson plan. **Person:** Teachers

Sep 19, 2012: Discuss data with teachers: Percent of teachers utilizing Marzano's nine strategies to meet a variety of learning styles. **Person:** Teachers

Sep 19, 2012: Discuss data with teachers: Percent of teachers who identify a standard and utilize vocabulary in submitted lesson plan. **Person:** Teachers

Oct 31, 2012: Differentiated Professional Development **Person:** Allison Shalk/Nathan Barnickle

Nov 30, 2012: Collect fall data: Percent of teachers specifically listing and using methods of differentiated instruction for a formal lesson. **Person:**

Nov 30, 2012: Collect fall data: Percent of teachers specifically listing standard and standards-based vocabulary on submitted lesson plan. **Person:**

Nov 30, 2012: Collect fall data: The % of teachers using Bloom's New Taxonomy levels as reported on their submitted lesson plan. **Person:**

Nov 30, 2012: Collect fall data: The percent of teachers using Marzano's as reported on their differentiated lesson template. **Person:**

Dec 19, 2012: Discuss data with teachers: Percent of teachers listing and using methods of differentiated instruction in submitted lesson plan. **Person:** Teachers

Dec 19, 2012: Discuss data with teachers: Percent of teachers utilizing Marzano's nine strategies to meet a variety of learning styles. **Person:** Teachers

Dec 19, 2012: Discuss data with teachers: Percent of teachers who identify a standard and utilize vocabulary in submitted lesson plan. **Person:** Teachers

Dec 19, 2012: Discuss data with teachers: The percent of teachers using Bloom's New Taxonomy levels as reported on their submitted lesson plan. **Person:** Teachers

Jan 9, 2013: Differentiated Professional Development **Person:** Allison Shalk/Nathan Barnickle

Feb 27, 2013: Discuss data with teachers: Percent of teachers listing and using methods of differentiated instruction in submitted lesson plan. **Person:** Teachers

Feb 27, 2013: Discuss data with teachers: Percent of teachers utilizing Marzano's nine strategies to meet a variety of learning styles. **Person:** Teachers

Feb 27, 2013: Discuss data with teachers: Percent of teachers who identify a standard and utilize vocabulary in submitted lesson plan. **Person:** Teachers

Feb 27, 2013: Discuss data with teachers: The percent of teachers using Bloom's New Taxonomy levels as reported on their submitted lesson plan. **Person:** Teachers

Apr 17, 2013: Differentiated Professional Development **Person:** Allison Shalk/Nathan Barnickle
May 15, 2013: Discuss data with teachers: Percent of teachers listing and using methods of differentiated instruction in submitted lesson plan. **Person:** Teachers
May 15, 2013: Discuss data with teachers: Percent of teachers utilizing Marzano's nine strategies to meet a variety of learning styles. **Person:** Teachers
May 15, 2013: Discuss data with teachers: Percent of teachers who identify a standard and utilize vocabulary in submitted lesson plan. **Person:** Teachers
May 15, 2013: Discuss data with teachers: The percent of teachers using Bloom's New Taxonomy levels as reported on their submitted lesson plan. **Person:** Teachers
Jun 30, 2013: Collect spring data: Percent of teachers specifically listing and using methods of differentiated instruction for a formal lesson. **Person:**
Jun 30, 2013: Collect spring data: Percent of teachers specifically listing standard and standards-based vocabulary on submitted lesson plan. **Person:**
Jun 30, 2013: Collect spring data: The % of teachers using Bloom's New Taxonomy levels as reported on their submitted lesson plan. **Person:**
Jun 30, 2013: Collect spring data: The percent of teachers using Marzano's as reported on their differentiated lesson template. **Person:**

Focused Academic Area

Apr 1, 2012: Collect baseline data: %age of teachers who bring one research-based instructional technique to discuss during scheduled collaboration **Person:**
Apr 1, 2012: Collect baseline data: Percentage of teachers sending progress monitoring information per nine weeks **Person:**
Aug 1, 2012: Create a list of when to progress monitor students (weekly, bi-weekly, monthly) **Person:** Lisa Hammond
Aug 1, 2012: Create a progress monitoring form **Person:** Angela Hood
Aug 15, 2012: K-3 Collaboration **Person:** K-3 Teachers
Sep 28, 2012: Administer DIBELS BOY assessment **Person:** K-3 Teachers
Sep 28, 2012: DIBELS progress monitoring information sent to parents **Person:** K-3 Teachers
Oct 17, 2012: K-3 Collaboration **Person:** K-3 Teachers
Nov 30, 2012: Collect fall data: %age of teachers who bring one research-based instructional technique to discuss during scheduled collaboration **Person:**
Nov 30, 2012: Collect fall data: Percentage of teachers sending progress monitoring information per nine weeks **Person:**
Dec 20, 2012: DIBELS progress monitoring information sent to parents **Person:** K-3 Teachers
Dec 20, 2012: Provide teachers release time to create research based activities for Literacy Work Stations **Person:** Marsha Himmelhaver
Dec 21, 2012: Technology Training **Person:** Liz Schigur
Feb 20, 2013: K-3 Collaboration **Person:** K-3 Teachers
Mar 15, 2013: Administer DIBELS MOY assessment **Person:** K-3 Teachers
Mar 15, 2013: DIBELS progress monitoring information sent to parents **Person:** K-3 Teachers
Apr 24, 2013: K-3 Collaboration **Person:** K-3 Teachers
May 30, 2013: Adminster DIBELS EOY assessment **Person:** K-3 Teachers
May 30, 2013: DIBELS progress monitoring information sent to parents **Person:** K-3 Teachers
May 30, 2013: Provide teachers release time to create research based activities for Literacy Work Stations **Person:** Marsha Himmelhaver
May 30, 2013: Technology Training **Person:** Liz Schigur
Jun 30, 2013: Collect spring data: %age of teachers who bring one research-based instructional technique to discuss during scheduled collaboration **Person:**
Jun 30, 2013: Collect spring data: Percentage of teachers sending progress monitoring information per nine weeks **Person:**

Focused Student Group

Apr 1, 2012: Collect baseline data: The % of teachers using new instructional strategies to improve female achievement **Person:**
Jun 18, 2012: Balanced Math Training **Person:** Balanced Math Team
Aug 17, 2012: Make math problem solving cues for student notebooks **Person:** Strategy Team
Aug 17, 2012: Make problem solving posters **Person:** Strategy Team
Aug 20, 2012: Distribute problem solving cues for student notebooks **Person:** Strategy Team
Aug 20, 2012: Distribute problem solving posters **Person:** Strategy Team
Aug 29, 2012: Explanation of strategy plan **Person:** Strategy Team
Sep 10, 2012: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Sep 17, 2012: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Sep 24, 2012: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Sep 28, 2012: Checkpoint for non-heterogenous groupings in classrooms **Person:** Strategy Team

Sep 28, 2012: Poster checks for additional math cues **Person:** Strategy Team

Sep 28, 2012: Teachers will add math cues to their original math problem solving cues posters as additional cues are introduced **Person:** Teachers

Oct 1, 2012: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Oct 8, 2012: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Oct 15, 2012: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Oct 22, 2012: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Oct 29, 2012: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Nov 5, 2012: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Nov 12, 2012: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Nov 19, 2012: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Nov 26, 2012: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Nov 30, 2012: Checkpoint for non-heterogenous groupings in classrooms **Person:** Strategy Team

Nov 30, 2012: Collect fall data: The % of teachers using new instructional strategies to improve female achievement **Person:**

Nov 30, 2012: Poster checks for additional math cues **Person:** Strategy Team

Nov 30, 2012: Teachers will add math cues to their original math problem solving cues posters as additional cues are introduced **Person:** Teachers

Dec 3, 2012: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Dec 10, 2012: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Dec 17, 2012: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Dec 24, 2012: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Dec 31, 2012: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Jan 7, 2013: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Jan 14, 2013: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Jan 21, 2013: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Jan 28, 2013: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Feb 1, 2013: Checkpoint for non-heterogenous groupings in classrooms **Person:** Strategy Team

Feb 1, 2013: Poster checks for additional math cues **Person:** Strategy Team

Feb 1, 2013: Teachers will add math cues to their original math problem solving cues posters as additional cues are introduced **Person:** Teachers

Feb 4, 2013: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Feb 11, 2013: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Feb 15, 2013: Career Day (including careers of women in mathematical fields) **Person:** Strategy Team

Feb 18, 2013: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Feb 25, 2013: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Mar 4, 2013: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Mar 11, 2013: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Mar 18, 2013: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Mar 25, 2013: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Apr 1, 2013: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Apr 5, 2013: Checkpoint for non-heterogenously groupings in classrooms **Person:** Strategy Team

Apr 5, 2013: Poster checks for additional math cues **Person:** Strategy Team

Apr 5, 2013: Teachers will add math cues to their original math problem solving cues posters as additional cues are introduced **Person:** Teachers

Apr 8, 2013: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Apr 15, 2013: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Apr 22, 2013: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Apr 29, 2013: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

May 6, 2013: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

May 13, 2013: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

May 20, 2013: Teachers will use non-heterogenous groups one time per week when doing math problem solving tasks (step 2 of the program) **Person:** Teachers

Jun 30, 2013: Collect spring data: The % of teachers using new instructional strategies to improve female achievement **Person:**

Graduation Plan

Aug 31, 2012: Distribute On Track Magazines provided by the State **Person:** Counselor or designee

Oct 25, 2012: Sign graduation plan **Person:** Teacher

Dec 14, 2012: Conduct Interest Inventory **Person:** Counselor or designee

Jan 31, 2013: Explore High School diploma options **Person:** Counselor or designee

Feb 28, 2013: Career Exploration **Person:** Counselor or designee

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 to 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.

F. Encourage Rigorous Curriculum: Differentiated Instruction and Assessment

Differentiated Professional Development

Brief Description: Teachers participate in a self-selected professional development in which they choose a specific skill or activity in which they want additional help and instruction to implement in their lessons. These teacher sessions are developed specifically to utilize differentiation.

Intended Participants: Teachers, Administrators

Date: Aug 8, 2012

Activity Purpose: Skill Building, Refinement

Activity Format: Presentation, Peer Coaching

Funding: N/A

Does this activity occur during the school day? No

Differentiated Professional Development

Brief Description: Teachers participate in a self-selected professional development in which they choose a specific skill or activity in which they want additional help and instruction to implement in their lessons. These teacher sessions are developed specifically to utilize differentiation.

Intended Participants: Teachers, Administrators

Date: Oct 31, 2012

Activity Purpose: Skill Building, Refinement

Activity Format: Presentation, Peer Coaching

Funding: N/A

Does this activity occur during the school day? No

Differentiated Professional Development

Brief Description: Teachers participate in a self-selected professional development in which they choose a specific skill or activity in which they want additional help and instruction to implement in their lessons. These teacher sessions are developed specifically to utilize differentiation.

Intended Participants: Teachers, Administrators

Date: Jan 9, 2013

Activity Purpose: Information, Feedback/Support

Activity Format: Presentation, Peer Coaching

Funding: N/A

Does this activity occur during the school day? No

Differentiated Professional Development

Brief Description: Teachers participate in a self-selected professional development in which they choose a specific skill or activity in which they want additional help and instruction to implement in their lessons. These teacher sessions are developed specifically to utilize differentiation.

Intended Participants: Teachers, Administrators

Date: Apr 17, 2013

Activity Purpose: Skill Building, Refinement

Activity Format: Presentation, Peer Coaching

Funding: N/A

Does this activity occur during the school day? No

K - 12 Method of Differentiated Instruction Emphasis Groups

Brief Description: Teachers select method of differentiated instruction to learn more about and easy ways to implement that method in their classroom. These methods include: process, product, and assessment.

Intended Participants: Teachers, Administrators

Date: Jul 24, 2012

Activity Purpose: Skill Building, Refinement

Activity Format: Presentation, Peer Coaching

Funding: N/A

Does this activity occur during the school day? No

I. Focused Academic Area: Systematic Reading Instruction K-3

Technology Training

Brief Description: Training on use of technology available in classrooms to be used during the 90 minute reading block. (SMART table/boards, TAG readers, Powerpoint...)

Intended Participants: Teachers

Date: Dec 21, 2012

Activity Purpose: Skill Building

Activity Format: Presentation, Peer Coaching

Funding: no funding needed

Does this activity occur during the school day? Yes

Technology Training

Brief Description: Training on use of technology available in classrooms to be used during the 90 minute reading block. (SMART software, clickers...)

Intended Participants: Teachers

Date: May 30, 2013

Activity Purpose: Skill Building

Activity Format: Presentation, Peer Coaching

Funding: no funding needed

Does this activity occur during the school day? Yes

U. Focused Student Group: Academic Performance of Female Students

Balanced Math Training

Brief Description: Five Easy Steps to a Balanced Math program is a research based framework for teaching math in the elementary grades.

Intended Participants: Teachers, Administrators

Date: Jun 18, 2012

Activity Purpose: Information, Skill Building

Activity Format: Presentation

Funding: Title II professional development funds

Does this activity occur during the school day? No

X. Graduation Plan

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... There is a percentage of females who do not know if they will pursue education beyond high school

Data Targets Influenced by This Concern:

- All Female Students -- Achieving Pass on End of Year Math Acuity

Strategies to Impact This Concern:

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

We are concerned that... Student learning styles are unknown by students and teachers

Data Targets Influenced by This Concern:

- Grades K - 2 Students -- Achieving Low-Risk Benchmark of Eng/LA on DIBELS from Spring Assessment
- K-2 -- Achieving low risk benchmark of Math on MClass

Strategies to Impact This Concern:

- F. Encourage Rigorous Curriculum: Differentiated Instruction and Assessment

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

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
- K-2 -- Achieving low risk benchmark of Math on MClass

Strategies to Impact This Concern:

- G. Attendance
- F. Encourage Rigorous Curriculum: Differentiated Instruction and Assessment
- I. Focused Academic Area: Systematic Reading Instruction K-3
- X. Graduation Plan

Required Areas of Concern

F. Encourage Rigorous Curriculum (IN Rules)

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:

- F. Encourage Rigorous Curriculum: Differentiated Instruction and Assessment

G. Attendance (IN Rules)

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
- K-2 -- Acheiving low risk benchmark of Math on MClass

Strategies to Impact This Concern:

- G. Attendance

I. Focused Academic Area (IN Rules)

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: Systematic Reading Instruction K-3

U. Focused Student Group (IN Rules)

Data Targets Influenced by This Concern:

- All Female Students -- Achieving Pass on End of Year Math Acuity

Strategies to Impact This Concern:

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

X. Graduation Plan (IN Rules)

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

Strategies to Impact This Concern:

- X. Graduation Plan

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?	Elementary Office Workroom
<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. 	None
C. Are your school's attendance rates supportive of learning? What activities will you implement next year to increase or maintain your attendance rate?	Lanesville Elementary attendance rate to date is at 97.49%. We will continue are daily calling practice for students who are absent whose parents fail to notify the school.
D. List the titles of the assessment instruments that are used in addition to ISTEP+ / ECA and give a brief description of each.	Wireless Generation DIBELS reading assessment Grades K-2 Wireless Generation MClass Math assessment Grades K-2 Terra Nova Kindergarten Acuity Grades 3-6

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 2013-2014 school year